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ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA

VOLUME I


P. 486b, AL-ANDALUS, (i), add to Bibl.: H. Halm, Al-Andalus and Gothica sors, in Isl., lxi (1989), 252-63.

P. 1277b, BOSRA, add to Bibl.: F. Aalund, M. Meinecke and Riyadh Sulaiman al-Muqdad, Islamic Bosra, a brief guide, German Archaeological Institute, Damascus 1990.

VOLUME II


VOLUME III


VOLUME IV


P. 206b, ISMAILIYYA, add to Bibl.: Farhad Daltary, The Imama't, their history and doctrines, Cambridge 1990.


P. 1069b, AL-KHARAZMI, ARUJ ABU ALLAH, add to Bibl.: C.E. Bosworth, Al-Khwârazmî on various faiths and sects, chiefly Iranian, in Textes et Memoires, Melanges Ch. Pellat], Paris 1988.

VOLUME V

P. 428b, AL-KURÂN, add to Bibl., section Other works in Arabic: R. Bell, A commentary on the Qur'an, 2 vols., Manchester 1991.


VOLUME VI

P. 342b, MAIN SINGH, l. 6, for Mali, read Mall.


P. 537a, MARATIB, 1. 39, for Safdar, read Safdar.

P. 730b, MAJUM, l. 1, for Madelis Jusro Indonesia, read Madelis Jusro Muslimin Indonesia.

P. 801b, MAṬBA'A, l. 60, for Sultan ʿAbd al-Majid I, read Sultan ʿAbd al-Hamid I.

P. 801b, l. 22, for 1210/1795-6, read 1211/1797.

P. 913b, MAYDÂN, add to Bibl.: A. Northedge, The racecourses at Sâmarra', in BSOAS, liii (1990), 31-56.


P. 1018b, MENTESHE-OGHULLARI, l. 46, for (1296), read (1293-5), see Angeliki Laiou, Some observations on Alexios Philanthropenos and Maximos Planoudes, in Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, iv (1978), 89-99.

P. 1018b, l. 3-4, for Orkhan Beg's death was probably before 1344, and his son Ibrahim succeeded him., read Orkhan Beg's death was before 1337, for in that year his son and successor Ibrahim Beg concluded a treaty with the Duca di Canda or Venetian governor of Crete.

VOLUME VII

P. 10-14, for but as a result of an agreement made with the assistance of Marino Morosini, the Count of Crete, between the years 1332-5, they were forced to disband. Ibrahim Beg died some time before the year 1360., read but treaties were concluded in 1353 between Marino Morosini, the Duca di Canda, and the amirs of Aydin [q.v.] and Menteshe and the Venetian forces were disbanded. Ibrahim Beg died at some point before 1358, because in that year his successor Mias (see below) concluded a treaty with the Duca di Canda (see on these treaties and their texts, which have survived, E.A. Zachariadou, Trade and Crusade, Venetian Crete and the emirates of Menteshe and Aydin, 1300-1413, 217-18,
ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA XV

the earliest treaty between one of the Menteshe amirs and a Venetian Duca di Candia being that of the year 1331).


1. 8 from bottom, for Count of Crete, read Duca di Candia.


P. 1026b. MESIHI, 2nd paragraph, l. 29, replace it is generally accepted ... no Persian model, by It is generally accepted that in Ottoman poetry the akwad-enge genre started with Mesihâ (akwad-enge by Dhibâ would appear to date from just about the same time); it did have Persian forerunners, though. (Cf. Michael Glüne, Sâfâî Şâhrângi, ein persisches Maßstäbli über die schönen Berufsleute von Istanbul, in Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques, xL2 (1986), 133-45.)

VOLUME VII

Pp. 81-87, MINTAKAT AL-BURUDJ.

P. 81b, l. 35-36, after mintakat falak al-burudj, add or (more rarely) nitdk al-burudj., l. 59, for nitdk, read nitdk.

P. 82a, l. 56, read Bihiycitugyqas.

P. 82b, l. 27, for 26, 27, read 36, 27.

l. 44, for 174, 3/2, read 174, -3/2.

l. 45, after from alâbâridj, add which means al-cuzûr (i.e. al-burudj).

P. 83a, l. 51, read ol Alâbudaj.

l. 67, for translation from Greek, read translated from Greek.

P. 83b, l. 35, read Xqdaî.

l. 67, for û, o, û, û, v, read û, o, û, û, v.

P. 84a, l. 48, read Yâbûroyoç.

l. 50, for idhrukhaîs, read idhrukhaîs.

P. 84b, l. 8, for al-rîsha, read al-rîsha.

l. 11, for al-Mukhassas, read al-Mukhassas.

l. 50, read Zhdâca bîwama.

l. 57, for triplicates, read triplicates.

l. 63, read tascuwoxqaroqep.

P. 85a, l. 19, read ûrçbojxqos, for (8oö), read ûróö.

P. 85b, l. 47, for aktuul, read atuul.

l. 58, for circles at longitude, read circles of longitude.

l. 60, for al-kawakib, read al-kawakib.

P. 86a, l. 8, for 417 1/2, read 417 1/2.

l. 12, read ûntcçepamçqoç.

in the Comparative table, entry no. 1 (Eratosthenes), last column, for + 7° 35', read + 7° 35'.

entry no. 8, name, for Banû Amadjur, read Banû Amâdʒur.

P. 86a, Bibliography, l. 5, read al-bâkyâa.


P. 138a, MISÂAHA, 1., add at the end of the article: In the Yemen, the normal measurement of surface area was the ma'âd, a large, square surface which has two kaşaba per side or two habî, a unit of measurement equal to 50 cubits. The ma'âd is subdivided into kîràt, which is a square with a side of 25 cubits; it is thus equivalent to 625 square cubits. There are 16 kîrât in a ma'âd, which contains 10,000 libna, a unit of surface measurement which has a side of one cubit. The surveyor is in, the Yemen, appreciably longer than that of the trader. This last contains 24 isha's or fingers, equivalent each one to 6 isha's. But the surveyors' cubit in use at Wâdî Zâbid contained 6 kbâdas, to which was added a seventh kbâda minus the thumb, which would make a total of 40 isha's or about 83 cm (cf. Ibn al-Dayba'), al-Fasl al-mazid, or about 83 cm (cf. Ibn al-Dayba', al-Fasl al-mazid).


P. 256b, MU'ÂRADA, add to Bibl.: Texts of Ottoman treaties, translations and comments can be found in Quaderni di Studi Arabi, v-vi (1987-8) (= Atti del XIII Congresso dell' U.E.A.I.), 91-104.


P. 303a, MUḌṬIHAĐ, l. 25, add A very paradoxical interpretation of the concept of idhrikhâd can already be found in the thought of Molla Muśîn al-Fayyâl al-Kâsháî (d. 1091/1680), for whom the true muḍṭihâds are those who follow the Akhbârî school (see Kohlberg, 143).
XVI ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA


P. 631a, MURSAL. The first three lines of the Bibliography should read as follows: Bibliography: Given in the article; see further Abū Dāwūd al-Sūdāstānī, Kitāb al-Marašīl, ed. Shu‘ayb al-Arna’ūt, Beirut 1988; Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī, Kitāb al-Marašīl, ed. S.B. al-Samarra‘ī, Baghdad 1388; idem, ed. Sh. N. Kātānī, Beirut 1977;

P. 654a, MUSADDIK, 4th l. from bottom, for negotiations on new occasions..., read negotiations on new concessions...


Plate XLII, for Ca. 1680-90, read The first quarter of the 18th century.

SUPPLEMENT

MIFRASH (A.), more usually in its Persian form mafrash, or the Ottoman mifresh, denotes a travelling pack for bedding. Derived from the Arabic verb farasha “to spread out or furnish a house or tent”, it is thus cognate with mafrakhat [q.v.] in the sense of “bedding”.

Two early examples made from waxed canvas, reinforced with patterns of brass studs, are preserved in the harem of the Topkapı Sarayı, Istanbul (8/460 and 8/465 kurg). These are flat-bottomed, 90 x 55 cm, with D-shaped ends 30 cm high around which the long sides curve inwards. A grip was fitted at each end, and the pack was secured by seven straps buckled from side to side and one lengthwise. The original colour seems to have been vine green.

The term is now generally applied to the woven rectangular bedding packs still used by nomads, and normally made in pairs to balance on either side of the camel carrying them. It appears in the following variants: Azāri (lit.) mafrak, (Pushkin, Nakhchivan, Djebrayil, and Shusha, also Karapapak) in Kars province) farmah, (Shahsevan and Karadaghli) färmaḥ or färmaḥ, Kurdish (Djalali) mafrāḥ or mafrash, Kaghāzī Turkish mafrāř or (Farsimand) mafrāṣ; Özbek (lit.) mafraṣa, (Kaučin) nafra, (Kungrat of the Surkhan-darya) nafra, (Lakay) mepremek, (Aksha and Taqkūrgān) meprema. The Karakalpak equivalent is called kargan. It is not clear whether mafrash as attributed to the Türkmen is due only to Iranian dealers; it does not appear in Baskakov’s dictionary, nor is it usual among the Yomut of Iran. It is applied only to a small pouch. The term survives in various parts of Anatolia as mafrār (Derlemе sıclığı, ix, 1977), and among the Türkmen of Kayseri (Akkişla) and the Karadaglı of Ayvon as nafrash, but in the latter two cases it is used for a woven pouch for soft goods.

In Iran, the form is particularly developed among the Shahsevan [q.v.] and Karadaghli, not only in Mughān and Arasbāran, but among the outlying tribes in Hāqtrūd and Miyāna, Bījār, Kasvīn and Sava, and Miyandāb; since substantial parts of the Kharakān groups appear to have been moved there from northeast Adharbāyjān under Nādir Shāh or later in the 12th/18th century, it was probably known to the main body of Shahsevan there by 1700, that is from the beginning of the federation (cf. Tapper in Bīhl., 804 ff.). Its use in Fārs is typical of the Kaghāzī, and it seems not to be known among the tribes of Kirmān; it may therefore have been brought south by those elements of the Kaghāzī who came from Adharbāyjān in Safavid times or earlier. In both regions the packs are usually flat-woven, though those of the Shahsevan are woven on a vertical loom, while those in Fārs are woven on a ground loom; the usual technique is progressive weft float brocading (soumad), though examples in pilework can also be found. The Shahsevan also use tapestry weave. Kaghāzī packs are characterised by leather binding along all the edges, a handle at either end, three straps across the width, and one lengthwise, with buckles, and flaps to close the top: they are thus close to the Ottoman model. They measure about 120 cm long, 40 cm wide and 55 cm high. Mughān Shahsevan packs are slightly smaller, at about 100 x 50 x 50 cm, and generally lack both straps and flaps, though the latter are occasionally provided. Instead, the open top is provided with rings at the edges through which lacing can be passed. In both cases the woven design appears on all four sides, the bottom being simply in plain weave. In brocaded packs from Miyāna, the design is sometimes on three sides only, whereas in those from Hāqtrūd, Khamsa and Bījār, only one face is decorated (Tanavoli, in Bīhl., 161 ff.). Tapestry-woven packs are, however, four-faced in all regions. Both types are some 10 cm lower than in Mughān, as are those from Kars. Kurdish packs in both Turkey and Iran, are used by the Djalali and Milān, resemble the Mughān format in size and in tending to have three bands of ornament continuous on all faces, but the handling of the motifs is more compact, and a technique of reversed extra-weft knotted wrapping is sometimes used. A few packs of the Kaghāzī format were made by the Bakhtiyārī and other Lur, but with Luri ornament: these too were usually in progressive brocading.

Lakay mepremek are also small in format, up to 95 x 30 x 40 cm, and are decorated with pilework or embroidery on one long side and the ends only; they are fitted with five or six loops on each of the long top edges. It is said that staves are passed through these to stiffen the pack as it is packed up, a procedure absent among nomads in Iran. Such packs appear to be associated particularly with the Kipčak group of Özbek. They are also found among some Iranian-speaking groups in southern Tādžikistan, including the ‘Arab and Larkhābī. Somewhat similar packs, called lang-tuk (100 x 60 x 30) are used by some Kazak (Kızıl Orda oblast), and may be compared to the felt covers, sandık kap, used to house their chests.

Bedding packs hold a complete bed, of mattress, quilt and pillow, rolled up, or even two, and can be lifted by two people with difficulty when full. They are ranged along the rear wall of the tent, forming the basis of the baggage pile, yak, where the decorated face can be displayed to advantage.

The equivalent Persian term is takht-i khyāb-piš. In northern India the same function is performed by the bedding roll, bisturāband or “holder”;
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This letter to Ishak was followed by another instructing him to send to al-MaDmun seven named
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[27x-181], is best known. He was born in 602/1205 Dawla and probably died towards the end of the 7th/13th century, after having held the post of mihmindxr.

and a treatise on rhetoric, who claimed to belong to labf/al-Taghlibi, author of a work on genealogy Tha

and officially applied under al-MaDmun, who was at al-Rakka (or Damascus, accord-

in the public service (see esp. al-
mihminddriyya (min arbdb al-akldm), was an

Englishman, Fribourg 1985). For the technique, see also R. L. and N. Tapper, M. Hiyarf, "... in the audience chamber of the ruler.

Whilst the nāb was an official of the pen (min arbāb al-okām), the office of mihmindärīya was reserved for an official of the sword (min arbāb al-sīlah) in the public service (see esp. al-Kalkashandl, K. K. "... and officials applied under his two immediate successors, for the purpose of imposing the view that the Kurān had been created.

1. The course of historical events. The circumstances of this initiative, which was set in motion by Al-Māmun in a letter written in Rābi‘ ii 216 (March 23, 835), four months before his death, are most fully described by al-Tabari (iii, 1112 ff.) and have been examined in detail by Patton (56 ff.). In the first instance, Al-Māmun, who was at Al-Rakkā (or Damascus, according to al-Ya‘kūbi, ii, 571), desired his deputy in Baghdad, Ishākh b. Ibrāhim, to test the kāfis in his jurisdiction concerning God's creation of the Kurān.

The language of his letter to this effect is powerful and direct: God has the right to have His religion carried out properly, and the great mass of the common people, who know no better, being without the light of knowledge, are mystified when they espouse the view that the Kurān is eternal (kātim al-awwal); for God has said in the Kurān “We have made it (dāʼahumā) an Arabic Kurān” (XXIII, 3), and everything He has made (dā’ihi) He has created (dālāh). In addition, they have made a fallacious link between themselves and the umma, making themselves out to be “the people of truth, religion and unity” characterising those who do not agree with them as “people of falsehood, unbelief and schism”, but in reality they are, inter alia, “the worst of the umma” and “the tongue of the Devil” and are in no way to be trusted. The Commander of the Faithful will not rely on anyone who does not conform in this regard, nor are kāfis to accept the testimony of such people.

This letter to Ishākh was followed by another instructing him to send to Al-Māmun seven named
individuals, including the traditionists Ibn Sa’d, Yahyá b. Ma’n and Zuhayr b. Hár [q.v.]. All seven were tested and, having acknowledged the doctrine of the created Qur’an, were returned to Baghdád where their acknowledgement was broadcasted. By this time, too, mihna letters from al-Ma’mun were reaching other centres: the text of the letter which reached Mísr in Djamádá II 218/July 833 was closely modelled on, or identical with, the first letter to Ishák (Ibn Taghribirdi, ed. Cairo, ii, 218 f., cf. al-Kifri, xix, 85 f). It was at Baghdád that the impact of the mihna was felt most at this time: in response to further instructions from al-Ma’mun, Isháq went on to test about thirty leading fukáhá and hadíthí specialists, who, with only two exceptions, and in certain cases under some duress, acknowledged the doctrine of the created Qur’an. The exceptions, Ahmad b. Hanbal [q.v.] and Muhammád b. Núh al-Játhí, were dispatched in irons to be dealt with by al-Ma’mun at Tarsús on his return from Byzantine territory, but the sudden death of the caliph (mid-Rádjal 218/mid-August 833) saved them from this particular predicament and they were sent back. Muhammád b. Núh died on the return journey, and Ahmad was kept in detention after reaching Baghdád.

Al-Ma’mun had set in motion in the last four months of his life (when his brother and successor as caliph, al-Mu’táṣím, was left to cope with him). He had moreover stipulated in his last will and testament that al-Mu’táṣím should, inter alia, hold to his policy on the Qur’an and make (the Mu’tazílís) Ahmad b. Abí Du’ád [q.v.] his closest confident (al-Ṭabarí, iii, 1137, 1139; al-Subkí, ii, 59); and al-Subkí with some justification advances this as the reason why, for al-Mu’táṣím himself, it was only on the return of ‘Ilí that he nonetheless required adherence to the doctrine of the created Qur’an. Concerning the question of how this was achieved, it would seem that a distinction should be made between mihna as a regular formality in courts of law and mihna as a ‘test’ applied beyond the confines of the courtroom: as an example of mihna in the first of these senses, we are told that in Mísr the kádhí would accept the testimony only of those witnesses who acknowledged that the Qur’an had been created and that ‘this [type of] mihna lasted from 218 until [after] the accession of al-Mutawakkil in 232’ (al-Kindí, 447). On the matter of where the mihna was applied, the evidence points to Baghdád, Kufa, Baṣra, Damascus, Mecca and Medina (Patton, 62 f.; Abu ‘l-Arkáb, 448 f.; Hanbal b. Isháq, 30 f.; Wákí‘, i, 268 f.; also Ikriyá, see below) in addition to Mísr. The situation in the Táhiríd-controlled East is not clear: the kádhí of Balkh is reported to have objected to a mihna letter which stated that the Qur’an had been created (al-Balkhí, Fadálî, 210), and the author of the Táhirí-i Sústán says that, after the floggment of Ahmad b. Hanbal, al-Mu’táṣím circulated letters to each community calling upon them to accept and believe in the created Qur’an (185 f.; Eng. tr. Gold, 147; one may suspect here a fusion of al-Ma’mún’s letters with al-Mu’táṣím’s treatment of Ahmad); but that appears to be the sum total of our present knowledge about the matter as far as the East is concerned.

The sources give the impression that al-Mu’táṣím himself was in general predisposed to settle for mihna as no more than a courtroom formality, and al-Kindí even remarks that ‘the matter of the mihna was easy (shabíh) during the reign of al-Mu’táṣím’ (431), but there are nonetheless two instances early in his reign where it was applied outside the courtroom. The first of these does not seem to have been particularly important: al-Mu’táṣím wrote to his governor of Mísr, Mu’azzáfír b. Kaydur (held office Rabí‘ II-Šáhí, 219/May-Sept. 834), instructing him to test the ‘uádá‘ on the creation of the Kur’an and he tested a group of people by assessing Iblír b. Taghríbír ði, 120, don’t know what it means of this, and it is possible that Ibn Taghríbír ði is misrepresenting the al-Ma’mún letter transmitted by the future caliph al-Mu’táṣím to Mu’azzáfír’s father Kaydur, when the latter was governor of Egypt and al-Ma’mún was still caliph, al-Kindí, 193, 445 f.). The second instance, the matter of the unfinished business of al-Mu’táṣím looms large in later Sunní hagiography. Abú Nu’aym, Ibn al-Djáwízí, al-Subkí and others, drawing freely on material transmitted by members of Ahmad’s family, regale us with the details of how the courageous and intransigent Imám Ahmad resisted all attempts to make him acknowledge the created Qur’an, was ultimately flogged on al-Mu’táṣím’s orders until he was unconscious (but cf. the alternative version given by Abú Nu’aym, ix, 205 f.), and was released shortly afterwards when commotion among the population of Baghdád threatened to get out of hand. These accounts include some striking embellishments, e.g. how Ahmad’s sandálí were supernaturally restored to their former (golden hand in some versions) when they were in the process of slipping off while he was being flogged. In sum, what is portrayed is an archetypal Sunní hero, quietist by disposition but resolute when pressed to espouse a view he regards as religiously improper: there is no room for takyíyá here (for a detailed treatment of all this, see Patton, 95 f.).

That Ahmad was flogged for not doubting, for all that the incident is ignored by al-Ṭabarí and Ibn Miskawayh; the sources give as the date of this event both Ramádán 219/Sept. 834 and Ramádán 220/Sept. 833, the second of which is to be preferred if it is correct that the total period of his detention was about two-and-a-half years (see e.g., Sálih b. Ahmad, 270; Hanbal b. Isháq, 42). There are, however, certain respects in which the received Sunnín account may in fact be questioned, in view of what some of the sources have to say. In the first place, these sources are under the impression that Ahmad was flogged until he actually acknowledged the created Qur'an: al-Ya’kúbí knew this to be the case (ii, 577), and Ahmad’s contemporary al-Djáhíz tells us that it took only 30 strokes (Rád“i, ed. Sandúlí, 152); al-Má’údi thought that it took 36 strokes (Murúa-, § 2977), while Ibn al-Murtádá opts for 68 (Tahákál al-Mu’tázíla, 125). Secondly, these sources know nothing about Ahmad’s release having been occasioned by a public commotion; for them, his release was the consequence of his acknowledgement, although Ibn al-Murtádá would have us believe that it took place only after he had acknowledged the created Qur’an before the assembled population of Baghdád. Thirdly, what these sources have to say provides an alternative explanation of why Ahmad was subsequently left alone by the authorities; it was not because they lacked the nerve to test him again, but because he had capitulated. None of these sources can be regarded as other than more or less hostile to Ahmad, but even so it is difficult to explain away the essence of what they have to say. The en passant remark by al-Djáhíz, in particular, with its casual and matter-of-fact tone, has a convincing ring to it; Ibn al-Murtádá’s reference to Ahmad’s public acknowledgement of defeat may well be dismissed as an embellishment, although it would have made good sense from the point of view of Ibn
Abi Du‘ad, who was by this time kādi‘ al-kudat and thus in effect chief inquisitor; and even Ibn al-Djawzf! was aware of such accounts, for all that he eschewed them (337; kitāb fi kisā‘ darbīhim lam yakhbū ‘indās inhalātuhā fa-tanankalnāhā).

However the case of Abūm is to be viewed, it is apparent that this was the last occasion on which al-Mu‘tasim involved himself in any conspicuous way with the prosecution of the muhna. Thereafter he was preoccupied with moving his capital to Sāmarrā’ [q. v.], dealing with the rebell Baβāk [q. v.], mounting his celebrated offensive against Amurān [see ‘Ammūriya], coping with the revolt of Mā‘āzī [q. v.], and in 228/841, the year before his death, overseeing the trial and execution of ʿAflāt [q. v.]. Although al-Kindī is (presumably) referring only to Misr when he says that the matter of the muhna was easy during the rule of al-Mu‘tasim (see above), his remark appears also to be true more generally; Ibn Ṭabarī even goes so far as to suggest that al-Mu‘tasim at some point banned the testing of ‘ulāmā‘ (ii, 259), and the relative inactivity of Ibn Abī Du‘ad during these years remains in need of explanation. Not until the last year of al-Mu‘tasim’s reign can any changes be observed in respect of the application of the muhna, at Misr in one case and Baghdad in another. The first of these changes came when the Mālikī kādi‘ of Mā‘āzī, Hārūn b. ‘Abd Allah al-Zuhrī (al-Kindī, 467), had been created Kūrān‘ since the time of the al-Mu‘āūn and had henceforward tested witnesses in court, baulked at transporting fukahā (sc. to ʿIrāk) for testing and was suspended from duty in ʿAṣaf 226/Dec. 840 (al-Kindī, 447, 449). Ibn Abī Du‘ad immediately put in charge of the mihna in Mā‘āzī a certain Muhammad b. Abī ‘l-Layth al-Asamm, who was a fahā‘īh according to the “ma‘ṣūlah of the Kūfī” (al-Kindī, 449), and is identified as a Mu‘taṣīlī (al-Kindī, 467). He set about transporting people to ʿIrāk for interrogation, among them the traditional Ṯu‘aymī b. Ḥammād and al-Ṣāḥīfī’s discipline Yusūfī b. Yābūy al-Buwaytī (al-Kindī, 447), both of whom later died there in prison (Patton, 119; Ibn al-Djawzf, 397 f.; Ibn Ḥādjār, Taβārī, xi, 460 ff., xi, 427 ff.). Two months later, Ibn Abī Du‘ad had the distinguished Malikī jurist Abī ‘l-Mu‘tasim, al-Muḥammad b. Abī ‘l-Ya‘kūb, appointed as kādi‘ at Baghdad, and had the distinguished Malikī jurist Saḥmīn [q. v.] arraigned at al-Kayrawān before the Mu‘taṣīlī kādi‘ Ibn Abī ‘l-Djawzf, Saḥmīn held to the view that the Kūrān was “the speech of God and not created” and was sentenced to house arrest (Ṭalībī, L’emirat aghlabide, 228; Abu ʿl-ʿArab, 454 ff., can be added to Talībī’s references).

Al-Wāṭhīk is said to have left off the doctrine of the created Kūrān after a ʿaybak from Adana, who was one of abī al-fikr wa ʿl-hadīthī, bésted Ibn Abī Du‘ad in argument on the subject (Patton, 121 ff.; al-Mas‘ūdī, Taβārī, ii, 150; Murūjī, al-Kindī, ii, 151 f., and Ibn al-Djawzf, 350 ff. can be added to Patton’s references). But it was his brother al-Mutawakkīl, who succeeded him in Dhu ‘l-Hijādha 232/August 847, who put an end to the mihna. Al-Subkī tells us (ii, 54) that this happened in 234/858-9, and Patton (122) concurs. Certainly, it appears to have been in Dijmādā I f 234/Jan.-Feb. 849 that al-Mutawakkīl prohibited argument about the Kūrān and sent instructions to this effect throughout his domains (al-Kindī, 197; al-Ṭabarī, iii, 1412 (lamma afṣal tasyih ‘l-khifasā); Ibn Ṭabarībirdī, ii, 275); and this decision may well have been facilitated by the fact that Ibn Abī Du‘ad had become paralysed in the preceding year (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 1379). But there are grounds for holding the view that it was not until 237/851-2 that the mihna episode was completely phased out. In the first place, it was in that year that the mortal remains of Ahmad b. Naṣr were taken down and given over to his relatives and that those who had been imprisoned on account of the doctrine of the created Kūrān were released (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 1412 f.; Ibn Ṭabarībirdī, ii, 290; cf. al-Ya‘kūbī, ii, 592, which implies that the prisoners were released earlier); it was in that year too that Ahmad b. Abī Du‘ad and his sons were deprived of all influence, together with their estates and most of their wealth, and were sent by al-Mutawakkīl away from Sāmarrā‘ to Baghdād (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 1410 f.).

Secondly, it is instructive to take note of the dates...
when kādis who had implemented the mihna were replaced: Ibn Abi 'l-Layth was dismissed as kadi of Misr in ša'ba' 235/Feb.-March 850 at the order of al-Mutawakkil, who instructed that he be cursed from the community for its eternity of pre-existence" (Madelung, 508, citing al-Tabari, iii, 1113, 1118). What was he trying to achieve? According to Sourdel, "jamais auparavant on n'avait vu un calife se présenter comme un 'docteur', chargé par Dieu d'éclairer la communauté et de lui communiquer la science qui lui avait été confiée" (Politique religieuse, ch. v), who propose that the type of caliphal religious authority which al-Ma'mūn sought to re-establish was one which had indeed been familiar in the time of the Umayyad caliphate. Whether he would have succeeded if he had lived longer is one of the great questions of counterfactual history, although the odds were certainly against him: for he had to contend not only with the choice of his 'Abbāsīd predecessors to play up their roles as kinsmen of the Prophet (at the expense of their role as deputies of God) but also with the fact that by his time the transformation of sunna into Prophetic sunna documented by hadith had gone a long way.

According to Watt, the point of insisting on a created Kur'ān as the central feature of the mihna was that it had less prestige than an uncreated Kur'ān (since God might have created it otherwise), and "there could not be the same objections to its provisions being overruled by the decree of an inspired Imam. Thus the doctrine of createdness enhanced the power of the caliph and the secretaries, that of uncreatedness the power of the ulama" (Formative period, 179). But this misses the point: for one thing, the doctrine of the created Kur'ān is a doctrine about God, and more specifically about God's unity, rather than a doctrine about the Kur'ān, and there is in any case no evidence whatsoever to support the view that al-Ma'mūn wanted to overrule the Kur'ān; for another, it is clear that it was the populist enthusiasts who were al-Ma'mūn's target. What al-Ma'mūn in fact appears to have been doing is espousing that form of what may be called "hardline" Hanafi thinking which was cautious about hadith and held to the doctrine of the created Kur'ān, and which to that extent had an affinity with the early Mu'tazzilī insistence that the Kur'ān be "the only basis for their system of religious doctrine ... [an insistence which] led them to the rejection of most traditions and, by implication, of legal doctrines based on traditions" (Schacht, Origins, 258). This is not to say that the inspiration for the mihna necessarily came from Mu'tazzilīs or that its initial purpose was the imposition of Mu'tazzīlī doctrine; indeed, van Ess (Dīnār, 34) has drawn attention to Ibn Tayfūr's important indications (i) that the truly influential figure behind al-Ma'mūn was the Dījahmite Hanafi Bishr al-Marāsī [i.e.,]. who, while he shared with the Mu'tazzīlī a belief in the doctrine of the created Kur'ān, did not hold with their doctrine of free will; and (ii) that al-Ma'mūn himself also left off al-kawl bi 'l-kadar. But this would appear to have been the only point of major difference between the two stances. Otherwise, there are simply further similarities. For example, Abu I-l-'Arab (451) knew of a mihna letter from al-Ma'mūn to Ishāk which stipulated not only the doctrine of the created Kur'ān but also the denial of 'ashīb al-kahf [q.v.] and other aspects of popular eschatology: this
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his accession. The correct date for her death, 25 Jan. 1578, is given only by Gerlach, Tagebuch, 449; the date in Karačelebi-zâde, ap. cit., 458, namely Düg 'I-Ka'da 584/20 January-18 February 1577, is a whole year off! She was buried beside her father in his tomb (mosque) in Istanbul. From her marriage with Rüstем Paşa, two sons and a daughter 5Aché Kihanum were born; the latter married the grand vizier Şemşeddin Paşa and then the Nişâbûndi Feridün Ahmed Beg (see A.D. Alderson, The structure of the Ottoman dynasty, Oxford 1956, Table XXX).

Bibliography: In addition to the references given in my mosque article, I now add also Khirbat al-Mafdjar. In other verses of the Kur'ân, namely in XIX, 12, it refers to a "sanc¬tuary", while in III, 36, the word is used for "a lady's private chamber" (see also Dozy, 1927, i, 265). Rhodokanakis mentions that in XXVIII, 21, it was not clear whether the Prophet meant a complete "palace" or only a "chamber" (Rhodokanakis, 1911, 71). Horovitz referred to some of the occurrences in pre-Islamic poetry, among them one of al-Aš'â's poems (al-Buhturi, Hamâsa, CDIV, 4) where the word, he claimed, meant a "throne-recess" (Horovitz, 1951-4, iii, 231-3). In a more recent article, Ghiûl explained that the basic meaning was a "row of columns with their intervening spaces". He also sug¬gested that under the Umayyads, "while retaining its other senses, it was the name given to the maksûra [q.v.]" (Serjeant, 1959, 453). Mahmûd 4All Ghiûl claimed that the ancient South Arabian midhâdân was almost identical in usage with the mîhrâb. It was a kind of masjdâ al-Mas'ûda [q.v.], or even a "burial place in the shape of a portico, place for prayers, and services for the dead" (Ghiûl, 1962, 321-5). In connexion with this last interpretation, the present author in an article called attention to the fact that flat marble, stubbo, stone, or facée mahârût strongly resemble tombstones. Tombstones from early Islamic times onward frequently depict a mîhrâb design. He re-examined one of al-Aš'â's poems (CDIV, 4) where the word mîhrâb occurs and suggested that it can be interpreted as a "burial place", as opposed to Horovitz's explanation as a "throne-recess". Other literary examples also use the word in the same context (Fehervári, 1972, 241-54; also, idem, 1961, 32 f.). From these interpretations it would appear that in pre- and in early Islamic times, the word mîhrâb was basically used for a special place within a "palace" or in a "room"; it was "the highest", "the first" and "the most important place". At the same time it also denoted "the space between columns" and was equally used for a "burial place". Its architectural origin and introduction into Islamic religious prac¬tices as the most prominent feature in a mosque should be examined from these various angles.

Architectural origin. In his EP article on the mîhrâb, Diez mentioned that orientalists and art historians give a twofold origin for the mîhrâb: the Christian apse and the Buddhist niche (Diez, 1936, iii, 485). Both features were alien to the Arabs and were not required by Islamic religious practices. Thus it could never have been introduced and accepted by the early Muslims without an adequate theological explanation. As an architectural feature, the mîhrâb is made up of three basic elements: an arch, the support¬ing columns and capitals between them. Whether in a flat or in a recessed form, the mîhrâb gives the impression of a door or a doorway.
The application of this feature can be as varied as the pre- and early Islamic meaning of the word suggests. The idea of a decorated recess or a doorway in the form of what we know and accept today as a mihrāb goes back to remote antiquity in the Near East. In its secular sense it was used in palaces as a raised platform with a dome above supported by four columns under which the divine ruler carried out his most important functions (Smith, 1956, 197). It was a royal baldachin, "the first place" in a maqṣūra, a "throne-recess". In its religious context it was a "sanctuary", fixed or portable, under which the cult images were placed and were provided with a shelter. The tradition of these domical shelters can be traced back to some of the tent traditions of the Near East, particularly to those among the Semitic people (Smith, 1950, 43; idem, 1956, 197). Such domical tents or structures were also used over burial places. These ancient oriental traditions were later adopted by Judaism and Christianity. The direction of prayer and divine service in ancient religions, particularly in Judaism, added greater importance and widened the scope of these antique traditions. Orientation was especially important among the Semitic peoples and it was not a matter of choice. The Jews turned towards Jerusalem, and in this respect all monotheistic people looked up to the Jews and followed their practice (Creswell, 1932, 201). Early synagogues, however, had no orientation; only the prayer was directed towards Jerusalem. The Ark of the Law, the 'aron ha-kodesh, Jerusalem, and in this respect all monotheistic people later appears on tombstones (Goldman, 1966, 105). With a pulpit. Churches and funerary chapels generally had a large dome in Syria and in (martyrid) 8th century A.D. onwards (Smith, 1950, figs. 17-21), and (Khitat, 1950, 67-72; Goodenough, 1953, figs. 594-5, 599). From subsequent centuries there are several other examples known, some of these depicting the Ark in mosaic decoration on the floor of the apse (Hachlili, 1976, 43-53). The essential part of these decorations include a pair (or two pairs) of columns supporting a semicircular arch framing a conch, these decorations include a pair (or two pairs) of columns supporting a semicircular arch framing a conch, while below, within the columns, the Ark is shown as a pair of doors, thus symbolising a doorway, the portal of the life beyond, or the "portal of the dead" (Golden, 1966, 101 f.). Christianity followed the same tradition. Early churches had an east-west orientation, the entrance was facing the east and the altar was towards the west. There was usually an apse, a baytāt, with a pulpit. Churches and funerary chapels (maṣṭura) generally had a large dome in Syria and in Palestine, not because of the structural function but rather because of the importance attached to this form (Smith, 1950, 92). The domical form with a portal below was frequently depicted on coins from the 4th century A.D. onwards (Smith, 1950, figs. 17-21), and later appears on tombstones (Golden, 1966, 105). The form of the Christian and Coptic apse was so strikingly similar to a mihrāb that it was not surprising that Arabic sources mention it as a feature borrowed from Christian churches (Lammens, 1912, 246; Creswell, 1932, 98).

The form was, however, not unfamiliar to the Arabs. Pre-Islamic sanctuaries in Arabia had a round tent, a kubba [hut. over their idols or over some of their burial mounds (Lammens, 1920, 39-101; idem, 1926, 39-173). It seems reasonable to surmise that the Arabs wanted to preserve this ancient Semitic Arabian custom, but intended to dress it in an Islamic garb by offering a new interpretation to the pagan tradition. By examining the life of the first Muslim community in Medina we may understand how and why this feature was adopted and introduced into Muslim religious practices. During his lifetime the Prophet was not only a religious leader, but also a statesman who used the first primitive mosque in Medina not only as a place for communal prayer but also for public ceremonies where he received delegations and delivered judgements. He used to sit on his minbar [q.v.] which was set against the kibla wall. Thus in the strictest contemporary interpretation of the word, the place where the kibla was indicated by a large block of stone which was first placed to the north, i.e. towards Jerusalem, but in the second year of the A.D. it was moved to the south side, facing Mecca (Burton, 1893, 361). In the earliest mosque at Wāsit, built by al-Hādhābī b. Yūsuf [q.v.], the excavators found no mihrāb recess (Safar, 1945, 20). This was also the case in the mosque of Banbhore in Pakistan, built at the end of the 1st/early 8th century (anon., in Pakistan Archaeology, i [1956], 32). That may indicate that in both cases the kibla was most likely marked either by a flat stone or by a stripe of paint.

The earliest known surviving mihrāb is a marble panel known as the mihrāb of Sulaymān in the rock-cut chamber under the Kubbat al-Sakhra [q.v.] in Jerusalem (Pl. 1, 1). Creswell has already indicated that this was most likely the earliest surviving mihrāb. His argument was based on the shape of the arch, on the primitive Kūfic inscription on the lintel, and on the simple scroll motif on the arch and the rectangular frame (Creswell, 1932, i, 70, pl. 120a in ii; idem, 1969, i/1, 100, fig. 374). Several other points can now be added to Creswell's remarks. The crenellations and pearl motifs on top of the panel recall pre-Islamic, i.e. Sāsānīd, monuments with identical decorations. The vertical bands down the pillars are similar to those on the mosaics of the circular arcade and on the drum of the dome (Creswell, 1932, figs. 189-9, 201, 205, pls. 33b, 37b). Further evidence is provided by coins depicting mihrāb designs on their reverse, most likely accepting the mihrāb of Sulaqmān as their model (Miles, 1952, 156-71; idem, 1957, 187-209, nos. 7-8; idem, 1959, 208, pl. 1/1; Fehervári, 1961, 90-105). All of these coins are attributed to the period when 'Abd al-Malik introduced his financial reforms in 75/694-5. The first concave mihrāb, i.e. mihrāb mudjasa'a'af, was introduced by 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz, governor of Medina, when he rebuilt the Prophet's Mosque in 87-
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8/706-7 (al-Makrtzi, Khitat, ii, 247; Ibn Taghribirdi, al-Nuajum al-zdhira, i, 76). It was richly decorated with precious material (Sauvaget, 1947, 93-4). After that, semicircular māḥārib flanked by pairs of columns were found in almost all of the Umayyad desert palaces (Creswell, 1932, fig. 438, pl. 120b, c; idem, 1969, i/2, figs. 538, 638, pls. 66 f., 103c and 115b). The earliest surviving concave māḥārīb in a mosque is, according to Creswell, in the Mosque of ʿUmār at Burāq, built during the late Umayyad period (1969 i/2, 489, fig. 544, pl. 809).

1Trāk. The Khāṣṣātī māḥārib in Baghdād (Pl. I, 2) is the earliest known surviving example in the country, as it may date from the end of the Umayyad or from the beginning of the ʿAbbāsid period (Sarre and Herzfeld, 1920, ii, 139-45, Abb. 185-7, Taf. XLV-XLVIa-d; Creswell, 1940, 35-6, fig. 26, pl. 1a-c; al-Tutunci, figs. 6-9, pis. 5-6). In it is the earliest, probably of the 3rd/9th century, and a close copy of Jerusalem flat māḥārib (Sarre and Herzfeld, 1911, ii, 285-6, Abb. 275, Taf. CXXXV). Several stucco flat māḥā ribs were discovered in private houses in Sāmarrā, presenting all the three styles of the Sāmarrā stucco decorations (Herzfeld, 1923, Abb. 167-70, 269-306, Taf. LXII and XC VIII). An interesting combination of flat māḥārib can be seen in two small mausolea in Mawsil, the Mausoleum of ʿĪyāḥ b. ʿĀṣim (Pl. II, 3) and in the Mausoleum of ʿĪnām ʿĀwn al-Dīn (al-Tutunci, fig. 59, pl. 34), both erected during the 7th/13th century (Sarre and Herzfeld, 1911, 249, 263-8, Taf. CXXXV). These two māḥārib are almost identical. They are made up of two flat panels showing the correct kībāla direction. In each of these two māḥāribs there is a mosque-lamp hanging down from the pointed arch.

2Out of the later rectangular māḥārib in Trāk, attention should be paid to the other three, the out of the prayer niche of the Great Mosque in Mawsil which appears to be a combination of flat and rectangular types (al-Tutunci, figs. 34-6, pls. 17-9). It is flanked by a pair of octagonal pilasters decorated by intertwined scrolls and crowned by what Herzfeld called “lyra” capitals (Sarre and Herzfeld, 1911, ii, Abb. 230-3). The spandrels and the canopy have rich arabesque decoration. Below, at the bottom of the recess of the inner panel showing a pair of spiral pilasters on bell-shaped bases and topped by identical capitals supporting the arabesque-decorated spandrels and canopy. This māḥārib may also be regarded as a transitional form between the simple and multi-recessed māḥārib that played an important role later in Persian religious architecture. The inscription round the niche bears the signature of the artist, one Mustafa from Baghdād, and the date 543/1148 (Van Berchem in Sarre and Herzfeld, 1911, i, 17; Herzfeld, 1911, ii, 216-24). There was a free-standing māḥārib built of stone in the courtyard of this Great Mosque in Mawsil, but it was moved to the ʿAbbāsid Palace Museum in Baghdād. It was attributed to Nur al-Dīn Arslān Shīh I (589-607/1193-1211). It has two recesses, the outer one being rectangular in plan while the inner one set back from it is pentagonal. There is an interesting innovation here, namely, the frame is composed of small compartments (Sarre and Herzfeld, 1911, i, 18, ii, 227, Taf. V; Francis, 1951, pl. no. 10; al-Tutunci, fig. 38, pl. 20). A similar frame, but decorated with human figures, appears around a niche that was discovered near Sīnjār on the site of Ġū Kūrinat and which might have been a māḥārib (Reitlinger, 1938, 151-3, figs. 14-7; Francis, 1951, pl. 5, no. 16; al-Tutunci, figs. 39-9, pls. 29-30). The marble māḥārib of the Pandra ʿAli in Mawsil (built in 686/1287) can be regarded almost as a triple māḥārib since the central pentagonal recess is flanked by a small niche on either side. All three recesses are crowned by muqarnas [q.v.] semi-domes, while each panel in the central niche is decorated by a hanging mosque-lamp (Sarre and Herzfeld, 1911, ii, 270-8, fig. 268, Taf. VII; Francis, 1951, pl. 2, no. 5).

3Syria and Palestine. Māḥārib were usually concave in these countries, but flat panels were used from time to time. A small and somewhat simple marble
mihrāb panel decorates the first pilaster under the western portico in the Umayyad Mosque in Damascus. It is attributed to the Tulūnid period (Creswell, 1940, ii, pl. 12c). Another flat mihrāb, a stucco panel, probably of the same period, is in the Maqām ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz at al-Ḥarrār. Two pairs of pilasters support the rectangular frame which surrounds the richly decorated canopy and spandrels (Herzfeld, 1910, 53-6, Abb. 18, Taf. IV-V; idem, 1923, Taf. LXXVIII; Creswell, 1940, 356, pl. 121c). Rectangular mihrāb with stucco decoration came to light during the excavations at Meskene, ancient Bābil [see Māskana]. One of these was in the central room of the Great Mosque. Another triple mihrāb with a central deeper rectangular recess flanked by shallow openings was found in room no. 1, while a third one was in room no. 2 (Salles, 1939, 221-4, pls. XCIIX-b, Ca). Two stucco mihrābs, almost identical in shape and decoration were discovered at Palmyra. The shallow semicircular niches are flanked by pairs of pilasters supporting round arches, with shell-shaped canopies inside. The spandrels have arabesque decoration and the panels are surrounded by floriated Kūfī inscriptions. Marble coating for maḥārib was first introduced in Syria, which was always rich in this material. As one of the possible prototypes and earliest examples for these polychrome marble-lined maṭārabs is the Madrasa al-Firdaws in Aleppo, made of polychrome stones, should be considered. An interesting innovation can be observed here: the upper part of the mihrāb, namely the rectangular frame surrounding the spandrels, is much wider than the lower part (Herzfeld, 1942, fig. 72; Sauvaget, 1931, 79, no. 21; Creswell, 1959, 103). The same form can be observed in the polychrome marble-lined maṭārabs of the Madrasa Sulaymāniyya in Aleppo dated 620/1223 (Herzfeld, 1921, 144; Creswell, 1959, 102). A slightly earlier and similar example can be found in the Madrasa ʿAṣrāfīyya (607/1210). Polychrome marble work, however, reached its apogee in the mihrāb of the Madrasa al-Firdaws, erected in 633/1235 (Pl. II, 4). It is the most developed of all the large prayer niches. The spandrels depict skilfully interlaced ornaments, the lines of which also form the frame of the upper part. Above there is a semi-circular panel filled by three coloured interlacing patterns and framed by an inscription. This type of marble-work found its way to Egypt and greatly influenced the decoration of the Sayyida ʿAtīka in Cairo. An interesting example of polychrome marble-work is a small flat mihrāb in the courtyard of the Būrātstān Nūr al-Dīn in Damascus which was built in 549/1152. It is of white marble, but the arch and the spandrels have polychrome marble decoration. Creswell attributed it to Mahmūd b. Zānjī b. Aṣḵunkur, whose name appears in an inscription on the building and the date of construction. Creswell has also suggested that this was the earliest marble mosaic work (Creswell, 1959, 202). On stylistic grounds, however, Herzfeld claimed that it must have been erected at least a century later, possibly in the late 7th/13th century (Herzfeld, 1942, 10).

Egypt. The first concave mihrāb in the country was built by Kurra b. Shārik [q.v.], governor of Egypt, in 927/1031-11, in the Mosque of ʿAmr at Fustāṭ. The structure of the main mihrāb in the Mosque of Ibn Tulūn (265/878-9) is also concave, and so are its four flanking columns and capitals. The polychrome marble of the recess and the wooden lining of the canopy and that on the archivolt are later in date (Creswell, 1940, 348-9, pl. 122; Fattal, 1960, 22-4, pls. 10-11). There are five flat maḥārib in the mosque, two of which are contemporary with the building. They are placed on piers in the fourth arcade of the sanctuary. One of them is badly damaged, but the other is well preserved (Creswell, 1940, 349, pls. 123a-b; Fattal, 1960, 24-5, pls. 17, 18 and 29). The two panels must have been almost identical. A pair of pilasters on bell-shaped bases and topped by identical capitals support a pointed arch, the outline of which can also be observed on the damaged panel. A row of pearl motifs provides the border for both and an inscription runs across on top. A difference can be noted in the decoration of the spandrels and in the spaces below the arches within the pilasters. In both instances the influence of Sāmarrā is obvious, just as it is evident in the overall plan and decoration of the mosque. The main mihrāb of the Mosque of al-ʿAzhār, built between 359/967-90 and 361/971-2, although several times altered and restored, still retains some of its original decoration. The canopy with its elaborate and deeply-cut floral design, the sofit of its arch covered by finely executed scrollwork, together with the floriated Kūfī inscription on the archivolt, are most probably of the same period as the mosque (Creswell, 1952, 55-6, pls. 4a, 7c; Hill, Golvin and H llenbrand, 1976, fig. 22). This original stucco work was covered by a wooden lining until 1933 (for a picture of this, see Hautecoeur and Wace, 1929, ii, fig. 91). The material lining of the niche and the flanking columns are much later in date.

One of the finest stucco maḥārib in Cairo which survives in its original form, is that of the Mosque of al-Dāʾunūsī, built in 478/1085 (Pl. III, 5). Its stucco decoration, after that of the Mosque of Ibn Tulūn, and that of the al-ʿAzhār, is the third outstanding example in Egypt. The design here is richer and more refined (Creswell, 1952, 157-9, fig. 80, pls. 48c, 116a; Hill, Golvin and H llenbrand, 80, figs. 31-2). None of the prayer niches built in Egypt in the following two centuries has ever surpassed it. The decoration of the Sayyida ʿĀṭīka, built during the first quarter of the 6th/12th century, is more restrained but presents some new ideas. The frame, which is an epigraphic band, does not surround the entire niche, but only its stilted and pointed arch; then it turns at right angles and runs all around the interior. Furthermore, in the spandrels there are large fluted paterae in high relief surrounded by pearl motifs. Finally, above there is a geometric band of overlapping orbs (Creswell, 1952, 229-30, pls. 80c, 117b). Somewhat similar but more elaborate patterns appear above the maḥārib of the Mausoleum of Sayyida Rukayya, built in 527/1133 (Pl. III, 6). The horizontal panel over these maḥārib recall the Sāmarrā ornaments (Creswell, 1952, 249, fig. 143, pls. 87b, 119c-d, 120a; Hill, Golvin and H llenbrand, 82, figs. 37-8). All the recesses in this building have scalloped canopies. Three phases can be observed in the development of these canopies. In the first phase the slightly projecting frame follows the outline of the scallop. One of the earliest examples of this is the mihrāb of Umm Kūltūm, built in 516/1122 (Creswell, 1952, 239-40, fig. 135, pls. 82b, 118b). The second phase of the development is connected with the mukarnas, where the frame of the scallop is combined with mukarnas cones, placed in one, two or three lines above the other (e.g. the maḥārib of the Sayyida Rukayya). The third phase was used in Turkey and will be discussed further below. There are two stucco mihrābs in Cairo which present a special group. They are triple-recessed. The earlier of these two is in the mausoleum of I ḥwāt Yūsūf, built during the last
quarter of the 6th/12th century (Creswell, 1952, 235-6, pl. 118a). These recesses here are plain, but their upper parts are surrounded by a continuous band of flared Kufic which runs all around the interior of the building. The spandrels are filled by carefully-executed arabesques which are comparable to earlier stucco work in Cairo and accordingly may indicate an earlier date for this mihrāb. The decoration of the second triple-mihrāb, in the mausoleum of Mustafā Paşâ (middle of the 7th/13th century), is so deeply cut that it looks like openwork. The recesses here have keel-arches which most probably originated in Egypt and were widely used there during the 6th/12th and 7th/13th centuries (Creswell, 1959, 178-80, pls. 57c, 107c).

An interesting and somewhat bold experiment can be observed in the mihrāb of the mausoleum of Ahmad b. Sulaymān al-Rifaʿī, erected in 690/1291 (Pl. IV, 7). The kibla wall has pieces of glass embedded in the stucco background and these are painted in green (Creswell, 1959, 220-1, pl. 109c; Lamm, 1927, 36-43). The experiment was not successful and was never attempted again.

It has already been pointed out that the polychrome marble-work of Syria had greatly influenced mihrāb decorations in Egypt from the mid-7th/13th century onwards. One of the earliest examples is the comparatively simple but very large mihrāb in the madrasa of Qiwām al-Dīn, built in 647/1249-50 (Creswell, 1959, 102, pl. 106c). A marble lining for the main mihrāb of the Mosque of Ibn Tulūn was executed at the order of Lādīn [q. v.] in the same year, and that of the Mosque of al-Azhār in 665/1266. The mihrāb of the Madrasa of Kāfāwīn [q. v.] and the almost identical one in his mausoleum, both erected in 664/1265 (Pl. IV, 8), are perhaps the most outstanding examples of polychrome marble work in Egypt. Both niches are of horseshoe shape instead of the conventional concave one. Inside of the mihrāb in the mausoleum there are four rows of small arcades, each crowned by a shell, while in that of the madrasa there are only two rows. The canopies and the span-drels of these two mihrābs are covered with gold mosaic, showing grapes and vine leaves. The arches are also examples of polychrome being made up of white and coloured voussoirs. The influence of the Maghrib is well demonstrated here in the shape of the niches and the arches and the coloured voussoirs, while the row of small arcades reveals Syrian traditions (Creswell, 1959, 202, pls. 108b, c).

Maghrib. The earliest known surviving mihrāb in the Maghrib is in the Mosque of Bu Fattāh at Sūpa in Tunisia, erected between 223/838 and 226/841. It is a low plain niche of horseshoe form with an arch of the same shape (Creswell, 1940, 247, pls. 58c, 121a; Hill, Golvin and Hillenbrand, fig. 129). In the Great Mosque of Sūsa we find for the first time a mihrāb in front of which a dome was built (Hill, Golvin and Hillenbrand, 190, figs. 140-1). This example was shortly followed in the Great Mosque of Kairawan, when it was rebuilt by Abū ʿIbrahīm Ahmad II. He was also responsible for the decoration of the new mihrāb. The niche has a horseshoe form flanked by a pair of marble columns crowned by Byzantine-style capitals supporting a horseshoe arch (Creswell, 1940, 308-14, fig. 232, pl. 121b; Marçais, 1926, i, 19-22, 68 f., figs. 7, 36; Hill, Golvin and Hillenbrand, 92-3, figs. 96-9). The canopy has wooden panelling which was most probably added at a later time. The walls of the niche are covered with marble openwork. The archivolt and the surface of the mihrāb are adorned with polychrome and monochrome lustre tiles imported from ʿIrāk in 248/862-3 (Marçais, 1928). The date of these tiles and the introduction of lustre has recently been questioned; nevertheless, it is clear that stylistically these tiles are related to those excavated at Sāmarrā. Another horseshoe-shaped mihrāb is that in the Great Mosque of Cordova (Pl. V, 9), which was erected and decorated at the order of al-Hakam II in 354/965 (Marçais, 1926, i, 222 f., 264-66, figs. 146, 154; Creswell, 1940, 143). This mihrāb is remarkable in its size and in its extremely rich decoration of polychrome marble and gold mosaics. Several new decorative features which appeared here for the first time were accepted and applied to later mihrābs in the Maghrib. The niche itself is very spacious and high, crowned by a complete dome, the earliest such example in a mihrāb niche. The lower part of the niche has plain marble panels, followed by a cornice with a Kufic inscription. Above there are seven trefoil arches supported by marble columns with gold capitals. These arches are almost identical to those which decorate the upper part of the mihrāb. Inside the niche there are floral decorations in Byzantine style. The horseshoe arch rests on the wall and on two pairs of marble columns, one behind the other. The archivolt is decorated with vousoir stones, all with rich floral designs, and in white and in polychrome alternately. Acanthus scrolls with a rosette decorate the spandrels. The cusped arcades inside the niche alternate with two large arcades. In the niche of the false window-openings found over the library portal in the Great Mosque of Kairawan (Terrasse, 1932, 110; but as Marçais once suggested, they can ultimately be traced back to Syria (Marçais, 1926, i, 266, n. 1, fig. 147). This mihrāb is one of the most beautiful examples in the whole Muslim world. Its form and decorative style has several times been copied, but its fineness and richness has never been surpassed. Certain elements in this mihrāb like the horseshoe form of the recess, the cusped arches inside and on top of the mihrāb, the broad archivolt with vousoir stones and floral decorations became the accepted features of later mabāḥir in the Maghrib.

The mabāḥir in the Great Mosque of Tlemcen in Algeria is one which reveals close connexions to that in Cordova. Its horseshoe arch and cusped archivolt closely resembles that of Cordova but is more elaborate, although executed only in stucco. The arch and the spandrels are surrounded, as in Cordova, with an epigraphic band of floriated Kufic. The niche itself is pentagonal, a form that was to be frequently used in the Maghrib and also in Turkey. The niche is flanked by an opening on either side giving access all round the mabāḥir (W. and G. Marçais, 1903, 140 f.; Marçais, 1926, i, 313 f., figs. 213-4, 381-5; Hill, Golvin and Hillenbrand, 111, figs. 208-9). This mabāḥir in Tlemcen is clearly a deliberate copy of the Cordova mabāḥir, albeit executed in cheaper material. Some architectural and decorative details which were new elements in Cordova appeared here, but in more developed forms, and were used again in later examples. These can be best observed in the mabāḥir of the Kutubiyya Mosque in Marrakesh, built ca. 541/1146 (Marçais, 1926, i, 321 f., fig. 179; Hill, Golvin and Hillenbrand, 125: Basset and Terrasse, 1926, 119). The canopy here is decorated with a muskarnas, as is the large dome in front of the mabāḥir. The muskarnas was a new feature in the architecture of the Maghrib and was introduced there during the first half of the horseshoe-shaped mihrābs in the Maghrib. The horseshoe arch of the niche rests on three pairs of engaged columns. The broad and cusped archivolt is decorated with trefoil arcade decorations. A frame filled with geometrical and star patterns surrounds the arch,
while above there are five blind window-openings with lobed arches. In the Great Mosque of Tinmâl in the High Atlas, the mihrâb, built in 548/1153, closely resembles that of the Kutubiyya. The same arrangements, sc. a mukarna can be observed here. The pentagonal niche, a similarly decorated dome in front of the mihrâb, and a horseshoe arch supported by three pairs of pilasters and a frame not unlike that in the Kutubiyya. Again there are flanking niches and an open path behind, once more presenting a free-standing mihrâb (Marchais, 1926, i, 329-385, figs. 181, 216-17; Hill, Golvin and Hillenbrand, 128, figs. 472-3). There is another mihrâb in the Mosque of Yā'kub al-Mansūr (also known as the Mosque of the Kašâa) in Marrâkeš, which stylistically is related to this group. This is perhaps the latest example of this type. It was built in 592/1195 (Hill, Golvin and Hillenbrand, fig. 413).

In southern Tunisia, at Tozeur, the mihrâb built in 592/1195 represents an entirely different type. The pentagonal recess is considerably smaller than any of the previous examples, and is crowned by a semi-dome coated with carefully-carved stucco decoration of floral designs and epigraphic bands. The horseshoe arch has an incomplete double archivolt interrupted by the attached rectangular frame. Once again the floral decoration of the wedge-shaped compartments of the archivolt recalls Cordova (Margais, 1926, i, 187-94; Godard, 1936, fig. 136; figs. 174-6). The unusual form and decoration of this mihrâb was due to an Almoravid patron and to the presence of Andalusian craftsmen.

Another example of the mihrâb is the Masjid-i Djami of Isfahān, built at the order of the kāb al-Mansur (also known as the Masjid-i Djami in Reza'iye) (Wilber, 1965, fig. 76; idem, 1965, fig. 186). The mihrâb of the Masjid-i Djami of Zawâra, dated 551/1156-7 (Godard, 1936, fig. 199) and those in the Masjid-i Djami in Ardîstân (553-5/1158-60; Godard, 1936, fig. 413) and in the Masjid-i Djami in Tâhir (567-9/1171-3) (Rashidi, 1978, fig. 208) are combinations of flat and multi-recessed mihrâbs. The mihrâb of the Imâmzâda Karrâr at Buzâz (now in the Archaeological Museum in Tehran, acc. no. 3268) should also be mentioned. The niche is very deep like an iwan, and it is covered by a vault instead of a semi-dome. A floured Kufic inscription in the frame gives the date of construction as 528/1133. This inscription is very interesting since the kibla of the Iwan side in human heads. The stucco work here is richer and more refined than in any of the previous examples, showing the wide scope of this technique (Pope, 1934, 114; Smith, 1935, 65-81; Surery, pls. 331-A, 312-A, 312-D). The two most outstanding stucco mihrâbs in Iran are those in the Madrasa Haydâriyyah in Kazwîn and in the Gunbad-i ʿAlawîyân in Hamâdan. Both are remarkable not only because of their great size (Surery, pls. 323-4) but mainly because of the extreme refinement of the stucco decoration. The designs appear as if superimposed in two or three layers. In Kazwîn, the lower part of the mihrâb is missing, but the remaining upper half indicates that stucco work may very well have been at its finest here (Godard, 1936, 200, fig. 136; Surery, pls. 313-A, 316-A-C, 312-D). The mihrâb in the Gunbad-i ʿAlawîyân in Hamâdan perhaps does not surpass that of Kazwîn, but certainly comes close to it (Herzfeld, 1922, 86-96; Surery, pls. 330, 331-A, 331-B; Wilber, 1959, 151-2, fig. 116, cat. no. 55). Herzfeld and Wilber attributed this latter mihrâb to the Il-Khanid period, while Pope dated it to the end of the 6th/12th century (Survey, 1301; idem, 1965, fig. 186). It seems most likely that both mihrâbs were erected about the same time, before the Mongol invasion of Iran in 617/1220. With the coming of the Mongols, the style slowly changed, and that change is already apparent in the stucco mihrâb of the Imâmzâda Abu I-Fadl wa-Yâhû in Maḥâfīt Bâlâ, dated to 700/1300 (Wilber, 137, pl. 67, cat. no. 44), and in two others, one of them in an iwan outside Shîrâz (Febrévâri, 1969, 93-11; idem, 1972, fig. 8) and the other one in the Pârs Museum (Febrévâri, 1972, fig. 7). The finest example of the Il-Khanid use of mihrâbs are in the Masjid-i Djami in Reza'îye (Ridâ'îyya) (Wilber, 112-3, pl. 9, cat. no. 16), dated 676/1277 and in the Masjid-i Djami of Isfâhân, built at the order of
Mosaic faience originated in Iran, and the earliest examples are to be found in the monuments of Khurásán and Central Asia dating from the 6th/12th and early 7th/13th centuries. The technique was, however, perfected and first applied in the decoration of maḥārīb in Turkey (see below). Mosaic faience decoration in Iran was not introduced in mihrābs before the 8th/14th century. The earliest known such mihrāb is in the Imāmzāda Shāh Husayn in Warāmnī, erected ca. 730/1330 (Wilber, 1955, cat. no. 86, 177-8, pl. 184). Two other outstanding examples are in the Masjīd-i Džāmī‘ of Yazd, dated 777/1375 (PL. VI, 12; Survey, pl. 443; Jope, 1965, 185, colour pl. VII and fig. 246), and the second one is in the Masjīd-i Džāmī‘ in Kirmān, dated ca. 957/1550 (Survey, pl. 401, 540).

Flat maḥārīb were also used in Iran. At first, these were of carved stone or alabaster. By the 6th/12th century faience tiles were used, with the decoration in relief in stone, faience or turquoise inlayed in the glaze. During the early 7th/13th century lustre painting was introduced on these tiles. Occasionally cobalt blue and turquoise colours were added. There are some ten such large lustre maḥārīb known today which were made up of several tiles. All of these were made in Kağhān. One of the earliest dated large lustre maḥārīb is preserved in the shrine of Imām Rida in Qom. One of the earliest dated large lustre maḥārīb is in Konya, which was the capital of the Saljūqs of Rūm. One such mihrāb was installed in the Sadrettin Konevi, dated 673/1274-5 (PL. VII, 14; Meinecke, 1976, cat. no. 58, i, 64, ii, 352-5, Taf. 36/4; Bakirer, Kat. no. 49, 182-3, res. 111-13, sek. 49). Towards the end of the 7th/13th century, tiles were used together with stucco and terracotta, as is the case in the mihrāb of the Arslanhane Cami in Ankara, built in 689/1290 (Otto-Dorn, 1957; Akurgal, Mango and Etinghausen, 1966, 149, colour pl. 92; Aslanapa, 1971, 121; Meinecke, cat. no. 18, i, 41-3, ii, 66-74, Taf. 8/3; Bakirer, Kat. no. 58, 196-8, res. 132-4, sek. 58). In the 9th/15th century, faience mosaic is replaced by the cuwdrāt sea technique, and perhaps one of the most beautiful maḥārīb with such decoration is that of the Green Mosque in Bursa, dated 821/1419 (Brown, 1964, 105, fig. 60; Aslanapa, 1971, fig. 214). Simultaneously with the cuwdrāt sea, underglaze-painted tiles were also introduced during the 9th/15th century. At first, these were painted in blue and white and later in polychrome.

India. The earliest known and reported mihrāb in India which survives is in the so-called Arthu-din-ka Jhombuka Mosque at Aḥmednagar, completed in 596/1199-1200. It reveals strong Hindu and Buddhist elements in its decoration and in its arch, which is cusped and is carved out of a single block of marble (Nath, 1978, 17, pl. XXI). Three maḥārīb in the tomb of Şems al-Din Ilutmish (died in 633/1235) are more in the traditional Islamic styles and in a way serve as models for later Indian prayer niches. The central maḥārīb here (PL. VIII, 17) is a combination of a rectangular and a flat maḥārīb. The frame is filled by an epigraphic band. The pair of polygonal and richly decorated columns and capitals support the cusped arch. The canopy of the recess, just like that of the mihrāb panel at the back, is filled with plated Kūfī. In the centre of the back panel there is a rossette in relief. Such patterns can be observed in the centres of several Indian maḥārīb. It is possible that the architects tried to imitate, either consciously or not, the black meteorite stone which is in the centre of the mihrāb of Sulaymān in Jerusalem.

One of the characteristics of Indo-Muslim architecture was to place three or more maḥārīb in the kibla wall, as it had already been done in Ilutmīsh’s tomb, where this principle was applied perhaps for the first time. The lotus flower, a hanging mosque-lamp or a vase from which a scroll emerges, become permanent decorative features of the back panels of later prayer niches. Such decorations appear in the five maḥārīb of the Royal Mosque, the Kila-yi Kuhna in Dihlī, which was built by Shīr Shāh Sūr in about 949/1542. The maḥārīb of the Kila-yi Kuhna are enormous in size. They are multi-recessed, with a cusped arch over the lower recesses, and a mihrāb panel at the back of each one decorated with a hanging mosque-lamp (Brown, 1964, 91, fig. 82). By the end of the 10th/16th centuries, Persian influence becomes stronger and more apparent in Indo-Muslim architec-
ture. It was perhaps most obvious in the decoration of prayer niches. Most of the Indian elements were omitted and were replaced by Persian motifs. The cusped arch, however, remains. A good example for this strong Persian influence is the mihrab of the Djami Masjid in Fathpur Sikri which is decorated with polychrome inlaid stonework and which reminds us of contemporary Safavid fince-tiled maharib (Brown, pl. LXXIV/1). Later prayer niches in Aga and Dhiili are built of marble and decorated in polychrome in the pietra dura technique.

Wooden and portable maharib. Maharib either as large niches or small portable wooden panels appeared during the Fatimid period in Egypt. They were found in excavations in Fustat, but several others are known from later periods and are preserved in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo (Weill, 1936, pl. X). Large wooden maharib were also introduced and these were popular all over the Islamic world.
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The name of the festival. It comes from the
Pahlavi mihrâbân/mihrâfân; a. Mihrâagan; Mihrâgan; Meherangân among the Parsees), name of an Iranian
Mazdaean festival dedicated to Mithra/Mihr, tradi-
tionally celebrated in Iran around the autumn equinox.
Its origins, its place in the calendar, its duration, its
rituals and the beliefs connected with it, its diffusion
in other cultural areas and its survivals in the Islamic
period present several problems which are the subject
of discussions and controversies. It is also a word used
in toponomy, patronymy and music (see below, iv).

i. The name of the festival. It comes from the
Pahlavi mihrâbân/mihrâfân, ancient mithnakâna (Darmesteter, ii, 443), a noun derived from a proper
noun, i.e. Mithra (Benveniste, 1966, 14; on the suffix
akâna becoming agân, of Parthian origin, see Gignoux,
1979, 43 ff). According to another attractive but
faulty interpretation, the kâna component (no longer
akâna) is a variant of agân (Vedâ Hindu, Old Persian
akâna
meaning to strike or kill; mithnakâna is then the killing
(or sacrifice) for Mithra, the expression being parallel
to that designating the Indo-Iranian god Verethragna
(Campbell, 335; on Verethragna, slayer of dragons,
and its dialectal variants, see Benveniste and Renou,
1. Jerusalem, Mihrāb of Sulaymān under the Kubbat al-Ṣakhra, 72/952.

2. Baghdad, The Khāṣṣāki mihrāb, late Umayyad or early ‘Abbāsid period.


6. Cairo, stucco mihrāb in the Mausoleum of Sayyida Ruṣayya, 527/1133.
7. Cairo, stucco and glass mihrāb in the Mausoleum of Sulaymān al-Rifāʿī, 690/1291.

8. Cairo, marble mihrāb in the Mausoleum of Kalāwūn, 684/1285.

11. Sar-i Pul, Afghānistān. Stucco mīhrāb which was standing until recently in the Ziyārat of Imām-i Khurd, 6th/12th century. (Photographed and reproduced courtesy of Prof. A.D.H. Bivar).

12. Yazd, faience mīhrāb in the Masjd-i Dāmī'.

14. Konya, faience mihrāb in the Sadrettin Konevi, 673/1274-5. (Photographed and reproduced courtesy of Mr. H. Dewenter)
15. Dihli, mihrab in the tomb of Shams al-Din Iltutmish, ca. 633/1235. (Photographed and reproduced courtesy of Mr. J. Burton-Page)

least in popular practice, to the duplication of the festival: the 16th day (mihr ruz) of the seventh month (mihr mah), was celebrated as the "little" (khordak or kielk) or "general day" (samna) Mihragan and the 21st day (ram ruz), as the "great" (bazung) or "special" (khodoreh) Mihragan. According to al-Biruni, the Sasanid king Hormizd I (272-3 A.D.), joined together the festival days of Naw-ruz and Mihragan which were observed respectively over six days. Then, the kings and people of Iran celebrated the two festivals over thirty days (al-Biruni, Aghar, 223 f., tr. 208 f.; idem, Tafhim, 254 f.). The whole month of Farwardin (that of Naw-ruz) had been consecrated to a festival divided into six sets of five days, respectively for the princes, nobles, servants of princes, the people, the shepherds and stock-breeders (after Djamshid, according to al-Biruni, Athar, 218, tr. 203; under Djamshid, according to Ps.-Dahihiz, Mahasin, 360, tr. 97, with some variants as to the social groups.) But the circumstances concerning the duration of the festival remain vague (al-Biruni, ibid., also mentions for the Sasanid Nav-ruz a duration of five days for the reception by the king of the people of all ranks and a sixth day of private royal celebration). One thing remains certain; the Zoroastrians festivals were still being adjusted for time in relation to the solar year, to keep them at a normal date, a second reform of the calendar was undertaken under the Sasanids between 507 and 511. At first, Mihragan apparently continued to be celebrated for six days by the Zoroastrians until after the 10th century A.D.; the Zoroastrian festivals were then reduced to five days, Mihragan also losing the ram ruz which represented for the Zoroastrian faithful the authentic ancient day of the festival (Boyece, 1975, 106 f.; idem, 1983, 807 f.). The Parsees of India and the Zoroastrians of Iran use different calendars for their festivals. Some of whose rites may have influenced Mithrakdana, its rites seem to have been made known to us especially by the Greek authors and, in their later elaborate form, by the authors writing in Arabic. The dominant aspect is that of a royal festival of a new year or renewal, celebrated by festivities, present-giving, animal sacrifices. The numerous features common to this festival and Naw-ruz show that the two festivals may have been treated together (notably of celebrating it). According to the epic-religious tradition, the festival was founded by the hero-king Thraetaona/Freton/Farhad who killed with his bull-headed club the dragon Azhdahak/Dahka/Dahkh (Widengren, Religions, 60 f., 68 f., 258 f.; see also G. Dumézil, Le problème des sanctuaires, Paris 1929, 721 f.; according to the tradition of Tabaristan/Mazandaran/Farhad was brought up in the north of Luristan (q.v.) where he used to hunt mounted on a cow). The myth has been historicised in the Iranian epic in which the legitimate king Farhad institutes the festival of Mihragan to celebrate his triumph over the usurping tyrant Dahkhah whom he chains to Mt. Dunibawd/Damavand. He inaugurates the month of Mihr by putting the crown on his head; the nobles perform libations. He introduces the public entertainment, the banquet, the processions, the festivities and banquets. He is remembered in the month of Mihr in which one should not wear a sorrowful and sad expression (Firdawsi, ed. Mohl, i, 114; ed. Moscow, i, 9-10; Asadi, 329, 474 f.; Fr. tr., i, 164, 271 f.) The hero-smith Kava [see Kawah], after having triumphed over Bavarasp/Dahkhah, asks the people to pay homage to Farhad (al-Biruni, Aghar, 222, tr. 207 f.).

The dominant feature of the festival was its royal and solar aspect. Mithra being the mediator between Ohrmazd and Ahriman. According to various traditions, the sun appeared for the first time on the day of Mithragan; God made the contract between light and darkness on the day of Naw-ruz and Mihragan (al-Biruni, op. cit., 222, tr. 208; Widengren, Hochgot, 94, 99 f., 138). According to other traditions, on the day of Mithragan, God created the earth and bodies; he illuminated the moon which was until then a sphere without light. Mithragan is regarded as a sign of resurrection and the end of the world, for everything which grows then reaches its perfection (al-Biruni, ibid.). The rituals are still little known. According to the Greek sources, the Achaemenids apparently celebrated Mithrakdana more than any other festival. Naw-ruz at Persepolis, the autumn season being pleasanter there and more convenient for bringing tribute (Nylander, 143, citing Atheneaeus; Boyce, HZ, ii, 110). It seems
that they also used to sacrifice horses to Mithra there; the satrap of Armenia sent them annually 20,000 colts (Boyce, HZ, i, 173; ii, 110, according to Strabo). Mithräkāna was celebrated joyfully, notably with dances (according to Duris); it was the only annual occasion on which the king of Persia became inebriated (according to Ctesis, physician to Artaxerxes II); cf. Boyce, HZ, ii, 35. It is thought that soma/homa was used for these libations (Boyce, HZ, i, 173; Turcan, 9; see below).

We have little information as to the diffusion, in eastern Iran, of Mithräkāna, whose Sogdian counterpart may have been Bagâkāna, a contracted form of Bagamithräkāna, celebrated on the 16th day of the 7th month (Boyce, 1981, 68 f.). The name mihrâkâni mîhragân is to be found in the Jerusalem Talmud (moharnaki) and in that of Babylon (muharnëkai); see Taḵzâda, op. cit., 192. The Sevelcud and Arscacid periods are much less documented. According to the epic tradition, the festivals of Mîhragân and Sada were revived by the last Arsacid, Ardavân, and by the first Sâsâni, Ardâšîr-i Pâpâkân (Firdawši, ed. Mohîl, v, 302, 328; ed. Moscov, vii, 442, 769). Although apparently more orthodox Zoroastrians than their Sâsâni ancestors, the Arsacids transposed Naw-râz and Mîhragân (see above, and Boyce, 1983, 805).

Under their influence, some Iranian cults and sanctuaries, which had been dedicated to Mithra, were introduced into Armenia. With Christianisation, the great Mîhragân (Arm. Mehekân, 21 Mehek = Mîhr) was reconsecrated to St. George the Soldier (Taḵzâda, op. cit., 194 ff.; Boyce, Zoroastrians, 89; eadem, 1981, 67; eadem, 1983, 804 f.; Turcan, 17). As far as we can see, it was in Asia Minor, rather than in Mîhragân, that Greco-Roman contacts were established out of which arose the Feast of the Mîhr (Turcan, 18). It is also possible to interpret the identification of Mithra with Helios-Apollo as more of a symbiosis than a syncretism (at least at Sardis; Boyce, HZ, ii, 268 f.). But the Mîhr of the mysteries is very different from the Median-Persian Mîhr and the diffusion in the Greco-Roman world of the rituals of Mîhragân (are there any Armenia?) remains conjectural, notably inasmuch as the place is concerned with their direct influence on the Mithraic celebration, then the Christian one of Natalis invicti on 25 December (Cumont, 167) or of Mîhtarâkâna celebrated in Phrygia, at the time of the wine-harvest, with libations of wine and animal sacrifices (Campbell, 239 f.). The epic legends and heroic character attached to the ritual of Mîhragân, celebrated especially by men, have supplied more definite links with Roman Mithraism (Boyce, 1966, 107, n. 3; eadem, 1969, 26, n. 83; eadem, 1983, 802).

With the Sâsâni reform, the religious calendar consisted of seven obligatory festivals: the Gâthâmâbûr (instituted, according to tradition, by Zoroaster; see al-Burûnî, al-Âdîr, 219, tr. 205) and Naw-râz (Boyce, 1983, 794 f.). Despite its optional character, Mîhragân preserved all its prestige. Some preferred it, just as Darius I had massacred the magus Gaumata (Ps.-Djahîz, 101-2, Fr. tr. 126-7, anecdote concerning Tâdî), rather than the Mîhragân or Naw-râz, the latter being connected with Iranian customs held in honour under some caliphs (see below). While the connections between Zoroastrian festivals and epic tradition are probably ancient (according to Ps.-Djahîz, "Afarîdune, Mahâmîn, 560, tr. 97), their duplication leads to a re-elaboration of the epic traditions; the little Mîhragân commemorates the joy of all human beings when they heard tell of Farûdîn's expedition, whereas the great Mîhragân celebrates the triumphs of Dahâm and bound him (al-Birûnî, Alîhû, 222 f., tr. 207 ff.; al-Kâzîwûnî, 123; Boyce, 1983, 807). According to various traditions, on the day of Mîhragân the kings of Persia used to wear (in the manner of Farûdîn?) a crown on which was engraved the image of the sun and the wheel on which he turns. A vaulted hall was erected in the palace to invoke the aid of the angels (who came to the help of Farûdîn?): al-Birûnî, ibid. According to Ps.-Djahîz, the bearer of good omen, at Naw-râz and Mîhragân, was said to come through the agency of two spirits (according to Inostrantzeff, the âmêţûa spenûa or "archangels" Haurvatat and Ameretot connected respectively with water and plants): Mahâmîn, 361, tr. 97, 3. Then, expressing his good wishes, he would place before the king, on a silver table, cakes prepared with different grains; seven grains of each kind; seven branches of an auspicious tree (and auspicious inscriptions), seven white earthenware plates, seven silver dirhams minted that year, a new dinâr and a bouquet of wild rue. On this day, the king would abstain from discussing any matter. The first thing that was said was greetings, a gift of a silver vessel containing white sugar, Indian nuts and silver or gold cups. He would then drink fresh milk in which dates had been soaked. He would give the dates to his favourites and sample whatever sweets he liked (ibid., 361 f.; tr. 98 f.).

Although Naw-râz may have been more important than Mîhragân in certain respects (welcoming the New Year, commemorating the old and new, nominating governors, transferring posts, minting coins, etc.), it was a right of the ruler to receive presents and his courtiers, relatives and dependents on the two festivals. Each one gave what he liked best or something in which he excelled. The donors were able to record the value of the gift in the diwan. The king had to remunerate these presents with gifts or rewards. On the day of Mîhragân, he would wear new clothes of poplin (huqaz), silk or closely-woven fabric. He would distribute to his courtiers and relatives, at Naw-râz, their winter clothes and, at Mîhragân, their summer clothes (Ps.-Djahîz, Tâdî, 146 ff.; Fr. tr. 165 ff.; these gifts of clothing were called aûmûn, Christensen, Sasanides, 125, 407 f.; on the presents that the king of Persia received from all quarters, see also Ps.-Djahîz, Mahâmîn, 367-8, tr. 100 f.).

At Naw-râz and Mîhragân, the king held a public audience to which all, great and small, had access (Ps.-Djahîz, Tâdî, 159-60, Fr. tr. 178-9; Nižâm al-Mulk, 57, tr. 42 f.; al-Ghazâlî, Nasîhât, 167 f.; tr. 102 ff.). These audiences were abolished by Yaztgird I (399-421) or Bhâhrâm Gîr (421-39) and his son Yaztgird II (439-57); see Ps.-Djahîz, Tâdî, 163-4, Fr. tr. 181-2; al-Ghazâlî, ibid. and tr. 103, n. 3; Christensen, op. cit., 283, 303. This custom may have been borrowed by Naw-râz from Mîhragân, the festival of Mithra Lover of Justice (Dâwâr Mîhr): Boyce, 1975, 110, n. 18. The ruler could grant forgiveness for an offence committed at Naw-râz or Mîhragân (Ps.-Djahîz, Tâdî, 101-2; Fr. tr. 126-7, anecdote concerning Khusrav I Anûqîrwanî and Muftâwiyâ). Moreover, it was at Mîhragân that Kâvâd I (488-531) organised, in 529-9, a massacre of the Mazdaikites (just as Darius I had massacred the magus Gaumâna and his followers at the Mîhtarâkâna): Ibn al-Balkhî, 90; cf. Widengren, Religions, 343.
As at Naw-rūz, a fair was held at Mihragan. The Persians wished to live for a thousand years (in the manner of Dabāhk). Eating pomegranate and smelling the perfume of rose-water secured them against illness (al-Birūnī, op. cit.). During the festivities of Mihragan, particular musical tunes were played (see below, iv).

With the installation of the ʿAbbāsīd caliphate in the ancient Sāsānīd territory, socio-cultural life was strongly influenced by Iranian traditions in Baghīdād and in the provinces. While the Zoroastrians continued to celebrate their ceremonies according to their own practices (see below), Naw-rūz and Mihragan survived, deprived of their original religious functions, in an Islamic context. Present had been sent to the caliphs on these occasions before the ʿAbbāsīd period. Muʿāwiya had imposed heavy contributions at Naw-rūz and al-Haḍrājīd had attempted to re-establish the Sāsānīd custom of obligatory presents at the two festivals; this was abolished by ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-Azīz (see Saṭa, 51 f.). With other borrowings from the Sāsānīd fiscal system, the ʿAbbāsīds also adopted the contributions in the form of presents. They celebrated Naw-rūz at their court with wine and music (al-Maʿṣūdī, Mūsaqījī, vii, 277 f. = § 2962). According to some poetic fragments attributed to the caliphs (al-Masūdī, Mūsaqījī, al-Biruni, 223, tr. 209). Some contributions at Naw-rūz and Mihragan were imposed in Kum on the būzdī folk; they were suppressed (in Kum, then in Aḥa) from the reign of the Būyid Rukn al-Dawla (335-66/947-77); Kumī, 164 f.}

By comparison with those bāys in Arabic which we are aware, the poetic production in Persian on Mihragan is considerable. Naw-rūz and Mihragan, often synonyms of spring and autumn, form a part of the nature themes celebrated by Persian poets. Among the best known who wrote poetry on Mihragan we may cite (excluding the epic poets such as Firdawṣī and Asādī):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>died around or in</th>
<th>patronised by</th>
<th>references*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rūdakī 329/940</td>
<td>Sāmānīd</td>
<td>LN; SN, 4, 427; DS, 46. ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daḵākī 368/978</td>
<td>eden</td>
<td>SN, 4, 428.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundžik Tirmidhī 370/980</td>
<td>Al-i Muḥtāʤī</td>
<td>LN; SN, 4, 429-32; 5, 458; DS, 50-54.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or 380/990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrukhī 429/1037</td>
<td>Caghānīyān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿUnsūrī 431/1039</td>
<td>Caghānīyān; Ghaznavīds: Mahmūd Ḥud Sabdū</td>
<td>LN; SN, 5, 458-9; DS, 46-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manūẖīrī 432/1040</td>
<td>Miḥmūd Ḥud Sabdū</td>
<td>LN; SN, 5, 459-62; DS, 47-50; Hanaway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azrāḵī before</td>
<td>Princes of Dāmghān and Ravy; Masʿūd</td>
<td>LN; SN, 9, 206-7; 10, 266-69.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katrān 465/1072</td>
<td>Saldūḵīs of Harāt and Kirmān</td>
<td>LN; SN, 5, 434-38; DS, 46.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djurdjānī/</td>
<td>Princes of Tabrīz</td>
<td>LN, 6, 34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurgānī 466/1073</td>
<td>Gangja and Nakhdjāwān Contemporary of the Saldūḵīs Ṭoghrīl and Aḵḥ Arslān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāsirī Khusraw 481/1088</td>
<td>(Ismāʿīlī)</td>
<td>LN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masʿūdī-i Saʿd-i 515/1122</td>
<td>Ghaznavīds of Lāhawr</td>
<td>SN, 6, 38-9; 91-4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salāmān</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muʿizzī between 519-21/1125-8</td>
<td>Sabdūḵīs Malīḵāh and Sandjār</td>
<td>SN, 10, 269.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šābir Tirmidhī between 538-42/1145-47</td>
<td>Sandjār and Khārażmshāh Atṣīz</td>
<td>LN, 11, 325-6; DS, 46.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukhrārī 544/1149</td>
<td>Saldūḵīs of Kirmān</td>
<td>LN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sūzanī 562/1166</td>
<td>Princes of Būkhrā and Samarkand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or 569/1173</td>
<td>Khārażmshāhs</td>
<td>LN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raḥīd al-dīn 575/1178</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB, 11, 325-6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waṣṭwāt 570/1182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anwarī after</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khāḵānī 595/1199</td>
<td>Shirwānshāh</td>
<td>LN.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Abbreviations: DS = Daḥīr Siyāḵī LN = Lugāt-nāma SN = Sādāt Nāṣīrī
Apart from the usual themes (nature, love and wine), these poetic evocations contain numerous mentions of and allusions to the celebration of Mihragan, the spring and harvest festival of the Zoroastrians, who use different calendars in Iran and India (Boyce, 1968, 213, n. 86; eadem, Stronghold, 164 ff. and index; eadem, Zoroastrians, 221 and index). Although this kind of information may be quite rare in the narrative sources, the Tārīkh-i Bayhaki supplies us with complementary information on the festival (gānghū) and the custom (raṃ) of Mihragan at the court of the Ghāznavid Mas‘ud [q.v.], observed around the autumn equinox.

The celebration of Ramadan may have provided an obstacle for that of Mihragan (see Farrukhi, for the years 419-21/1028-30: cited by Dabir-Siyākū, 53 ff.; Fouchecour, 25 f.). In 422, Mas‘ud received the presents of the princes and governors, many of them horses, on the day of Mihragan (28 Ramadan/18 September 1031). He celebrated the festival with great pomp two days later, on the breaking of the fast (fitr). He organised a reception “such as no-one had ever seen”. The sultan and his entourage were inebriated. Musicians and poets enlivened the festivities at the court and outside. Considerable rewards were distributed: 1,000 dārsās for Ṣūnzār, 20,000 dirhams for the courtiers, 20,000 dīrāms for the governor of Zanjan, 30,000 for the musicians and jesters (Tārīkh-i Bayhaki, 359 f.; Bosworth, 132). This celebration is mentioned more briefly for the years 426-27/1034-35, 429 (9 Dhū ‘l-Hidjād/12 September 1038) and 430/1039 (at that time he sent to India Mas‘ud-i Rāzī who ventured to advise him in a kaštāl: Tārīkh-i Bayhaki, 642 f. 343 f.).

It seems that the celebration of Mihragan, like that of Sādat/Sada [q.v.], had been abandoned, in its Islamic context, after the rupturing of traditions provoked in Iran by the Mongol invasion (Safta, 38, 118). This theme, however, continued to inspire poets (e.g. Damiri, d. 973/1565, a contemporary of ǧāhān Tahnmāsī i: LN). It has been suggested that some Sā‘ūtī festivals following their solar computation may be survivals of Mihragan (e.g. in the ceremonies of kalīkāshūn/shūrūn at Mashhad-i Ardahān, near Kāşān, celebrated in the month of Mihr; see Āl-i Ahmād, 200 ff.; A. Boloukbachi, in Objet et Mondes, xi, Paris 1971, 133-40).

There is also continuity in the celebration of Mihragan by the Zoroastrians, who use different calendars in Iran and India (Boyce, 1968, 213, n. 86; eadem, Stronghold, 164 ff. and index; eadem, Zoroastrians, 221 and index). Although the Parsees of India seem to have stopped observing this non-obligatory festival during the 19th century (Boyce, 1969, 32), they retained the ritual (Dhabhar, Riwayats, 343; Mehr and Jashn Meherangan, Bombay 1889; idem, LN: Ceremonies, 429 ff.). One of the causes of their neglect of Mihragan is probably, under pressure from their Hindu surroundings, the opposition to animal sacrifice which they were still practising in the 18th century (witnessed by Anquetil-Duperron; cf. Boyce, 1966, 197; eadem, 1975, 106). Their celebration is now limited to a cult restricted to 16 Mihr (Boyce, 1969, 32). By contrast, the Zoroastrians of Iran have continued to observe this festival. At the beginning of the 20th century, those of Yazd used to celebrate it (from 16 to 20 Mihr), in February-March according to the time adjustment of the kāleči calendar: 365 days, with notably, in each house, the sacrifice of an animal: sheep, goat, poultry for the very poor, and the eating of unleavened bread. Despite the objections of their coreligionists in Tehran and Bombay, the Zoroastrians of the villages of Yazd were still celebrating it for five days in 1960, under the name Dāghan-i Mihrāzī. It was a joyful and convivial event, to which the “migrants” from Tehran were invited, the principal elements of the ritual still being the cult of Mihr, to whom the animal sacrifice was dedicated (essentially a sheep or goat, whose flesh was roasted, shared out and eaten) and the offerings of products of the season preserved and brought for the festival (Boyce, 1975, 108 ff.; eadem, Stronghold, 54 ff., 83ff., 200 ff.). These rituals were probably survivals of Mihrān-kadak, the sacrifice of livestock, symbolising the immolation of the primordial bull (Boyce, 1975, 108, 117 f.). A large sanctuary of Kirmān is dedicated to “Shāh Mihr Izd” (Boyce, Stronghold, 83).

iv. Other usages of the noun.

(1) As a toponym, Mihragan designates, in a compound or adjoining forms, various localities and districts:

Mihrādjan, ancient name of Isfahān [q.v.] in Khorāsān. According to Yākūt (7th/13th century), it was still a village near the ruined town; 51 villages were under its control. It was also a small town between Isfahān and Tabās (Yākūt, v, 233; Barbir de Meynard, 552; Le Strange, 393).

Mihrāndjanāvād (« Mihrān-jānābād », a town in Fars (Le Strange, 283; Schwarz, i, 30, 180).

Mihrān-kadak/Mihrān-kudak (Mihrān-kudhak), a densely populated and very fertile district in the 4th/10th century in Ǧībāl, near Saymara (Yākūt and Barbir de Meynard; al-Mas‘ūdī, Tanbih, Fr. tr. 74, 453; Le Strange, 202; Schwarz, iv, 470 and index).

Mihrān, one of the villages in the region of Rāy (Yākūt, 235; Barbir de Meynard, 552; Schwarz, vi, 805).

Mihrān, a village in Fārs (Schwarz, i 37).

Mihrāndjan, a small town in the country of Marw; a major village in Fārs, near Kāzarūn [q.v.] (Yākūt, 234; Barbir de Meynard, 553).

Mihrāndjan, Kāzarūn, a village in a region near Kāzarūn, Fārs ibid.

Mihrān, two villages, region of Kāzarūn, Fārs ibid.

Mihrān, two villages, region of Bandar ʿAbbās (vii, 400).

Mihrān, region of Nāvin; Mihrān, Mihrāndjan-i arāmītra, in ruins, and Mihrān-kūrkhā, region of Isfahan (v, 88).

(2) As a personal name. Mihragan was given rarely as a patronym (see e.g. Mihrān-b. Rūzbih; Schwarz, iii, 136, n. 3). However, there exist many proper Persian names derived from Mihr. According to a Zoroastrian custom, a name with Mihr was given to a child born on this day (Farēvashi, 306). As well as names such as Mihrān, Mihrān-bī, Mihrān, etc., many female names are also formed, such as Mihrbānūn, Mihrbūkh, Mihrmāh/Mihr-i māh [q.v.], Mihrvās, etc. Several people were also known by their nības derived from toponyms (Mihrāndjanī, Mihrāndjanī, Mihrāndjanī, Mihrāndjanī, etc.).

(3) Mihragan and music. As with Nau-rūz, Mihragan also gave its name to some musical themes whose origin goes back to the Sāsānīd period (see Christensen, 1918, 376; Schwarz, i, 30, iii). Several names were given to these tunes (āvāz, dastgāh, īlah, nægma, naqū, parda), whose tenor is not known in the general body of makāms [q.v.]. We can distinguish essentially mihragan-i buzurg, the eleventh of the twelve makāms according
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Jhelum, on which Multān was situated and which formed part of the Pančanada or Pandjnad 'Five rivers' [see PANCANA], as the main stream, whose waters unite near modern Ucch and then join the Indus. The modern city of Multān, about 100 miles/160 km. below Multān. The Jādrānwār must have been one of the main arms of the lower Indus within the province of Sindh [q. v.] just below the town of Rūr or Arūr-al-Rūr [q. v.], modern Rohri. Likewise, the Ḥudūd al-ṭālām, § 6, 13-15, cf. Minorisky's comm., 209-10, 371-2, regards the Indus river system as essentially composed of three streams: the Sindh-Rūd (the modern upper Indus, north of Atak [q. v.] or Attock), the river of Lamghān (= the Kābul river, which the author considers to be the principal channel of the Indus) and the Hīvān (apparently the Sutlej, the longest affluent of the Indus). After the junction of these three, the author says, the river is called the Mihrān, and empties into the 'Great Sea' at Kullī (the Kori creek, the ancient estuary of the Indus, now in the Rann of Cutch); he also mentions (§ 16-16) a 'Lesser Mihrān' to the east, perhaps the Narbadā of central India, which flows into the Gulf of Cambay. Al-Idrīṣī uses only the term Mihrān, and describes the main course of its lower reaches in Sindh as flowing in his time near al-Mansūra; cf. S. Maquib Ahmad, India and the Neighbouring Territories in ..., al-Sharīf al-idrīsī, text 41, text 41 etc.

Of the historians, al-Baladhuri uses the term Mihrān in his account of Muhammad b. al-Kāsim's conquest of Sindh (Fīṭḥ al-Mustafī, 438). The Ghaznavid chroniclers al-Ṭūbih and Gardīzī, if they give the Indus a specific name at all, use that of Sayhūn, normally used by the geographers for the Sir Darya or Oxus; its application to the Indus is only the term Mihrān, and describes the main course of its lower reaches in Sindh as flowing in his time near al-Mansūra; cf. S. Maquib Ahmad, India and the Neighbouring Territories in ..., al-Sharīf al-idrīsī, text 41, etc.

We should mention that the source of the delta course of the Indus could well have been the name of the city of Jāshān, in the preceeding text, it is a tiller's ploughshare. Having seen in the house of the Prophet is said to have exclaimed: "These things do not enter a house (dār) without also bringing in debasement" (see al-Bukhari, Sahih, k. al-wakldla, mdd^d^afi 'l-harth wa l-muzdra' ed. Halabi, Cairo n.d., iii, 135; cf. Houdas et Marçais, Les traditions musulmanes, ii, 91). Ibn Khaldūn (Mukaddima, i, 238, Fr. tr. de Slane, i, 297, Eng. tr. Rosenthal, i, 289-90), specifies that, in the ḫadīth in question, it is a tiller's ploughshare (ṣīkka), and, without dwelling on the interpretations that could be put on it so as to mitigate the effect, he goes on to say that taxes (payable on products of the land) are used to designate today a plough, but these terms are applied more specifically, in mediaeval literature, to the tiller, which is not equipped with wheels or a mould-board or a coulter, but consists essentially of a ploughshare, a crossbeam, a handle and a pole (or beam).

While it is true that the "kinder of war", was not known to agronomists, notably Andalusians, who, nevertheless, tended to consider it as colloquial (see Dozy, Suppl., s. v.); for his part, Ibn Khaldūn is prepared to use it, without any reference to a famous ḫadīth which bears witness after all to the existence of the tiller in ancient Arabia. Having seen in the house of one of his Companions a ploughshare (ṣīkka) and other parts of a ploughing implement, the Prophet is said to have exclaimed: "These things do not enter a house (dār) without also bringing in debasement" (see al-Bukhari, Sahih, k. al-wakldla, mdd^d^afi 'l-harth wa l-muzdra' ed. Halabi, Cairo n.d., iii, 135; cf. Houdas et Marçais, Les traditions musulmanes, ii, 91). Ibn Khaldūn (Mukaddima, i, 238, Fr. tr. de Slane, i, 297, Eng. tr. Rosenthal, i, 289-90), specifies that, in the ḫadīth in question, it is a tiller's ploughshare (ṣīkka), and, without dwelling on the interpretations that could be put on it so as to mitigate the effect, he goes on to say that taxes (payable on products of the land) are used to designate today a plough, but these terms are applied more specifically, in mediaeval literature, to the tiller, which is not equipped with wheels or a mould-board or a coulter, but consists essentially of a ploughshare, a crossbeam, a handle and a pole (or beam). Although it goes back to the earliest antiquity, this agricultural implement is still in use, with a modification of note, throughout the Islamic world.
by quite an expected extension of meaning, came to designate also the area that a pair of oxen could till in a given time [see MISAMA].

By force of circumstances, the mediaeval philologists inevitably concerned themselves with the tiller and noted its terminology; but, cut off from rural realities, doubtless embarrassed by the diversity of the terms attested in different regions and perhaps also hindered by the hadith cited above, they do not seem to have possessed a very clear idea of the structure and function of an implement that they could not, however, neglect. It is thus that we find a rather obscure and fairly contradictory account of a lexicographical character, for the elements were drawn from various sources and probably concern slightly different types, in the Mukhasas of Ibn Siduh (s. v. 152-4) and a brief description in the Lisdn (s. v. d-q-r). There follows an attempt at translating the passage in question of the Lisdn which seems to consist of two yokelets [read fi tarafih] as if they were speaking of two cars (uɫ gumān); the iron is called sunba (sic', udhändn); Fadajīn is the name of all assembled parts (adwādat) of the implement. The khāshaba placed on the neck ("uwaq") of the ox (sic) is the nīr. The two sānīks are pieces of wood attached to the neck. To the pole which [ends in] the centre [of the yoke], is fixed the strap (read jāndn instead of jāndn) of the waydjī, i.e. the kahānah. Waydžī and mays (read hays as in the Mukhasas and in L.A. s. v. h-y-r) in Yemeni are the name of the long khāshaba which passes between the two oxen. The piece of wood that the ploughman holds is the miskawān.

The preceding description is not of blinding clarity, but by means of the terminology retained by the author of the Lisdn and with the help of the list supplied by Ibn Siduh, it nevertheless allows us to form an idea of the elements constituting the tillers at an early date.

The ploughshare (sikka, but also sinn, sinna, na'd) was joined by means of a strap ("sīn") of iron to the crossbeam, which could also be called dadjīr (and vars.), sometimes used in the dual (dadjīran) because instead of fi tarafī

1. sīlb = beam 5. kahānah = joining pin
2. dadjr = cross-beam 6. miskawān = handle
3. 'sīn = strap 7. sayfīn = holding bar
4. sikka = ploughshare

it was in two parts with one joined to the other by another strap and/or a cord (fati), which could indicate that the transition from the tied object to the object fitted together had still not been totally achieved (?). The Mukhasas says also that the two dadjīrs were placed at the meeting point of the la'ama and the sīlb, and defines this last as being the piece of wood whose end (one should probably read fi tarafī instead of fi tarafī) joins on to the ploughshare; but as it says that the sīlb is the longest element of the tiller, it is clearly the pole (or beam) called waydżī and hays in Yemen or in 'Umān and to which it also gives the name la'ama; the Lisdn (s. v. l-l) specifies that the end of this part was driven into the hole pierced in the beginning of the la'ama; this last, rather imprecise, term would designate on the one hand all the parts of the tiller, whether of wood or iron, and on the other only the ploughshare—which is not very likely—or, more probably, like sīlb, the beam tied to the cross-beam at a point called gidār. Kannahā, for its part, presents a difficulty; the Lisdn (s. v. k-n-h) explains this word as designating a polo-stick and, in general, a curved piece of wood, whereas, according to Ibn Siduh, it is a kind of joining pin used to connect the ploughshare (or rather the cross-beam) to the beam.

The ploughman ensures the proper functioning of the tiller and drives the ploughshare in the earth by putting pressure on the handle (miskawān, Ibn Siduh also gives dadawī, from Persian dastāh; cf. Dozy, Syriac s. v. dastād); this part has not been double for a long time, but it doubtless has a holding bar, which is what the Mukhasas calls sayfīn.

The team itself is not described very exactly, and we know simply that the beam was attached to the centre of the yoke by means of a trace called djarr. Regarding the yoke, the Mukhasas supplies a list of terms supposedly synonymous, of which nīr is the best known today; it also cites nīr, nū'usawāna (which designates a pair of ploughing oxen) and midmad/midmāda, of which the Lisdn (s. v. d-m-d) gives an explanation which is lacking in clarity. However, we understand that yokes could assume various forms, one of which seems to consist of two yokelets (samikān) which, according to the Lisdn (s. v. s-m-8), are "two pieces of wood [each] encircling the neck of the ox like a collar and joining under the animal's dewlap (ghab-ghab); they are then attached (wisir, but shuddī in the Mukhasas) to each other by means of a rope." Other terms are also cited, notably the mikrān which designates a piece of wood fixed on the oxen's head, when they plough, by means of a rope called taraghīk. No pole under the belly is mentioned, but there is mention of a kīrān or kāran, which is a rope passing over the ox's neck and attached to the la'ama, here the beam.

The two principal sources used mention, immediately after enumerating the parts of the tiller, a still more rudimentary implement for levelling the earth after ploughing and burying completely the seed which was sown there before the ploughshare had turned over the soil; this is the mišlak or mimlaka, a wide board that the ploughman presses on with all his weight and was pulled along by two oxen (which is rather the Egyptian zabbafla).

As W. Marçais (Takrūwa, i, 88-9) remarks, the terminology that can be noted in the work of the classical lexicographers "probably contains a certain proportion of inexactitudes and errors"; not only is it not uniform, but furthermore, agriculture being left to slave and foreign elements, loan words have been detected (see Fraenkel, Aramäische Fremdwörter, 131 ff.; cf. M. Feghali, Étude sur les emprunts syriques dans les parlers du Liban, 93) which risked increasing the confusion. In addition, several types of tiller were bound to exist, to judge by mediaeval practice [see Fīlāta] that the Andalusian agriculturists, in particular, describe (see L. Boleus, 97 ff.) and by the present or recent situation. In fact, in detail, the forms and parts of the various implements that can be seen today present perceptible differences, and the corresponding ter-
minology is itself too dissimilar, both in Arabic dialects and in Berber—for the use of the tiller is still widespread in Barbary—for one to consider giving even a rough idea of it here. So we will merely repeat the brief description given by Ayrout (Fellâks, 59) of the tiller used in Egypt and in other countries of the East. This implement, which weighs about 40 kg, "consists of a wooden cross-beam fitted with a flat, ogival-shaped ploughshare of about 25 cm and a long beam of about 3.50 m to which the harnessed animals are attached by means of a straight yoke resting on the withers and not, as in Europe, on the brow. Two water buffaloes are used or the smallholder's water buffaloes used or the smallholder’s water buffalo and donkey, or two camels hired for the occasion, or even a camel and a donkey. The ploughman leans on the single handle to drive in the ploughshare with his voice and hand, for he does not use reins or a whip."

The tiller thus described does not differ fundamentally from that which was in use in ancient Arabia, where the very best team consisted of two oxen, just as the description of faddân implies. It is possible that the Arabs, who no doubt did not have to respect the prohibition of Deuteronomy (xxii, 10: 'You shall not plough with a donkey and an ox yoked together') any more than do the Egyptians of today, used some ill-matched teams, but we do not have any immediately usable evidence.

No more do we have information at our disposal on the use of camels [see mth.] for ploughing in ancient Arabia. Nevertheless, the use of a single camel appears characteristic of southern Tunisia and Libya (see W. Marçais, Takrouna, 1, 182, 189-90). In this case, the tiller is somewhat different, in that the beam is shorter and that a swingle-bar is attached to the ends, traces leading from them to a collar (or half-collar) held in place, on the withers, by a system of ropes passing over the neck, as well as behind the hump and on the crupper; long reins allow the animal to be driven (see the detail and local terminology in G. Boris, Documents linguistiques et ethnographiques sur une région du Sud Tunisien (Nefzaoua), Paris 1951, 19). After rejecting (in Mots et choses berbères, 290) the current assertion that the Berber peasant sometimes makes his wife and donkey draw the tiller, and on the whole doubting the evidence of Pliny who claimed to have observed such a team, E. Laoust considers (in Hesperis, x/1 [1930], 37-47). The account of H.H. Ayrout, Monuments et coutumes des fellâhs, Paris, 1938, has been consulted with profit. For Islamic Spain, the work of Lucie Bolens, Agronomos andalusio d’Menen Áge, Geneva-Paris, 1981, 97 ff. and bibl. cited, contains an interesting chapter on ploughing. See also P. Bahnstedt and M. Woidich, Die ägyptisch-arabischen Dialekte (Wiesbaden, 1985), i, 62-3, 91-2, ii, maps 474-510. (CH. PELLAT)

MIHRGAN [see MIHRAGAN].

MIHRI KHATUN, an important Turkish poetess of the end of the 9th/10th and beginning of the 10th/16th centuries. Although 'Ashik Çelebi clearly states that Mihrî was her given name as well as her makhâsî, later on Ewliya Çelebi writes (Seyahatnâmé, ii, 192) that it was Mihrmâh. (It is possible as her cognomen that Fâhîr al-nisâ is mentioned in one of his works she is addressed to him.) Mihrî Khatûn was a descendant of Fîr Êlyûs, the Kahlwetî sheykh of Amasya. Her father was a kâfî who wrote poetry under the makhâsî Belâyî. Mihrî Khâtûn herself spent her whole life, about which very little is known, in and around Amasya. She belonged to the literary circle of prince Ahmed, son of Bâyezîd II, during his government of Amasya in the years 885/1481 (or possibly 890/1485, according to Reindl, op. cit. below, 80) to 919/1513. Indeed, almost all of the kasîlîs in her Diwân are addressed to him.

Mihrî Khâtûn is known to have fallen in love repeatedly, her best documented loves being Mû‘eeyyê-zâde 'Abîl al-Râmân Çelebi, who was born in Amasya in 860/1456, later became kâfî 'ûsak, and wrote poetry under the makhâsî Khâtêmi, and Iskender Çelebi, son of Sinân Pashâ. She sang of her loves in her shâhâls, and the tâdîkhêrlîs recorded this, especially citing a shâhâl on Iskender Çelebi in which she names him through iwâhî (allusion). Yet, at the same time, they all agree in emphasizing her chastity and virtuousness, reiterating that these were innocent showing a Roman influence, but not prejudging at all the origin of the North African types, which may well be considered autochthonous.

In this connection specialists (e.g. V. Mosseri and C. Audeloue, Le labourage enEgypte, in BIE, 5th series, x [1916], 83-127), the tiller in use "constitutes the implement par excellence of regions where it is sufficient to scratch the ground in order to bury the seed and allow it to germinate before the top soil dries out. This tiller is also all that is needed when, owing to a limited water supply, it is necessary to prevent the rapid evaporation of the soil." The tiller with a light ploughshare has moreover been used until recently in Spain for ploughing on the flat, and it has not been entirely replaced by modern ploughs in the regions of North Africa where the peasants have to be satisfied with it and where the arable land bed will not support deep ploughing.

Bibliography: Apart from the reference cited, the classic study of the plough is that of A.G. Haurdricourt and M.J.B. Delamare, L’homme et la charrette à travers le monde, Paris, 1955, a short article by the first of these authors appears in the Dictionnaire archeologique des techniques, Paris, 1963, i, 263-5. The terminology of the tiller in Arabic-speaking countries has been made the subject of a certain number of research studies enumerated in a long critical note by W. Marçais in his Tokerhê, i, Paris, 1925, 187-90. As far as the Berber region is concerned, an excellent monograph by E. Laoust, Mots et choses berbères, Paris, 1920, 275-301, was completed in an article by the same author, Au sujet de la charrette berbère, in Hesperis, x/1 (1930), 37-47. The account of H.H. Ayrout, Monuments et coutumes des fellâhs, Paris, 1938, has been consulted with profit. For Islamic Spain, the work of Lucie Bolens, Agronomos andalusio d’Menen Âge, Geneva-Paris, 1981, 97 ff. and bibl. cited, contains an interesting chapter on ploughing. See also P. Bahnstedt and M. Woidich, Die ägyptisch-arabischen Dialekte (Wiesbaden, 1985), i, 62-3, 91-2, ii, maps 474-510. (CH. PELLAT)
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loves and that she lived a blameless life. In fact, she is reported to have remained unmarried... in the 15th and 16th centuries, Baghdad 1958-61, ii, 205, 209) considers that the decline of Arabic poetry begins... Amasya. Mihri Khatun was well educated for her sex and day, being sufficiently versed in Persian poetic... Celebi, was buried in her ancestor Pir Ilyas's tekye in Amasya.

Mihri Khatun left a not particularly voluminous Diwan and at least one treatise in rhyme. A number of her poems had been made accessible by Smirnov and translated by Gibb (op. cit. below) before a critical edition of the Diwan based on four mss. was published by E.I. Mahtakova (Mihri Khatun. Diwan. Kir'etitskii tekst i iustpitel'nuyu stat'yu, Moscow 1967). This contains 208 ghazels, 11 kasidahs, a mista'az and a terqiq-i bend, 7 marabahs and a mudhammes as well as 4 nasms and 6 muhafiz. These poems are preceded in the Diwan by a terqiq in the form of a me'neesi of 29 byez (which start with the Arabic letters in their alphabetical order) and, more importantly, by her rizale in verse, Tadarru'-ndme. Composed mainly in the form of a me'neesi, but interspersed with about ten poems in the form of a ghazel as well as one kaside and one marabah, this contains mina'ajis, nat'am, me'te'az, etc. The whole rizale totals about 460 lines and ends with a touching khātme, which includes a few lines which Mihri Khatun said in defence of women.


MIHTAR [see MEHTEK] MIIHYAR B. MARZAWAYH (Marzoye) AL-DAYLAMI, Abu 1'-Hasyan ( Ibn Khalilkan) or Abu 1'-Hasan (other sources), poet who used the Arabic language, originally a Zoroastrian but becoming a convert to Islam in 394/1004 at the hands of al-Sharif al-Radi (559-606/970-1016 [q. v.]), dying in 428/1037.

The famous Shih poet and nakib of the descendants of the Prophet took charge of the education of his protégé, into whom he inculcated not only the basic principles of Shihism but also the necessary skills for him to act as a secretary in the administration. He naturally took care also to teach him the rules of versification, but his pupil very soon showed the natural talents by which he was to make him one of the most famous poets of the 5th/11th century.

Apart from the items of information concerning his relations with the Sharif, under whose protection he seems to have lived, we have virtually no other biographical information about Mihyar, whose extensive Diwan nevertheless in itself supplies material for a substantial study.

This poet, who simply copied his master, attempted almost all the poetic genres, but did not display an equal talent for all of them. Thus his descriptions were considered to be prosaic, as also his eulogies, which seem lengthy; but on the other hand, he excelled in the sphere of the ghazel [q. v.], friendly or amorous verses, versified epistles addressed to his friends (ikhwaniyat) and above all in the funeral eulogy or elegy or rig [see MARTHYA]. As a good disciple of al-Sharif al-Radi, he successfully celebrated the memories of 'Ali and al-Husayn (see e.g. Diwan, Cairo 1344-50/1925-31, ii, 259-62, 367-70, iii, 109, etc.), and his poems of condolence (a-tazi, Diwan, ii, 72-4, iii, 6-8, 54-8, etc.) are highly appreciated; but the poem in min (Diwan, iii, 366-70), in which he laments the death of his master, is considered to be a masterpiece and is used as a basis for comparison.

The Sunni sources, which naturally blame him for his Rafidi beliefs and which cite a witticism according to which he conversion to Islam merely transferred him from one corner of Hell to another, nevertheless adjudge his poetry to be of an "extreme beauty" (e.g. Ibn Taghrabardi, Nadum, v, 26-7), and even the Spaniard Ibn Basam (in Ibn al-'Imad, Shahibard, iii, 243) is said to have praised him highly. A critic like 'Ali Di, al-Tahir (in ‘Arabat f-l'ashq wa-bildd al-‘arab), Istanbul 1269, 93 f., 308 f.; Muslih, Hayati ve Divani, in Adtrum fi l'asr al-salikhin, Bagdad 1958-61, ii, 205, 209) considers that the decline of Arabic poetry begins
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after Mihyar and that the Seljuk period is characterised by a tendency towards imitation and even towards making a pastiche of al-Radi and his pupil.


Cf. PELLAT

MIKĀL, the archangel Michael [see also MALAKA], whose name occurs once in the Kurʿan, viz. in II, 92, “Whosoever is an enemy to God, or his angels, or his apostles, or to Gabriel or to Michael, verily God is an enemy to the unbelievers.” In explanation of this verse two stories are told. According to the first, the Jews, wishing to test the veracity of the mission of Muhammad, asked him several questions, to all of which he gave the true answer. Finally they asked him, who the two angels were to whom God had given the revelation? When he answered, Gabriel, the Jews declared that this angel was their enemy and the angel of destruction and pestilence, in opposition to Michael whom they said to be their protector and the angel of fertility and salvation (al-Tabari, Taṣfīr, i, 324 ff.). According to the second story, ʿUmar once entered the synagogue (midras) of Medina and asked the Jews questions concerning Gabriel. They gave an account of that angel as well as of Michael similar to the one mentioned above, whereupon ʿUmar asked: What is the position of those two angels with God? They replied: Gabriel is to His right and Michael to His left hand, and there is enmity between the two. Whereupon ʿUmar answered: If they have that position with God, there can be no enmity between them. But you are unbelievers. More than that, you speak animism on Islam, which calls Michael the attendant of the second heaven, in contradistinction to Michael, who is the guardian of the sea in the seventh heavens (15). Other forms of the name are Mikail, Mikhail, Mickil, Mikail, Mikail, Mickil. It is hardly necessary to say that, in the magical usage of the names of the archangels, that of Michael is on the same level as that of his companions (see e.g. S.M. Zwemer, The influence of animism on Islam, 195, 197).


MIKALIS, an Iranian family of Khurāsān prominent in the cultural and social worlds there and also active as local administrators and town officials under the Sāmānids and early Ghaznavids [q.v.].

They were apparently of Sogdian origin, and amongst their pre-Islamic forebears is mentioned the Prince of Pandjakent Shīr Dīvāstī, killed at Mount Mugh by the Arabs in 100/722–3 [see MAWARAK AL-NABIR 2. History]; al-Samʿānī traces the family back to the Sasanids Hārdagird ʿII and Bahārān Gūr (K. al-Anbāʿ, facs. edn., fol. 548b–549b). It must nevertheless have become Muslim, for Islamic names now appear in its genealogy, and like many other families

served other features ascribed to Michael in Jewish Apocrypha (mediator between God and mankind, 1 Enoch ix, 9; Test. Dan., vi, 2; 3 Baruch, xl, 2), or in the New Testament (Jude, v, 9: Michael disputing with the devil on behalf of Moses, Revelation, xii, 7 ff.; Michael and his angels fighting against the dragon and the final discomfiture of the latter). Perhaps a faint recollection of Michael as the protector of mankind (the Jews, the Christians) may be found in the tradition according to which Michael has never laughed since the creation of Hell (Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, iii, 224). Further, however, Michael is rarely mentioned in Arabic sources, al-Bukhārī, Bāḥd al-ṣayl, bāb 7, where he, together with Mālik, the guardian of Hell, and Gabriel, appears to Muhammad in a dream; al-Nasāʾī, Ištīḥād, bāb 37, where Michael incites Gabriel to urge Muhammad to recite the Kurʿan according to seven abrafs).

Al-Yaʿḳūbī mentions a story of which we have no counterpart in Jewish or Christian literature either, which is not at variance with the story bearing an outspoken Shiʿi tendency. One day, God announced to Gabriel and Michael that one of them must die. Neither, however, was willing to sacrifice himself on behalf of his partner, whereupon God said to them: Take ʿAli as an example, who was willing to give his life on behalf of Muhammad (sc. on the night before the ḥajj, cf. Samaʿi, ii, 27), while Gabriel and Michael deliberated.

Michael is further mentioned by name as one of the angels who opened the breast of Muhammad before his night journey (al-Tabari, i, 1157–9; Ibn al-ʿAṭīr, ii, 36–7), and as one of those who came to the aid of the Muslims in the battle of Badr (Ibn Saʿd, iii, 9, 18).

In the text of the Kurʿan, as well as in a verse cited by al-Tabari (i, 329), the form of the name is Mikil as if it were a mišar form from wakala (Horovitz). A direct reminiscence of the Greek, probably also of the Hebrew and Aramaic, forms of the name is to be found in the tradition preserved by al-Kisāʿī (12), which calls Mikhaʾil the attendant of the second heaven, in contradistinction to Mikil, who is the guardian of the sea in the seventh heavens (15). Other forms of the name are Mikai, Mikil, Mikīl, Mikai and Mikīl. It is hardly necessary to say that, in the magical usage of the names of the archangels, that of Michael is on the same level as that of his companions (see e.g. S.M. Zwemer, The influence of animism on Islam, 195, 197).
from Khurásan and the far eastern fringes of the Islamic world, its members were drawn westwards to the new capital Bagdád by the early 'Abbasíds. 'Sháh b. Míkal (d. 302/914-15) was a protégé of the 'Abbásíds and the mamád of the poet al-Buhtúr [q. v.], 'Sháh b. Míkal's nephew 'Abd Alláh b. Muhammad began in the service of the 'Abbásíds [q. v.] and became governor of Ahwáz. His son Abu 'l-'Abbás Ismá'íl had the philologist Ibn Duráy [q. v.] as his tutor, and the latter wrote for him his great dictionary, the Dámmakát al-lugha, dedicated to him his Maqsurá and as his tutor, and the latter wrote for him his great dictionary, the Dámmakát al-lugha, dedicated to him his Maqsurá and was praised as a poet and traditionist. Under 'Abd Alláh Ismá'íl, the family moved back to Khurásan and settled in Nishápúr. He himself was given the headship of the Dáwwát al-ra'ábí or chancery in 347/958 by the Samání vizier Abu Da'ír al-Útbi, holding this post till his death in 362/973, and was also apparently the first Míkalí ra'í (i.e. municipal head and representative of the town notables vii-d-vii the central government; see on this office, C. E. Bosworth, The Ghaznávis, 184-5; A. S. Lambton, in Camb. hist. of Iran, v, 279-81; and R. M. Bulliet, The patricians of Nishápúr, Cambridge, Mass. 1972, 66-8), corresponding as such with the author and stylist Abu Bákár Khúsháramí [q. v.]. His son Abu Muhammad 'Abd Alláh [d. 379/989-90] followed his father in these offices, and was known as an authority on físh and as a fine poet, specimens of whose best-known representative was Abu 'l-Fadl 'Ubayd Alláh mentioned above, for Hasanák dispossessed them of lands and rights in Nishápúr, and all these were only restored to them in 424/1033 by the Ghaznávi vizier 'Abd Alláh the-Samád Shírází. Finally, it should be noted that the Míkalí exercised political and social influence beyond the confines of Nishápúr itself. Ibn Fundúkh devotes a section of his local history of Bayhák to the Míkalíán (Tábi'í Bayhák, ed. Ahmad Bahmanyar, Tehran 1317/1938, 117). We lack information on the family after the middle 5th/11th century; it seems improbable that their influence could disappear abruptly, though it may well be that Saljúq domination in Khurásan was, in the long term, unfavourable to the maintenance of their social and political power in Nishápúr.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the references given in the article, see Muhammad, Shafi, *The sons of Míkal*, in *Procs. of the Idara-i Maarif-i Islamia*, Lahore 1933, first session, Lahore 1935, 107-68; Bosworth, *The Ghaznávis*, 179-85, and R. W. Bulliet, art. Alí-e Míkal, in Encycl. Iranica. Sa'id Násífí gathered together uncritically much information on the Míkalí at the notes to his edition of Bayhák, Tehran 1319-32/1940-9, ii. 969-1009, with a genealogical table at p. 1008; according to Bulliet, Patricians, 67 n. 23, the biographical historian of Nishápúr 'Abd Alláh the-Gháfirí al-Fárisí mentions several further Míkalí not recorded by Násífí. See also H. Ritter, *Die Geheimnisse des Wortkasten des 'Abdulláh al-Curdím*, Wiesbaden 1959, 27-32 (= n. 17) [with family tree]. (C. E. Bosworth)

**MÍKÁT (A., mifíl form from w-l-t, plural mánáwíf) appointed or exact time. In this sense the term occurs several times in the Kur'án (II, 185; VII, 138, 139, 154; XXXVI, 37; XLIV, 40; LVI, 50; LXXVIII, 17).**

**1. Legal aspects.** In hadáth and físh, the term is applied to the times of prayer and to the places where those who enter the haram are bound to put on the haram. For the latter meaning of the term, see HÉRAM. Although some general indications for the times at which some saláts are to be performed occur in the Kur'án (cf. II, 239; XI, 116; XVII, 80; XXIV, 29), it may be considered above doubt that during Muhammad's lifetime neither the number of the daily saláts nor their exact times had been fixed and that this happened in the first decades after his death. A reminiscence of that period of uncertainty may be preserved in those traditions which apply a deviating nomenclature to some of the saláts. The saláti al-zuhr, e.g., is called al-'hájír al-saláti; the saláti al-maghlíbí, 'tsháb,
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2. Astronomical aspects. Ulm al-mīkāt is the science of astronomical timekeeping by the sun and stars and the determination of the times (mawḍūṭ) of the five prayers. Since the limits of the permitted intervals for the prayers are defined in terms of the apparent position of the sun in the sky relative to the local horizon, their times vary throughout the year and are dependent upon the terrestrial latitude. When reckoned in terms of a meridian other than the local meridian, the times of prayer are also dependent upon terrestrial longitude.

The definitions of the times of prayer outlined in the Kur‘ān and hadīth [see 1, Legal aspects] were standardised in the 2nd/8th century and have been used ever since. According to these standard definitions, the Islamic day and the interval for the maghrib prayer begin when the disc of the sun has set over the
c. the maghrib before the twilight had disappeared; d. the ‘āshā when the first of the night had passed; e. the fadjr when sunrise was near (ṣafra bḥār).

In a tradition communicated by al-Sha‘īfī’s (Kitāb al-
Umm, i, 62), the fixing of the mawḍūṭ just mentioned is ascribed to the example of Gabriel (cf. Zayd b. ‘Āli, Masūdī al-fikhr, no. 109). These masūdūt have for the most passed into the books of fikr. We cannot reproduce all details here. The following scheme may suffice:

a. zuhr: from the time when the sun begins to decline till the time when shadows are of equal length with the objects by which they are cast, apart from their shadows at noon. The Ḥanafīs alone deviate in one of their branches, in so far as they replace the ultimate term by the time when the shadows are twice as large as their objects. In times of great heat, it is recommended to postpone the zuhr as late as possible; b. ‘asr: from the last time allowed for zuhr till before sunset. According to Mālik, the first term begins somewhat later; c. maghrib: from the time after sunset till the time when the red twilight has disappeared. Small deviations only, in connection with a predilection for the first term; d. ‘āshā: from the last term mentioned for the salat al-maghrib till when a third, or half of the night has passed, or till daybreak; e. fajr: from the last daybreak till before sunrise.

Side-by-side with these masūdūt, we find in the books of Tradition and of Law the times at which it is not allowed to perform prayer, viz. sunrise, noon, and sunset (al-Bukhārī, Masūdī, bāb 30; Muslim, Salāt al-masā‘īfīn, trads. 285-94; cf. al-Nawāwī’s commentary for controversies regarding this point, and further Wensinck, A handbook of early Mus. trad., 192a).

According to ‘Akhīta, it is only forbidden to await sunrise and sunset for prayer (Muslim, Masā‘īfīn, trad. 296). In Mecca, prayer is allowed at all times (al-
Bukhārī, Hadījī, bāb 42).
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horizon. The intervals for the "isha and fadjr prayers begin at nightfall and daybreak. The permitted time for the zuhr begins either when the sun has crossed the meridian, or when the shadow of any object has been observed to increase, or, in mediaeval Andalusian and Maghrabi practice, when the shadow of any vertical object or gnomon has increased over its midday minimum by one-quarter of the length of the object.

The interval for the asr begins when the shadow increase equals the length of the gnomon and ends either when the shadow increase is twice the length of the gnomon or at sunset. See Figs. 1 and 2.

Fig. 1. The Islamic day.

Fig. 2. Shadow increases at the zuhr (Andalusí/Maghribi definition) and at the beginning and end of the asr.

The names of the prayers are derived from the names of the corresponding seasonal hours [see sā'a] in pre-Islamic classical Arabic, the seasonal hours (al-sā'it al-zamānīyya) being one-twelfth divisions of the day and night. The definitions of the times of the daylight prayers in terms of shadow increases (as opposed to shadow lengths in the hadīth) represent a practical means of regulating the prayers in terms of the seasonal hours.

In some circles, a sixth prayer, the dhuḥā, was performed at the same time before midday as the asr was performed after midday. These definitions of the dhuḥā, zuhr, and asr correspond to the third, sixth and ninth seasonal hours, the links being provided by an approximate Indian formula relating shadow increases to the seasonal hours (see below). The Umayyad Caliph 'Umar b. Abd al-'Azīz [q.v.] is reported to have used a (Graeco-Roman) sundial (marked with the seasonal hours) for regulating his prayers. The early 'Abbāsid astronomer al-Khūzāzī [q.v.] was still toying with different definitions of the zuhr intended to associate it with the sixth and the seventh seasonal hours.

The regulations of the times of prayer was conducted at two different levels. At the popular level, the simple techniques of folk astronomy were used. Muslim astronomers, on the other hand, used sophisticated tables and instruments for timekeeping.

As we see from treatises on folk astronomy and on the sacred law, in popular practice the daylight prayers were regulated by simple arithmetical shadow schemes of the kind also attested in earlier Hellenistic and Byzantine folk astronomy. The night prayers were regulated by observation of the lunar mansions [see MA'ĀZIL], as the 7th/13th century Yemeni legal scholar al-Asbaḥi wrote in his treatise on folk astronomy: "The times of prayer are not to be found by the degrees (marked) on an astrolabe and not by calculation using the science of the astronomers; they are to be found only by direct observation ... The astronomers took their knowledge from Euclid and the Sā'indīkā, and from Aristotle and other philosophers; all of them were infidels."

Some twenty different shadow schemes have been located in the Arabic sources. In most cases, they are not the result of any careful observations. Usually a single one-digit value for the midday shadow of a man 7 kadams ('l 'feet') tall is given for each month of the year. One such scheme, attested in several sources, is (starting with a value for January):

9 7 5 3 2 1 1 2 4 5 (or 6) 8 10.

The corresponding values for the shadow length at the beginning of the asr prayer are 7 units more for each month.

Other arithmetical schemes are sometimes presented in order to find the shadow length at each seasonal hour of day. The most popular formula advocated in order to find the increase (Δ) of the shadow over its midday minimum at T (≤6) seasonal hours after sunrise or before sunset is:

\[ T = 6 \frac{n}{\Delta + n}, \]

where \( n \) is the length of the gnomon. This is the formula which was first used to establish the values \( \Delta n \) for the 3rd and the 9th seasonal hours of daylight, the beginnings of the dhuḥā and asr (T = 5), and \( \Delta = 2n \) for the 10th hour, sometimes taken as the end of the asr (T = 2).

The Muslim astronomers had a passion for compiling tables, and some of these were specifically for the purpose of timekeeping. Al-Khūzāzī compiled the first known tables for regulating the times of the daylight prayers. Compiled for the latitude of Baghdad, his tables display the shadow lengths at the zuhr and the beginning and end of the asr, with values for each 6° of solar longitude (corresponding roughly to each six days of the year): see Pl. IX, 1. He also compiled some simple tables displaying the time of day in seasonal hours in terms of the observed solar altitude.

The 3rd/9th century astronomer 'Ali b. Amādīr compiled a more extensive table for timekeeping based on a simple approximate formula which serves all latitudes. The underlying formula is:

\[ T = \frac{1}{15} \sin (\sin h \sin H), \]

where \( h \) is the observed altitude and \( H \) is the meridian altitude. (Note that \( T = 0 \) when \( h = 0 \) and \( T = 6 \) when \( h = H \), as required for the cases when the sun is on the horizon and the meridian; in fact this formula is accurate only when the sun is at the equinoxes.) Ibn Amādīr simply tabulated \( T(h, H) \) for each degree of both arguments (\( 6^\circ H \)).

In astronomical handbooks [see 2lg] from the 3rd/9th century onwards, we find descriptions of an
accurate method for finding \( T(h, H) \). These involve the semi-diurnal arc \( D \) and the use of the versed \( \text{vers} \) function \( \text{vers} \theta = 1 - \cos \theta \). The standard medieval formula is (in modern notation):

\[
\text{vers} (D - H) = \text{vers} D / \sin H,
\]

which can be derived with facility by means of an analemma construction applied to the celestial sphere. This formula was adopted by Muslim astronomers from Indian sources.

The modern formula for the hour-angle \( t = (D - T) \) can also be derived by these procedures. It is:

\[
\text{cos} T = (\sin h - \sin \phi) / (\cos \phi - \cos \phi,
\]

where \( \phi \) is the solar declination and \( \phi \) is the local latitude (note that \( H = 90^\circ - \phi + \delta \)), and is used in this form by later Muslim astronomers (see al-Khâlidî, below).

Likewise, from the 3rd/9th century onwards, we find descriptions of how to find the time of day or night using an analogue computer such as an astrolabe [see ASTURLAB] or using a calculating device such as a sine quadrant [see RUB]. In the first case, there is no need to know the formula; in the second case, one uses the formula to compute specific examples.

Ali b. Amâdîjî also compiled a table of \( T(h, H) \) for Baghdad based on an accurate trigonometric formula. Some prayer-tables for Baghdad preserved in the Zîdî of the 7th/13th century astronomer al-Êâîîmî b. Mâhîîsî al-Badîîgî, which display, for example, the duration of twilight for each day of the year, were probably another early \( \text{Abhâsîd} \) production. Quantitative estimates of the angle of depression of the sun at nightfall and daybreak occur in the Zîdî of the 3rd/9th century astronomer Habâsh al-Êâîsî [q.v.]. Quantitative estimates of the effect of refraction at the horizon were first made in the 4th/10th century by the Cairo astronomer Ibn Yûnûs [q.v.]. Isolated tables displaying the altitudes of the sun at the \( \text{zuhr} \) and \( \text{asr} \) prayers and the duration of morning and evening twilight occur in several early mediaeval Islamic astronomical works, usually of the genre known as \( \text{zidî} \). Several early examples of extensive tables for reckoning time by day from the solar altitude or for reckoning time of night from altitudes of certain prominent fixed stars have come to light. All of these tables were computed for a specific locality, and to use any of them one needed an instrument, such as an astrolabe, to measure celestial altitudes or the passage of time. There is no evidence that these tables were widely used.

In practice, at least before the 7th/13th century, the regulation of the prayer-times was the duty of the muwâkkit or muezzin [see ADAM and MASRI]. The muezzins were appointed for the excellence of their voices and their character, and they needed to be proficient only in the rudiments of folk astronomy. They had to know the shadows at the \( \text{zuhr} \) and the \( \text{asr} \) for each month, and which lunar mansion was rising at daybreak and setting at nightfall, information which was conveniently expressed in the form of mnemonic poetry. They did not need astronomical tables or instruments. The necessary techniques are outlined in the chapters on prayer in the books of sacred law [see RUK]. The qualifications of the muezzin are some-
Cairo muwakkits were influential was the Yemen. Under the Rasulids [q.v.], mathematical astronomy was practiced and patronised. In particular, the Sultan al-Aghraf (1295-6) compiled a treatise on instrumentation inspired by that of al-Marrakushi. The Yemeni astronomer Abu 'l-Ukäl, who worked for the Sultan al-Mu'ayyad in Ta'izz, compiled a corpus of tables for timekeeping by day and night which is the largest such corpus compiled by any Muslim astronomer, containing over 100,000 entries.

In Cairo in the 8th/14th century there were several muwakkits producing works of scientific merit but the major scene of ʿilm al-mikdt was Syria. The Aleppo astronomer Ibn al-Sarrād, who is known to have visited Egypt, devised a series of special quadrants and universal astrolabes and trigonometric grids; his works represent the culmination of the Islamic achievement in astronomical instrumentation.

Two other major Syrian astronomers, al-Mizzi and Ibn al-Shātir, studied astronomy in Egypt under Ibn al-Akfiān [q.v.] and others. Al-Mizzi returned to Syria and compiled a set of hour-angle tables and prayer-tables for Damascus modelled after the Cairo corpus. Ibn al-Shātir compiled some prayer-tables for an unspecified locality with latitude 34° (the new Mamluk city of Tripoli?). Al-Mizzi also compiled various treatises on instruments, but Ibn al-Shātir turned his attention to theoretical astronomy and devised a new series of models which represent the culmination of the Islamic endeavour in this field [see ʿilm al-hay]. This notwithstanding, he also devised the most splendid sundial known from the Islamic Middle Ages, the fragments of which are preserved in the garden of the Archaeological Museum in Damascus; a replica made in the late 19th century by the director of the short-lived Istanbul Observatory in the late 10th/16th century. In the 12th/18th century, the architect Sālih Efendi produced an enormous corpus of tables for timekeeping which was very popular amongst the muwakkits of Istanbul. A feature distinguishing some of these Ottoman tables from the earlier Egyptian and Syrian tables is that values of the time of day are based on the convention that sunset is 12 o'clock. This convention, inspired by the fact that the Islamic day begins at sunset (because the calendar is lunar and the months begin with the sighting of the crescent shortly after sunset), has the disadvantage that clocks registering "Turkish" time need to be adjusted by a few minutes each few days. Prayer-tables based on this convention were compiled all over the Ottoman Empire and beyond; examples have been found in the manuscript sources for localities as far apart as Algiers and Yarkand, and Crete and Şanlıa: see Pl. XI, 6.

In the 19th/20th centuries, the times of prayer were recorded in annual almanacs, wall calendars and pocket diaries, and the times for each day are listed in newspapers. In Ramadan, special sets for the three daylight hours are also published. The number of azādāyās and/or stars were prepared for Istanbul and for Edirne. One set for the sun was compiled by Taki‘ I-Din b. Ma'ruf [q.v.], director of the short-lived Istanbul Observatory in the late 10th/16th century. In the 12th/18th century, the architect Sālih Efendi produced an enormous corpus of tables for timekeeping which was very popular amongst the muwakkits of Istanbul. A feature distinguishing some of these Ottoman tables from the earlier Egyptian and Syrian tables is that values of the time of day are based on the convention that sunset is 12 o'clock. This convention, inspired by the fact that the Islamic day begins at sunset (because the calendar is lunar and the months begin with the sighting of the crescent shortly after sunset), has the disadvantage that clocks registering "Turkish" time need to be adjusted by a few minutes each few days. Prayer-tables based on this convention were compiled all over the Ottoman Empire and beyond; examples have been found in the manuscript sources for localities as far apart as Algiers and Yarkand, and Crete and Şanlıa: see Pl. XI, 6.

In the 19th/20th centuries, the times of prayer were recorded in annual almanacs, wall calendars and pocket diaries, and the times for each day are listed in newspapers. In Ramadan, special sets for the three daylight hours are also published. The number of azādāyās and/or stars were prepared for Istanbul and for Edirne. One set for the sun was compiled by Taki‘ I-Din b. Ma'ruf [q.v.], director of the short-lived Istanbul Observatory in the late 10th/16th century. In the 12th/18th century, the architect Sālih Efendi produced an enormous corpus of tables for timekeeping which was very popular amongst the muwakkits of Istanbul. A feature distinguishing some of these Ottoman tables from the earlier Egyptian and Syrian tables is that values of the time of day are based on the convention that sunset is 12 o'clock. This convention, inspired by the fact that the Islamic day begins at sunset (because the calendar is lunar and the months begin with the sighting of the crescent shortly after sunset), has the disadvantage that clocks registering "Turkish" time need to be adjusted by a few minutes each few days. Prayer-tables based on this convention were compiled all over the Ottoman Empire and beyond; examples have been found in the manuscript sources for localities as far apart as Algiers and Yarkand, and Crete and Şanlıa: see Pl. XI, 6.

In the 19th/20th centuries, the times of prayer were recorded in annual almanacs, wall calendars and pocket diaries, and the times for each day are listed in newspapers. In Ramadan, special sets for the three daylight hours are also published. The number of azādāyās and/or stars were prepared for Istanbul and for Edirne. One set for the sun was compiled by Taki‘ I-Din b. Ma'ruf [q.v.], director of the short-lived Istanbul Observatory in the late 10th/16th century. In the 12th/18th century, the architect Sālih Efendi produced an enormous corpus of tables for timekeeping which was very popular amongst the muwakkits of Istanbul. A feature distinguishing some of these Ottoman tables from the earlier Egyptian and Syrian tables is that values of the time of day are based on the convention that sunset is 12 o'clock. This convention, inspired by the fact that the Islamic day begins at sunset (because the calendar is lunar and the months begin with the sighting of the crescent shortly after sunset), has the disadvantage that clocks registering "Turkish" time need to be adjusted by a few minutes each few days. Prayer-tables based on this convention were compiled all over the Ottoman Empire and beyond; examples have been found in the manuscript sources for localities as far apart as Algiers and Yarkand, and Crete and Şanlıa: see Pl. XI, 6.

In the 19th/20th centuries, the times of prayer were recorded in annual almanacs, wall calendars and pocket diaries, and the times for each day are listed in newspapers. In Ramadan, special sets for the three daylight hours are also published. The number of azādāyās and/or stars were prepared for Istanbul and for Edirne. One set for the sun was compiled by Taki‘ I-Din b. Ma'ruf [q.v.], director of the short-lived Istanbul Observatory in the late 10th/16th century. In the 12th/18th century, the architect Sālih Efendi produced an enormous corpus of tables for timekeeping which was very popular amongst the muwakkits of Istanbul. A feature distinguishing some of these Ottoman tables from the earlier Egyptian and Syrian tables is that values of the time of day are based on the convention that sunset is 12 o'clock. This convention, inspired by the fact that the Islamic day begins at sunset (because the calendar is lunar and the months begin with the sighting of the crescent shortly after sunset), has the disadvantage that clocks registering "Turkish" time need to be adjusted by a few minutes each few days. Prayer-tables based on this convention were compiled all over the Ottoman Empire and beyond; examples have been found in the manuscript sources for localities as far apart as Algiers and Yarkand, and Crete and Şanlıa: see Pl. XI, 6.

In the 19th/20th centuries, the times of prayer were recorded in annual almanacs, wall calendars and pocket diaries, and the times for each day are listed in newspapers. In Ramadan, special sets for the three daylight hours are also published. The number of azādāyās and/or stars were prepared for Istanbul and for Edirne. One set for the sun was compiled by Taki‘ I-Din b. Ma'ruf [q.v.], director of the short-lived Istanbul Observatory in the late 10th/16th century. In the 12th/18th century, the architect Sālih Efendi produced an enormous corpus of tables for timekeeping which was very popular amongst the muwakkits of Istanbul. A feature distinguishing some of these Ottoman tables from the earlier Egyptian and Syrian tables is that values of the time of day are based on the convention that sunset is 12 o'clock. This convention, inspired by the fact that the Islamic day begins at sunset (because the calendar is lunar and the months begin with the sighting of the crescent shortly after sunset), has the disadvantage that clocks registering "Turkish" time need to be adjusted by a few minutes each few days. Prayer-tables based on this convention were compiled all over the Ottoman Empire and beyond; examples have been found in the manuscript sources for localities as far apart as Algiers and Yarkand, and Crete and Şanlıa: see Pl. XI, 6.
Fig. 3. Extracts from some modern tables for regulating the times of prayer for different localities. The examples shown serve (a) Yemen; (b) Mecca (?); (c) Tunis; (d) Tashkent; (e) Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir and Erzerum; and (f) Nābulus (for Ramadaan, 1396/1975).
Spherical astronomy in medieval Islam: the Hakimi Zij of Ibn Yunus (forthcoming), and ... died in al-
Djuruf (e.g. Usama b. Zayd, cf. Ibn Sa'd, iii/2, 115). Then al-Mikdad participated in the emigration to
Abyssinia (the second wave, cf. Watt, Mecca, 111f), from where he returned just before the hidra to
accompanied Muhammad to Medina (contrary to what is implied in Watt, Medina, 3). As part of the mu'akkith
[g.v.] or 'brothering' measures, Muhammad paired him with Djabar b. Atik (Ibn Habbah, Muhammad, 73),
but we also find Djabar b. Sakhr (Ibn Sa'd, iii/2, 115).

During a raid under the leadership of 'Ubayya b. al-Harîth in the year 1/623, al-Mikdad and another
man sought to curry favour with the Meccans, but their intentions seem to have been thwarted and they
had to fall back on the Muslims. Then al-Mikdad is recorded as having fought at Badr, where he was the
only one, or one of the very few, who rode his own horse. He is said to have participated in all the other
campaigns launched during the Prophet's lifetime. Al-Mikdad was one of Muhammad's archers. On
subsequent raids he was given several commands, e.g.

After the Prophet's death, al-Mikdad is listed among those who took part in the conquest of Syria and
his name is mentioned particularly in connection with Hims. The people of Hims used to rely on al-
Mikdad's Kur'an recitation (cf. Ibn al-Athir, iii, 127), a report rejected by Bergstrasser (G. der Q., iii, 172),
but which could conceivably be read in connection with his having been appointed as the official Kur'ân
reciter of the army fighting in Syria in the year 13/634 (cf. al-Tabari, i, 1059). Then the sources depict al-
Mikdad as the commander of a force of one thousand men sent by 'Umar in aid of 'Amr b. al-As, which

The Table of Minutes, in Centaurus, (w 1972), 1-19; and Al-Kgalî's auxiliary tables for solving problems
of spherical astronomy, in Journal for the History of Astronomy, iv (1973), 99-110, repr. in idem, XI. See

According to another account he died after drinking a potion made of the castor-oil plant. As seems to have

See also the Bibli. to Mizwala. (D. A. King)

Al-Mikdad seems to have become a man of
affluence. More or less concur that his father 'Amr fled to the
Kinda [g.v.] tribe after he had become involved in a
blood feud in his own tribe of Bahra [g.v.], a group of
Kuda'â. There, in Kinda, al-Mikdad was born ca.
585 A.D. Then al-Mikdad, in his turn, had to flee
Kinda after he had wounded a fellow-tribesman in the
foot. He made good his escape to Mecca. Having
been adopted by al-Aswad b. 'Abd Yaghuth b. Zuhri,
he became a muwakkit [g.v.] or a member of the
Qur'an, XXXIII, 5, declaring adoption
in Islam illegal, was revealed, whereupon he once
more became known as the son of 'Amr b. Tha'laba. He
is listed among the first seven persons who openly
professed Islam (al-Dhahabi, Siyar, 1, 251), but,
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1. Al-Khwârazmi’s prayer-tables for latitude 33° (Baghdad). For each 6° of solar longitude the lengths of the shadow of a gnomon of length 12 units are tabulated for the beginning of the zuhr and for the beginning and end of the ‘ṣūr. Note that some entries are written in Hindu-Arabic numerals [see HISAB] and others in the more usual alpha-numerical system [see ABDJAD]. Taken from Ms Berlin Ahlwardt 5793 (Landberg 56), fol. 94a, with kind permission of the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung.

2. An extract from some anonymous prayer-tables for an unspecified latitude (about 40°). The function tabulated is the ascendant at ten different times of the day and night, and values are given for each 6° of solar longitude. The times served are dusk (muhāb al-ṣhafāk) and daybreak (al-fajr al-sādik and al-fajr al-kādish) and the seven moments which divide the length of daylight into eight equal parts. The table is evidence of a survival of the early tradition of associating the duḥa and the ‘ṣūr with the seasonal hours. Taken from Ms Cambridge U.L. O.1, fol. 179a, with kind permission of Cambridge University Library.
3. An extract from the corpus of tables used for timekeeping in mediaeval Cairo. These tables display the time since sunrise (al-dāʾir), the hour-angle (fadl al-dāʾir) and the solar azimuth (al-samt) as a function of solar altitude (here 15°) and each degree of solar longitude (al-ʿadaḍ). Time is reckoned in equatorial degrees (1° = 4 minutes since 360° = 24 hours). Taken from Ms Cairo Bar al-Kutub mikāt 690, fols. 15b-16a, with kind permission of the Egyptian National Library.

4. Another extract from the tables in the Cairo corpus displaying the times since sunrise up to the prescribed moments for the muʿadhthin to extinguish the lamps on the minarets during Ramadān and to announce a benediction on the Prophet Muhammad. Taken from Ms Cairo Dar al-Kutub mikāt 954,2, fols. 3b-4a, with kind permission of the Egyptian National Library.
5. An extract from al-Khallîl's corpus of tables for Damascus showing some 12 functions for regulating the times of prayer. Values are displayed for each degree of solar longitude (this extract serves the first few degrees of Aquarius). Taken from Ms Paris B.N. ar. 2558, fols. 10b-11a, with kind permission of the Bibliothèque Nationale.

6. An extract from some Ottoman prayer-tables for the latitude of Algiers. For each day of each month (here February) the times of the ḍuḥā (here called ʿadājā), the ʿṣar and the ʿimsāk are tabulated. The times are expressed in hours and minutes and are reckoned according to the Ottoman convention that sunset is 12 o'clock. Taken from Ms Cairo Tal'at fulak turki'9, fol. 41a, with kind permission of the Egyptian National Library.
Uthman performed the funeral salat for him. This was in 33/653-4, when ... de son f Us Napoleon II, Roi de Rome. Allegorie sur le bonheur futur de la France Encyclopaedia of Islam, VII

Tammam's Hamds and the of al-Hariri. He pursued his studies there. He returned to Syria in 5). Taikh al-Shaykh Zahir al-Umar al-Zayddni

Basha al-Mukhallis in his introduction to M. al-

Al-Mikdad is supposed to have transmitted a few traditions from the Prophet. An analysis of the inreads seems to suggest that his role in these traditions is to be regarded as fictitious, the majority of these inreads showing up “common links” who may be held responsible for the maans attached to these inreads. Thus Al-Mikdad is said to have lost a hand in the fighting at Badr, a report which, after analysis, is most likely Ibn T. Shahib al-Zuhni (cf. al-Bukhari, diyat l-ed. Krekel, Juvonnell, iv 14 f., and al-Mizzi, Tuhfat al-asghdf, viii, no. 1547); then there is the story of how he was on one occasion tempted by the Devil (cf. Muslim, aghba 174, and al-Mizzi, viii, no. 1546). Perhaps the best-known report featuring Al-Mikdad is the one in which he maintains that sycophants deserve no more than having earth thrown in their faces (apparently a severe humiliation, cf. Ibn Sa’d, ii/1, 93). This report seems to have later been raised to the level of a Prophetic hadith at the hands of Sufyan al-Tahwri [q. v.], imitated by 1lyba b. al-Hadjipdd [q. v.].

Bibliography: Dhababi, Suyar, index; Ibn Haqar, Tadhhib, x, 285 ff.; idem, Isha, vii, 402ff.; Wikidi, Mawguid, index; Bahgdiri, Fatih, index; idem,毡, index; Ibn Khayri, Taikh, index; Ibn Hisham, Sira, index; Tabari, index; Ibn al-Athir, index; Mazdi al-Din al-Mubarak, Muhammad Ibn al-Athir, al-Nabaya fi ghair al-badgig wa-t-aggar, index; Fasawi, K. al-ma’rajia wa’l-tarikh, iii, 386; Ibn Abd al-Hakam, Feeh, Misr, index; Ibn Kutayba, Ma’arif, index; Khalifa b. Khayyat, Tavikh, index; Miskisi, K. al-Bad’ wa’l-tarikh, 1, 125 of the French text; Musaidi, Musarir, ed. Pellt, §§ 1582, 1599; Nawawi, Tadhhib al-asghf, ed. Wustenfeld, 567; Makrizi, Khidr, Buluk, i, 213, 289, 295, ii, 247; Ibn al-Arabi Rabihi, Ikhd, index; Mizzi, Tuhfat al-asghf, viii, nos. 1142-51; al-Mikdad’s musnad in Ibn Hanbal’s Musnad is in vol. vi, 2-6, and 8. (G.H.A. Juvonnell)

Mikha'il al-Sabbagh, Arab scholar and litterateur. He was born in 1806, not mentioned by Graf), repr. with appendices by G. Loper, Strassburg 1879. 2. Ta’rikh al-sahab al-Umar al-Zayddani, akka wa-bildd Safad ‘unyu bi-nashriyya wa-t-3ik hawashid al-Khuri Kustadin al-Basha al-Mukhallisi, Hariqa [cq. 1928]. In this, Mikha'il al-Sabbagh describes the rise and fall of Shaykh Zahir al-Umar, whom Mikha'il’s grandfather had served as a physician; this concern “prevails over the traditional pattern used for annals” (T. Philipp, in JESIV, xvi [1984], 161-75, esp. 168). In his unpublished history of Ibrahim al-Sabbagh and his family, Mikha'il did not even try to uphold the form of annals” (loc. cit.). The manuscript of the Ta”rikh is in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich (Cod. Arab. 901). The same collection also comprises literary selections by Mika’il al-Sabbagh (Munich, Cod. Arab. 899) as well as the manuscript of his "History of Bedouin tribes” ("History of Bedouin tribes”), and Ta’rikh al-Qharn wa-Mur ("History of Syria and Egypt”). 3. His Risala al-tamna’ wa’l-3umma wa’l-mandahiyya wa ahwil al-kalam al-darug (Munich, cod. Arab. 690, 644-80) was published by H. Thorbecke under the title Mika’il Sabbbagh’s "History of the arabic Umgangssproche in Syrien und Aegypten, Strassburg 1886. The author writes that he had to rely on actual speech only, written documentation on the subject being non-existent and the field until then unexplored. The first chapter deals with the Arab language as it was “before and immediately after Islam”, the beginning of its corruption, the intrusion of alien matter and the diversification of the present vernaculars in the various countries. Then follow chapters on elisions, additions and omissions, on pronouns, nouns, verbs, and particles. The ninth chapter deals with inversions, and the tenth with loanwords and their origins. Thorbecke describes the manuscript as an unfinished draft, with many corrections, additions and deletions, written in a scrawling, barely legible hand (pp. II-13). 4. The Kitab fi ‘l-marifat li-n-3airi wa-mubadaikha la-‘l-zadaf wa’l-mus绝dhiyya wa’l-masabiyya, a study of poetry and its metres, is mentioned by Freytag in his Darstellung der arabischen Verkunft, 435-82. Freytag writes that this study is of little value and unreliable in detail, but interesting since it describes poetical forms such as the masurid, the zadaf and the kan wa-kun. 5. The Nasdir hasadat taini bi-‘l-3idat al-Kayar al-mu’azzam Nabiliyin has been translated into French by Silvestre de Sacy as Cantiques de l’Empereur le grand, storia del re et roi d’Italie, a l’occasion de la naissance de son fils Napoléon II, Roi de Rome. Allégories sur le bonheur futur de la France Encyclopaedia of Islam, VII
et la paix de l'univers, Paris, Imprimerie impériale, 1811; and the Nashid tahdni li-sa^ddat al-kulli ... and Jorga. Under the title
Ahwdl-i Ghdzi Mikhal (Istanbul 1315; cf. Babinger,
3 MIKHAIL AL-SABBAGH_MIKHAL-OGHLU
16x270 GOR,
16x270 J. von Hammer, in
i, 48, 57, following Idrls
who appears in the
Ministre de la justice, visitant I'Imprimerie de la republique,
L 'ung desdictz Grecz estoit nomme Michaeli ... Dudict
later as an ally of the first Ottoman ruler earned great
djik) at the foot of Mount Olympus near Edrenos, and
Abd Allah, originally a Greek (cf. F.-A.
family.
GOR,
Palaeologi; cf.
 Gor,
i, 572), and along with the
Mindestischanse in Syrien und Aegypten,
Strassburg 1886, pp. iii-x; L. Shavkh, Mikhal al-
Sabbagh wa-usratulu, in Masrkh, vii (1905), 24-34;
iden, al-AdlB al-arashiyya fi l-karn al-sawm "asghrr, in
ibid. (1907), 469-73; idem, al-AdlB al-arashiyya fi l-
kafr al-asghar, in the same magazine, iv (1912),
22, 15-23, 34-5; Al-KhurI Ishakh Armalma, al-
Malakiyyun, in Masrkh, xxxiv (1936), 381.
(C. NHULAND)
MIKHÂL-OGHLU, an old Ottoman noble family.
This family traced its descent to the feudal lord Kose Mikhal 'Abd Allah, originally a Greek (cf. F.-A.
Geulfroy, in Ch. Schefer, Petits textes de l'Europe des
Turcs par Th. Spandoun Conicasin, Paris 1896, 267;
L'un des dictz de Thessalonik, qui estoit nomme Michaeli ... Dedic
Michali sont descens dus les Michaloli), who appears in the reign of 'Othman I as lord of Chirimen忧a (Khirmen-
dji), at the foot of Mount Olympus near Edrenos, and
later as an ally of the first Ottoman ruler earned great
merit for his share in aiding the latter's expansion (cf.
J. von Hammer, in GOR, ii, 48, 57, following Idrls.
Bidisth and Nesht). Converted to Islam, Kose Mikhal
appears again in the reign of 'Othman's son Orkhan.
The rank of commander of the akinjis [q. v.] became hereditary in the family of Kose Mikhal, which is even
described as a family of Edirne, at a time when the
beglerbegi was still a state prisoner (see Kose Mikhal Beg in 897/1492 and again in 949/1542, GOB, iii, 305), after being previously (816/1413) detained as
a prisoner of the Warschau, and lastly, a
akindjls
mention, perhaps as the last of the Mlkhal-oghlu
families, is said to have been domiciled at Edirne for 1309, 82 ff., the Mlkhal-oghlu had
further mentions estates and
of the family in the Amasya
further mentions estates and
Bursa regions.

The family of the Mikhal-oghlu now begins to fall
into the background. About the middle of the 10th/16th century, an Ahmad Beg is again
mentioned, perhaps as the last of the Mikhal-oghlu
holding the hereditary office in the family of leader of a body of akinjis (see GOR, iii, 293); and lastly, a
Khurd Pagha is mentioned in a history as a descendant of Kose Mikhal (see GOR, iv, 512). The family at
a later date had estates in Bulgaria (around Ihtiman, cf.
Ewliya Celebi, iii, 390, and C. Jiracek, Das Fürsten-
thum Bulgarien, Vienna 1891, 138, and at Filibe,
Ewliya Celebi, iii, 379-80) and survived down to
modern times. As we learn, however, from the Sal-
name of Edirne for 1309, 62 ff., the Mikhal-oghlu had already at an early date large estates around Edirne.
They had the country round Bu^lar-Hisar, Trebizenz, Kirk Kilsie and Wize as a hereditary lieu. The
Anatolian district of Mikhalidj (Mikhalidj,
Myx-
aklou in Chalkondyles, 225; Ewliya Celebi, in MOG, ii, 311), it must therefore have lived into
the reign of Murad I and had a remarkably long
life.
Kose Mikhal had two sons, namely Mehmed Beg and
Yâkınci (Bakhshî?), of whom only the former acquired a great
renown. He was vizier under Musa II, and of his sons
Musa Celebi and a close friend of Shahk Bahr al-Din of Simaw [q. v.]. Under Musa he was Bâgirdch of Rûmeli, and died in 825/1422 at Iznik at the hand of the judge
Tâgâl al-din-oghlu and is said to have been buried at
Plevna in Bulgaria (cf. Ewliya Celebi, Seyhân-nâme, iii, 305), after being previously (816/1413) detained as
a state prisoner in the prison of Bedewi Cardak near
Tokat. His son was Khord Beg, who distinguished himself in the wars of Murad II's reign. He died in
870/1465 and was buried at Edirne beside his ancestor
Kose Mikhal. Khord Beg seems to have had three
sons, namely Ghâzi 'Ali Beg, Ghâzi Iskandar Beg and
Ghâzi Ball Beg, of whom only the first two are of any
historical importance. Ghâzi 'Ali Beg in 865/1461
distinguished himself in the battle against Vlad (see
GOR, iv, 64, and 876/1470) rewarded the lands of the
usun Hasan (ibid., ii, 118), invaded Hungary in 880/1475
(ibid., ii, 144) with his brother Iskandar Beg, in
881/1476 (ibid., ii, 156) was in command of the akinjis
before Scutari in Albania, and appears once again in Transylvania (ibid., ii, 172); but in the next 13 years nothing is heard of him. In 897/1492 he
seems to have met his death at Villach in Carinthia,
defeated by Count Khevenhüller, although other
sources mention him at a still later date. According
to them, he died in Plevna. His brother Iskandar Beg in
881/1476 commanded the light cavalry at the siege of
Scutari, as sandjak beg of Bosnia (880/1475, 885/1480
and 890/1485, GOR, ii, 156); and in 895/1490 in the
Karaman campaign, in which he lost his son, the
governor of Kaysariye, Mihâl Beg (see GOR, ii, 300),
without whose death in the campaign and in Egypt he
seems to have lived till 903/1498. The military
exploits of Ghâzi 'Ali Beg were celebrated by Sûzî
Celebi (d. 930/1534 at Prizren; cf. Babinger, GOR,
34-5) in a long epic (said to have been 15,000
couples), fragments of which have recently been
discovered (one in Berlin, ms. Or., no. 1468 containing
1,700 lines and the other in Zagreb, South Slav
Sciences, Codex 34, lines 1-352, and in Vienna
212 bays). In some sources, a Mehmed Beg, who was
a distinguished himself at that time, is described as a
descendant of Ghâzi Khord Beg; in others, however, he
appears as the son of Ghâzi 'Ali Beg, which is not at
all probable if he really was twice governor of Bosnia,
namely as early as 897/1492 and again in 949/1543,
diitnally in 950/1543.

The family of the Mikhal-oghlu now begins to fall
into the background. About the middle of the 10th/16th century, an Ahmad Beg is again
mentioned, perhaps as the last of the Mikhal-oghlu
holding the hereditary office in the family of leader of a body of akinjis (see GOR, iii, 293); and lastly, a
Khord Pagha is mentioned in a history as a descendant of Kose Mikhal (see GOR, iv, 512). The family at
a later date had estates in Bulgaria (around Ihtiman, cf.
Ewliya Celebi, iii, 390, and C. Jiracek, Das Fürsten-
thum Bulgarien, Vienna 1891, 138, and at Filibe,
Ewliya Celebi, iii, 379-80) and survived down to
modern times. As we learn, however, from the Sal-
nome of Edirne for 1309, 62 ff., the Mikhal-oghlu had already at an early date large estates around Edirne.
They had the country round Bu^lar-Hisar, Trebizenz, Kirk Kilsie and Wize as a hereditary lieu. The
Anatolian district of Mikhalidj (Mikhalidj,
Myx-
aklou in Chalkondyles, 225; Ewliya Celebi, v. 293-4;
W. Tomaschek, Zur historischen Topographie von Kleina-
sien im Mittelalter, in SBAK, Wien, Phil.hist.
Cl., xxiv [Vienna 1891], 95 and J. H. Mordtmann, in ZDMG,
xv [1911], 101) seems to be connected with the family of the Mikhal-oghlu. Ewliya, loc. cit., further mentions estates and akinjis of the family in the Amasya
and Bursa regions.

Bibliography: The well-known histories of von
Hammer, Zinkeisen and Jorga. Under the title
Ahsâl-I Ghâzi Mikhal [Istanbul 1315; cf. Babinger,
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GOW, 35, n. 1), Nuzhet Mehmed Pasha published
a work glorifying Kose Mikhal and his descendants. See also IA art. Mihal-Dugulan (M. Tayyib Gökbilgin), with a detailed genealogical tree.

MIKLAF (A., pl. makhllif), a term of mediaeval Islamic administrative geography used particularly in Yemen. The sources usually state that it is the equivalent of Arabic kūra [g.v.] "administrative province" (Nashrān al-Himyari, Die auf Sudarabien bezüglichen Angaben im Sami al-tulam, Leiden-London 1916, 34) or Persian rustād [g.v.] "rural area" (al-Kahlāl b. Ahmad, cited by Yākūt, Baldūn, Beirut 1374-6/1955-7, i, 37, tr. Wadie Jwaideh, The introductory chapters of Yaqūt’s Miqṣam al-baladān, Leiden 1959, 56-7), with a fanciful explanation that the progeny of Kahṭān, the Yemen, remained behind (tukhullafa) in the region of that name, hence the district of each tribe was called its mikhllaf. The term may be tenuously related to Sahābi ‘kh.l.f “vicinity of a town”, cf. Conti Rossini, Chrestomathia arabica meridionalis epigraphica, Rome 1931, 136. Al-Ya’kūbī states in his K. al-Baldūn, 317-19, tr. 156-8, that Yemen comprises 84 makhllif, with a list, and in his Taṣālib i, 227-9, gives a further one; however, the total number of names amounts to only 74, and some of these are tribal and not geographical names.

From the period of Ayyūbid rule in Yemen onwards, the term gradually falls out of use there and is no longer used at the present time, although Ibn al-Mudājārīr (early 6th/13th century) defined it in his Taṣālib i, 227-9, as having the restricted sense of the settled and cultivated lands around a fortress as well as having the later usage and meaning of a specific tribe, and as such, the term was only used in the mountain zone of Yemen and not in the coastal Tiḥāmā.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(C.E. BOSWORTH)

MIKINDANI (in Swahili, “the places of young coconut trees”) a small East African port which has now yielded in importance to its modern neighbour of Mtwara.

It lies near the Tanzanian border with Mozambique. The nearby coast is thick with mangrove plantations, whose wood is the principal attraction today for Arab dhows. The place was once a commercial centre, and noted for its quality of their light soil, remains on a soil, a small East African port which has now yielded in importance to its modern neighbour of Mtwara.
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ostich farm, the origin of which goes back to Mawlay ʿAbd Allāh, has been laid out, beside an experimental garden. Farther on there is a horse-breeding establishment. The village has along miles of rammed earth walls and finds enormous ruins: the Herīʿ ʿI-Sharqīrū (used as a stable and storehouse for forage), the stables, the granary and the ornamental waterbasin left to go to ruins.

There is very little industry in Meknès: only carpentry and particularly weaving, already noted by al-Idrīsī. The most notable artistic industries are the many coloured embroideries of large irregular point lace and painted wood. The public services always endeavour to keep these trades going, in which purely Berber influence is marked. European competition is severely affecting, at Meknès as elsewhere, some classes of artisans, like the tailors, smiths and potters. The building trades, on the other hand, are flourishing. Sūs are held outside the town and are attended by the country people: the Sūk of Bāb Jdīlī, before the gate on which the heads of rebels used to be placed for the edification of the tribes, the Sūk al-Khāmisī and that of the Lanterns. The market of Meknès does not extend beyond the environs of the town; it exports nothing except in years of abundant harvest. The region was already famed in the last century for its fruits, its vines, its gardens and its vegetables. The market, for which there is no one other which is still taking, date from the same period. During the French occupation, colonisation developed considerably. The colonists, most of whom came from Algeria, cultivated mainly wheat, of which they obtained increasing yields. The cultivation of the vine is increasing each year.

The government of Meknès, which is a makhzaniyya town, was in the hands of a bāgīḥī. He was also bāgīḥī of the Bwāghī, town till 1912 provided the garrison of the town (900 men according to Le Chatelier). In the administrative organisation of the protectorate, Meknès was made the capital of a very considerable area.

The population of Meknès consists of many distinct elements: Shorfa, Bwāghī, Berbers and Jews. The Idrīsī Shorfa, who have played their part in the history of the town and retain privileges of the numerous descendants of Mawlāy Idrīsī, only the families residing in Fās and Meknès are allowed to share in the income of the zāwiyat of Fās), and the Hasanī Shorfa, who have many privileges of their own, form a kind of aristocracy, generally penurious. The Bwāghī, descendants of the ʿaṭāb al-Bbāghī, a black guard of Mawlāy Ismāʿīlī, till 1912 formed an unreliable element, which was always a nucleus of trouble. Since that date they have been taking up the trades of mat-makers and farriers. They lived close to the town of old kāṣās and gardens which belong to the Makhzen, and in the old kāṣa of Mawlāy Ismāʿīlī in the Bāb Mārāgh quarter. Their houses, roofed with thatch, looked like African encampments. But it is the Berber (bāber) element which predominated at Meknès and gave it its desire for independence, a feature of which has for centuries been a jealousy of Fās. It is the Berbers of the mountains who gave it its tone; when they come down to the town, their women give colour to the streets of the medina with their short skirts, their leather gaiters and their wide-brimmed hats. The Berber elements of the plain are much more mixed, having undergone many vicissitudes since when Mawlāy Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allāh inaugurated the policy, considerably practised by his successors, of transferring tribes. A considerable part of the population of Meknès consists of transient elements who come, usually between harvests, to work as artisans. These immigrants almost all come from the south, from Tāffālī in particular (potters, tanners and porters), from Sūs (grocers), from Tūwāt (oil-makers), from Fīgīq and Dāʿa (masons). The Rifans and Jbālī supply most of the agricultural labourers. A small number of Fāsīs, who have in recent years merged into the population of the town, are cloth-merchants, dealers in old clothes and shoemakers.

Jews formed a quarter of the native population. Père Ch. de Foucauld estimated the mīlāḥ of Meknès to be half that of Fās. Chénier remarked on its prosperity.

Religious life. From the presence of the Idrīsī and Hasanī Shorfa, the proximity of the sanctuary of Mawlāy Idrīsī and the religious event of the celebrations of his mūṣīm (class. mawṣīm [q. f.]) every year, Meknès is one of the most important centres of Shorfaism. At the same time, for the Berber population it is a centre of marabout rites of the most elementary kind. All the brotherhoods that have zāwiyas in Morocco are represented in Meknès. The most important are those of the Kādiriya, Tijāniyya, and especially Ḥmādiba [see Ḥmādiba in Suppl.] and the largest, the Ḥisawā, to which half the population are attached. Meknès, whose patron saint is Ṣīdī Muhammad b. Ḥisā and which contains his tomb under the būbāb erected by Mawlāy Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allāh, is the centre of the order. This saint came here at the end of the 9th/15th century. His teaching at first met with a vigorous resistance, which he overcame so completely that, when the governor of the town sought to take steps against him, the people protected him. Before his death he acquired an estate, constituted in Ḥūsā, and men of religion are buried there. The celebration of his mūṣīm on the first day of the mīlāḥ (mawṣīm [q. f.]) festival is the great event of the year. The preparations for it begin forty days before. On the day before or on the preceding day of the festival, delegations flock in from all parts of Morocco, following the traditional routes. The most generous hospitality is given to the pilgrims by the descendants of Shāykh al-Kāmīlī, who have the dāwa (Brunel). The excesses committed on the occasion of this pilgrimage have been frequently described. Many other special cults are observed in Meknès, including that of a contemporary holy man, Mawlāy Ahmad Wazzānī. As it was his custom to wear simple dress and to sit by the highway, he was in 1917 granted clothes and a kūbbā at the request of Mawlāy Yūsuf. The kūbbā is at the entrance to a dispensary, and the admirers of the saint came there daily to keep him company.

History. We know nothing certain about the history of the region in the Roman period nor in the centuries which followed. The most advanced Roman stations were on the slopes of the Zahrūn guarding the plain, out of which the warriors of the Central Atlas might debouch, and perhaps throwing out a screen as far as the plateau of al-Ḥājjīq. We do not know at what date the people here had their first contact with Islam, nor even if it was not till the Hilālī invasion that Islam became securely established here. The Berber tribes of the Sāʾis and Sebī made the most of the fertility of their country. A tradition records that a fire destroyed the gardens there in 305/917. It was at this period that the country was covered, from Tāţa to Meknès, by the migration of a Zenātī tribe, the Mīknāsī, a section of whom, who received the name of Mīknāsī al-Zayṭūn to distinguish them from the Mīknāsī Tāţa, who lived father to the east, established themselves securely in
the plain. The Idrisids met with a vigorous resistance from the Miknās. They always found in them opponents whom they could not overcome in spite of several campaigns, and who were the instigators of Unayzah intervention.

At this date, a few villages stood on the site of Meknès. One cannot say at what date, perhaps in the 4th/10th century, they were grouped together to form the Tākrart (Tagart) mentioned by al-Idrīsī (Opus geogr., iii, 244, 245). The population seems to have been more numerous in the Almoravid period than later, and prosperous. Enclosed by a wall, Meknès looked like a pleasure resort, with its gardens, cultivated fields, its mosques, its baths and water channels.

The Miknāsīs vigorously opposed the Almohad onslaught. When passing through this region in 514/1120-1, Ibn Tūmār wrote (p. 11) that he had not well received. Twenty years later, 5Abd al-Muʾīn laid siege to Meknès, but it was not he who took it. He left it to enter Fās, leaving the conduct of the siege in the hands of Yahyā b. Yaghmur. The Kitāb says the siege lasted seven years. The town fell in 545/1150. It was plundered, the defences dismantled, a part of its wealth confiscated and all its garrison put to death, except the governor, who was said to have escaped. On the site, or beside the ruins, Meknès rapidly rose again under the shelter of the fortifications built by the Almohads. At the end of the century, it had regained some importance and the mosque of al-Nāṣirīnārīn was finished. This is the oldest monument in Meknès: in 1170/1756-7 Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allāh had it restored and built the present minaret. The Almohad brought water hither from Tadjenna, five miles away. In 578/1182 the ʿAttān was said in five different places in Meknès and there were six gates in the wall which surrounded the town.

In the course of the following century, the intrigues of the Marinids (p. 11) disturbed the country, where the fighting that accompanied the fall of the Almohads was particularly lively. In 629/1231-2, al-Maʿāmūn had to intervene against the Banū Fārazz and Mekkātā, who were ravaging Meknès. In 634/1236-7, as a result of the Marinid success in the battle in which al-Saʿīd b. al-Nāṣir’s son was slain, Abū Bakr entered the town. This occupation was only temporary, but the Almohad restoration was not secure. In 643/1245-6, the governor left there by al-Saʿīd was slain in a rising in the town in favour of the Ḥāfṣīd Abū Zakhariyyā. Al-Saʿīd again returned victorious, causing Yahyā b. ʿAbd al-Hakk to fly to Tāzá. The Marinid had only two years to wait; after the death of the Almohad governor, he returned to Meknès to occupy it definitely.

The first period of greatness for Meknès dates from the Marinids. They set out to make it beautiful like Rabat and Fās. Abū Yusuf moved from Fās Jīdī to Meknès, which owed to him a kasba and a mosque (675/1276). Abu 'l-Hasan improved its water supply, built bridges on the road to Fās and began the Madrasa Dājdida which Abū Inān was to finish. It bears the latter’s name and is still the most notable building in Meknès, in spite of the indirect restorations carried out in 1917-22. Other madrasas, the ʿAṭṭārīn and Fūlā, were built by the Marinids.

During this period the political organisation of the country was developing in quite a different direction. The Idrīsīī Shūrā, having assisted the Marinids to gain power, prepared to take advantage of the organisation which the latter had given them. Thus the foundations were laid for the movement which was to end in the partition of Morocco in the last years of the 9th/15th century into practically independent divisions. The Shūrā were numerous in Meknès. When the weakening of the Marinids and the decline of their prestige made it possible, the Shūrā supplied leaders. History has preserved the name of Mawldāy Zayyān. The Waṭṭāsīs only intervened, it appears, when at the beginning of the 10th/16th century Masʿūd b. al-Nāṣir, having rebelled against Muḥammad al-Burūkīlālī, found an asylum at Meknès. The Sultan besieged the town and took it, then installed his brother al-Nāṣir al-Kīfīdī there, who however did not prove faithful to him. The few years of independence enjoyed by Meknès were not particularly glorious. They mark, however, an epoch in the history of the town destined at other periods to be only the prey of anarchy or the playing of a tyrant.

The rise of the brotherhoods of the 9th/15th century found a favourable soil among the Miknāsīs. The za’iyāt of the Dājdīlīyya was established there, as in other places in Morocco. A few years later, Muḥammad b. ʿIsā was teaching there.

Meknès was thus well prepared to welcome the Saʿādīs (p. 11). When Muḥammad al-Shāykh approached in 955/1548 he entered the town without much trouble. The Marinid al-Nāṣir al-Kāṣīrī is said to have agreed to hand over the town in return for the liberty of his father Ahmad Bū Zekrī, and the marabouts to have demanded the conclusion of such an agreement. Muḥammad al-Shāykh however took a sufficiently sure method to establish his authority; when the ḫāṭīb Abu ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Harzūz began to preach against him, he had him scourged to death. When he returned two years later, he was welcomed with gifts. The estimates of travellers of this time put the population of the town at 6,8,000 hearths. It was the only town in the region. The Saʿādīs took little interest in Meknès, which never attracted their attention. The country was well in hand and the Berber tribes peaceful to such a degree that the road from Marrākušh by the Tādīlā was regularly used. It was the practice to make Meknès the residence of one of the sons of the Sultan. There was, however, no important command attached to it. Leo Africanus credits it with a revenue equal to half that of the viceregal of Fās, which is astonishing. Under Muḥammad al-Maḥnūr, Abu ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAllī lived there and then after the second partition, Zayyān and, lastly Mawldāy al-Shāykh, but as a prisoner in the last years of his father’s life.

The civil war which broke out on the death of al-Maḥnūr placed Meknès at the mercy of the Berber risings and marabout intrigues. In the midst of this disorder an authority gradually made itself felt, that of the za’iyās, and especially the Zāwiyya of Dīlāy (p. 11 in Suppl.). In 1023/1614-1, Muḥammad al-Hādīdī was even able to seize the sovereign power and get himself recognised by Fās and Meknès after his victory over Mawldāy Muḥammad al-Shāykh b. Zayyān. He won over the Berber tribes, and Mawldāy al-Raḥīdī in 1076/1666 found the Banū Mīr against him, allied with the Dīlāyī Abū ʿAbd Allāh, and he had to fight them again in 1076/1668.

Mawldāy al-Raḥīdī seems to have been interested in Meknès, the kasba of which he restored. In burying him in the mausoleum of al-Maṭḥūṭ (p. 11), Mawldāy Ismāʾīl said he was fulfilling the last wishes of the deceased. But the most important event was that al-Raḥīdī sent Mawldāy Ismāʾīlī to Meknès. The latter lived before his accession in the Almohad kasba, as a landed proprietor managing his estates. In his choice of a capital, we see the attraction of a rich district like
he wished it to be in his own image and realised his desire. For fifty years, Meknès was simply the framework for his splendour, the scene of his extravagance.

He at once decided to build himself a palace, and a grandiose scheme was projected. He began by clearing a space. The houses adjoining the Almohad wall east of the town were destroyed and their owners forced to carry the débris off to a site which has retained the name of Hedim, then to rebuild on a site which the shari'a enclosed by a wall to the north-west of the médina. The site which he chose for himself was also separate from the town. His palace was built, and another one even more splendid for his women. This first edifice, Dar Kbir, was finished in 1090/1679. It was a series, without intelligible plan, of riyaḍs embellished with fountains, paved with marble, surrounded by galleries which were supported by columns of marble; the apartments opened on to three galleries. The sovereign's palace was in two suites, that of his birthday in four and larger than his. His four wives and his favourites were equally splendidly housed. The other concubines, of whom he had 500 of all nations, were housed in rooms along the passage. At the end was a common hall, on a higher level, which gave a view over the gardens through iron grilles. The reception pavilions were planned on the scale of a tomb in the form of domes. The palace contained in all 45 pavilions and twenty kubbas. The whole was surrounded by a crenelated wall, pierced by twenty gates. It was triple in the north-east with a road round it and it could be defended equally well against the interior of the kasba. The bastions supported batteries of guns and mortars. The women being subject to rigorous confinement and Mawlay Isma'il did not hesitate to display his performance of the duties of religion, a mosque was set aside for them. Another had been begun in 1085/1672, communicating with the town by the Bāb ʿĪsā. Lastly, the palace with its dependencies contained four mosques; two are still in use, the Ǧāmī al-Ākhḍar and in the quarter of the mews, very broken down, the Ǧāmī al-Ruwa. To the south was a garden, the area of which was divided by a corridor now in which olive trees predominated. Farther on were the stables to which the sultan admitted only picked horses, to the number of 1,200: two parallel rows of which is equal to that of the present mdina, of which two are still in use, the Djami cSa ʿīsā. One day when a corsair ship had become stranded near Tangier, he ordered the Ǧumārā to bring the cannon from a work which had been set up there, and another was built on it. All the columns of marble which were still on their way were left at the roadside.

Labour was recruited by a similar means. The Sultan imposed days of labour on the tribes, levied forced labour as he pleased, sent his ministers to the workshops, but relied mainly on renegades and Christian slaves who were his permanent workmen. From 1091/1680 the work was pushed on frantically. All the Christians in Morocco were collected there and were first housed in siloes near the building-yards, then they were moved to the Dār al-Makhzen, then to the stable, under the arches of a bridge, where their lot was particularly miserable, finally to lodgings built from mud brick along the walls which the Dār al-Makhzen retained the name of Hedim, then to rebuild on a site which the Almohad wall enclosed by a wall to the north-west of the médina, ponderous, of proportions by no means perfect but imposing, of which the Bāb al-Bārdāʾin and the Bāb al-Nuwwār are the two other finest examples at Meknès at the present day. Mawlay Ismaʿīl directed all the operations himself. During the first twenty-four years of his reign, he never spent twelve months on end at Meknès. But he returned there after each expedition; in proportion as his ambition and his power increased, his despotism and the needs of his government, his army and his family grew, his scheme became more and more grandiose; the work done was found unsatisfactory, modifications were made, buildings taken down and the work began all over again. The result certainly was sumptuous and imposing but also odd and varied.

After fifty years of unorganised but superhuman effort, the buildings were not yet completed. It was in 1144/1731-2 that Mawlay ʿAbd Allāh finished the surrounding wall and the Bāb Manṣūr, the most finished example of the Ismaʿīlī gateway, ponderous, of proportions by no means perfect but imposing, of which the Bāb al-Bārdāʾin and the Bāb al-Nuwwār are the two other finest examples at Meknès at the present day. Mawlay Ismaʿīl directed all the operations himself. During the first twenty-four years of his reign, he never spent twelve months on end at Meknès. But he returned there after each expedition; in proportion as his ambition and his power increased, his despotism and the needs of his government, his army and his family grew, his scheme became more and more grandiose; the work done was found unsatisfactory, modifications were made, buildings taken down and the work began all over again. The result certainly was sumptuous and imposing but also odd and varied.

Lastly, a site was reserved for the troops. To the west of Meknès a large duʿaṣār was settled with ʿAjīd and their families. To the east of the Dār al-Makhzen, five kasbas for the 130,000 men of the gūḥ were gradually incorporated in the great kasba.
On the death of Mawlay Isma'il, the Bwakher and the soldiers of the j SUMMARY...
struction of the instrument. When it was complete, al-Mutawakkil appointed Abu '1-Raddad to look after it, and the other inhabitants helped in his family down to the time of al-Ma'qrizi, who died in 846/1442.

The Nilometer was surveyed and described by K.A.C. Creswell *A short account of early Muslim architecture*, Harmondsworth 1958, 292-6, with a diagram at p. 293). It consists of a tall graduated octagonal column, which serves as a measuring gauge, standing in a stone-lined pit, roughly 6.20 metres square, with a staircasing running down to the bottom. Below this is a cylindrical section with steps cut into its masonry walls. The four sides of the square pit are relieved by recesses, each covered by a pointed arch vault resting on a pair of engaged colonnettes with clock-formed capitals and bases. This type of arch was, of course, an essential part of Gothic architecture, but the arches in the Nilometer are three centuries older than any Gothic example. The measuring column is a tall octagonal shaft measured into 16 cubits, averaging 54.05 cm, by transverse lines, and the ten uppermost are each subdivided into 24 "fingers" by 24 divisions, grouped four by four alternately on either side of a vertical line. Creswell then mentions that the column has been broken in two places: "(1) in the twelfth east side. the Nile is made by three tunnels, all opening into the ported by four heavy timber beams. Connection to broken, including these supports, was 19 cubits. The length of the column before it was divided into cubits and fingers. He tells us something, however, about the importance of the device to the people of the Nile Delta. When the water started to rise, the supervisor reported daily to the sultan the mark reached by the water on the measuring column. No public announcements were made until the level reached 12 cubits. Thereafter the crier made his rounds every day, announcing "Allah increased the blessed Nile today by such-and-such an amount." The people rejoiced when the water level reached 16 cubits, since they knew it would be a good year.

**Bibliography:** In addition to references given in the text, see the *Bibl.* to *EP* art. *s.v.* (J. Ruska). (J. Ruska-[D.R. Hill])

**MILÂD** *(A.).* According to some Arabic lexicographers, the meaning of this term is time of birth in contradistinction to *mawlid*, which may denote also "place of birth". The latter is the usual term for birthday, especially in connection with the birthday of the Prophet Muhammad and Muslim saints [see *mawlid*]; *mîlad* denotes also Christmas. For other special meanings, cf. *Dozy, Supplement*, i.e. *Bibliography: See the Arabic lexicons.*

**MÎLÂH** *(A.) "navigation, seamanship; seafaring".* Like its English and French counterparts, *navigation*, the Arabic term has both a narrower and a broader connotation. The former refers to the mariner's art of determining the ship's position, charting her course and assuring that her progress and ultimate arrival is performed efficiently and safely; the latter, to seafaring in general. The term is attested in its *fûsîl* form, *mîlîh*, at least since the 'Abbasid period (Lane, *vii*, 2733); it appears to go back to Akkadian and ultimately Sumerian (*Chicago Akkadian dictionary*, Letter M, Part 1, Chicago 1977, 149-52: Akk. *mâlîhâ* "sailor, boatman"; R. Labat, *Manuel d'epigraphie akkadienne*, Paris 1976, 93: Mâ "boat", Mâlah "sea, nautical"). The former has been reduced, between the 12th and 17th century, to the *fûsîl* form, *mîlîh*, at least since the 'Abbasid period (Lane, *vii*, 2733); it appears to go back to Akkadian and ultimately Sumerian (*Chicago Akkadian dictionary*, Letter M, Part 1, Chicago 1977, 149-52: Akk. *mâlîhâ* "sailor, boatman"; R. Labat, *Manuel d'epigraphie akkadienne*, Paris 1976, 93: Mâ "boat", Mâlah "sea, nautical"). The term is attested in its *fûsîl* form, *mîlîh*, at least since the 'Abbasid period (Lane, *vii*, 2733); it appears to go back to Akkadian and ultimately Sumerian (*Chicago Akkadian dictionary*, Letter M, Part 1, Chicago 1977, 149-52: Akk. *mâlîhâ* "sailor, boatman"; R. Labat, *Manuel d'epigraphie akkadienne*, Paris 1976, 93: Mâ "boat", Mâlah "sea, nautical").

1. In the pre-Islamic and early mediaeval periods.

I. NAVIGATION IN PRE-ISLAMIC TIMES. The early Near Eastern civilisations. In spite of the geopolitical position of the Arabs, with the Arabian peninsula being bounded by the Red Sea, the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf, they were not among the first seafaring nations of the Near East, like the inhabitants of Mesopotamia, the Egyptians and the Phoenicians, because most of their ports were not accessible for navigation in ancient times (G.F. Hourani, *Arab seafaring*, New York 1975, 5 ff.).

In Mesopotamia, swimming floats or float-supported rafts were used on the Euphrates, as appears from Assyrian reliefs of the 4th millennium. The first Mesopotamian vessels were rivercraft, and even when the inflated skins were replaced by a line of pots the hulls were not constructed with any pre-cast inner structure, but instead they had a "backbone" (a prominent keel plank) and "ribs" (inserted frames) (L. Casson, *Ships and seafaring in the Ancient World*, Princeton 1971, 27; and for the Islamic descendant of the inflated skin craft, see *KLEK*).

It seems that the Mesopotamian vessels in ancient times carried no sails and were only propelled by oars. They were used for carrying timber, etc., but depictions on Assyrian reliefs show that such vessels could also become warships and carry soldiers.

The artistic evidence from Egypt is especially rich and offers ample light on the types of the Egyptian vessels of ancient times. Again, the shell-of-planks technique is used for the construction of ships. By the year 3100 B.C. a sail appears in an Egyptian drawing of a vessel, while a great number of drawings of Egyptian ships offer us detailed depictions of masts, oars, steering oars and spoon-shaped hulls (C. Lefebvre des Noëttes, *De la marine antique à la marine moderne*, Paris 1935, Pls. III ff.). The Egyptian depictions reveal that...
Egyptian vessels were used as cargo ships and warships as well. The vessels which the Egyptians used in the Red Sea were constructed on the River Nile, then dismantled and reassembled on the Red Sea (Abdel M.A.H. Sayed, *Noue light on the recently-discovered port on the Red Sea Shore*, in *Chronique d’Egypte*, ivii [1983], fasc. 115-16, 23).

It is likely that ancient Egyptian vessels sailed coastwise to avoid the dangers of the open sea, and that the lengths of voyages were limited, going as far as Punt, i.e. Somaliland and Hadramawt, whence the Egyptians imported such products as ebony, myrrh, ivory, gold and wild animals (see Casson, *The ancient mariners*, London 1960, 12-13). Vessels were also used for warfare in Egypt, as is shown by a relief of the Pharaoh Sahure’s pyramid (ca. 2550 B.C.), depicting ships carrying troops.

The mariners *par excellence* of the Near East were, however, the Phoenicians. Phoenician ships appear already in a relief of the third millennium B.C. at the time of the Pharaoh Snerfu, sailing to Egypt loaded with cedar trees, but their maritime strength reached its peak in the first millennium, when they replaced the naval dominance of the Minoans and Greeks who had first dominated the Mediterranean.

In contrast to Egyptian naval architecture, which was based on riverboats, the vessels of the Phoenicians were from the beginning intended for seafaring, being half-moon in shape with high stern, and with bows distinguished by a wide beam. Phoenician galleys were surmounted by broad square sails and were often two or three-banked. Phoenician ships were propelled by oars and/or sails and two huge oars were used as rudders.

The Phoenicians firmly established the spice route to be followed for centuries later by the Persians and Arabs. Already at the time of King Solomon, Hiram, the Phoenician king from Tyre, sent his sailors to serve Solomon’s newly-established fleet in Ezion Geber. King Solomon’s fleet, as stated in I Kings, ix, 26-8, was manned by Phoenicians and sailed as far as Ophir, by which it is understood Oman and India. Gold, myrrh, parrots and other goods were thus transported by the Phoenicians from India and South Arabia to Palestine (see V. Christides, *L’énigme d’Ophir*, in *Revue Biblique*, lxxvii [1970], 240-7).

After the 9th century B.C., the Greeks started taking the upper hand in navigation in the Mediterranean, so that by the 5th century B.C., the Mediterranean became a Greek lake and later a Roman one.

The pre-Islamic Arabs. The role which the pre-Islamic Arabs played in navigation in this early period was marginal, but should not be ignored. Certain Arabs used float-supported rafts in the Red Sea and appear in Greek sources as *Azetani*. From such primitive rafts—whose model should be traced to Mesopotamia—boats sewn together with fibre, whose flat bottom consisted of a single plank, developed for navigation on the Red Sea.

In order to safeguard sea traffic, the Ptolemies had planted a number of coastal towns—or renewed and renamed old ports—on both sides of the upper part of the Red Sea: Clyisma-Cleopatra, Arsinoe, Philothera, Myos Hormos, Berenice and Leuke Kome.

Goods from the Orient were unloaded in Myos Hormos on the African coast, from where they were transmitted via the river Nile, to Muzza (Strabo, 780, 781), whilst Leuke Kome on the Arabian side of the Red Sea served as a port of discharge for these goods. With the advent of the Romans, Leuke Kome diminished in importance and the little island Iotabe at the entrance of the Gulf of ‘Akaba acquired great importance, serving as a customs clearing-house for the ships which headed towards Ayla (*q.v.*), which developed into an important emporium in the 4th century A.D.

Meanwhile, the participation of Arab vessels, merchants, shipowners and seamen in the Red Sea traffic is explicitly attested in the Greek and Latin sources of the Hellenistic and Roman period. As pirates, some Arab tribes, living on the coastline of the Red Sea, forced the Romans to embark guards in their merchant ships (Pliny, *Natural History*, vi, 173). But it was mainly as sailing traders that they were known; Strabo reports that the Arabs of South Arabia used float-supported rafts (*daphniokondos plóidios*) to sail across the Red Sea towards the African coast in order to trade with the African (Strabo, xvi, 4, 19).

The best information about Arabian ports, trade and seamen is found in the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, written in the early Christian era, which mentions that Muzza at the southern tip of the Arabian peninsula, not far from the inland capital of the Himyarites, Zafar, and the nearby port of Okelis, were the most important starting points for sailing to Western India.

For the 6th century, two contemporary Byzantine sources give information on Arab seafaring. The first, the *Martiriym of Arthas* (ed. Boissonade, in *Anecdota Graeca*, 1933, 443-6), states that since we know that Indian ships usually did not sail beyond the island of Ceylon or the Bab al-Mandab, we should probably understand by the term “Indian” “South Arabian” vessels. In the second source, the *Acts of Gregentius*, there are also references to Arabian ports (see Christides, *The Himyarite-Ethiopian war and the Ethiopian occupation of South Arabia in the Acts of Gregentius*, ca. 530 A.D.), in *Annales d’Ethiopie*, ix [1972], 115-46).

Arabic sources have only scanty references to Arab navigation in pre-Islamic times. The nautical terminology found in the *Kur‘ân* and in the Arab lexicographers is exiguous, but betrays a triple influence, i.e. Persian, Indian and Graeco-Roman, on Arab navigation. Thus the word *ndkhuddh* “captain” comes from the Hindi *ndkhuddh* (cf. S.S. Magoulias, *The lives of the saints as sources of data for the history of commerce in the Byzantine Empire in the Vth and VIth centuries*, in *Kronograpfia*, iii [1971], 303-30). This was the time of the florescence of Byzantine navigation and its international sea trade, and Byzantine shipowners enjoyed great freedom and prestige, one never to be repeated in later times when strict state controls were imposed.

The Red Sea traffic reached its peak in the reigns of the emperors Justin I (518-27) and Justinian (527-
with commercial competition in this area among the rival powers of the Persians and the Byzantines. There was no direct confrontation between Byzantines and Persians at sea or on land, but the Persians tried to infiltrate Yemen in order to support the local pagans and the Jewish Himyarite rulers, while the Byzantines through their allies, the Christian Ethiopians, strongly supported the Christian Himyarites.

Justin I, taking profit from the upheaval in Yemen, allied with the most important powers in the southern part of the Red Sea on both sides of the coast: the Ethiopians and the Blemmyes, who extended in a loose confederation from ʿAydhāb [q. v.] as far as Ethiopia, hoping to use his Christian Himyarite allies in order to extend his power as far as Aden, transforming the Red Sea into a Byzantine lake (see Christides, Ethnic movements in southern Egypt and northern Sudan. Blemmye-Byba in late antique and early Arab Egypt until 707 A.D.,; inListy Filologiczne, ci.iii [1980], 136).

Unfortunately for the Emperor, the situation was reversed when the Persians occupied Yemen, and his successor Justinian I failed equally in his attempt to persuade the Ethiopians to try to undertake the sailing to India in order to gain control of the silk trade with China and to exclude the Persian intermediaries.

Thus in practice, Persian cargo ships dominated the Mediterranean trade, sailing side-by-side with the Byzantine ships; the 9th-century author Cosmas Indicopleustes informs us that Byzantine ships dared to sail as far as Ceylon, where again they competed with the Persian ships, and Greek inscriptions discovered in various parts of the Arabian and African coasts of the Red Sea and numerous coins discovered in Ceylon attest to the activities of Byzantine traders in this area (N. Ahmad, The Arabs' knowledge of Ceylon, in JC, xiv [1945], 224-5; B. J. Perera, The foreign trade and commerce of ancient Ceylon, in Ceylon Historical Journal [1951], 110 ff.). During the time of Khusraw I (531-78) the Persians imposed their rule on Yemen and their ships based at the port of Aden, controlled the Bāb al-Mandab, the entrance to the Red Sea, and nearly shut off the Byzantine route to the East (D. Whitehouse, II. NAVIGATION IN ISLAMIC TIMES. Although the newly-established Islamic caliphate did not possess any ample reservoir of trained navigators, it did control the Egyptian shipyards and their workers; it inherited the Phoenician tradition from the conquered Byzantine Orient; and there were a number of Arabs living on the southern coasts of the Arabian peninsula who were experienced sailors and skilful ship crafbers.

We know something of the nature of the ships sailing from the Phoenician shores in the period preceding Islam from e.g., the depiction of a Phoenician cargo ship incised on the wall of a burial chamber in the catacombs of Bet She'arim, between Haifa and Nazareth, dating between ca. the 2nd and 4th centuries A.D., in which this ship strongly resembles the late Roman vessels (see R.L. Bowen, A Roman merchantman from Israel, in The Mariner's Mirror, xviii/1 [1962], 68-70); and the Phoenician tradition of the stern post ending in a horse's head was transmitted to Muslim naval architecture.

However, the construction of Muslim merchant ships owes also certain of its features to pre-Islamic Arab naval traditions; thus the imitation of the sewn boat—common in the Arabian Gulf from the pre-Islamic period until the present day—in the construction of Arab cargo ships can be easily understood (see Bowen, Primitive watertight of Arabia, in The American Neptune, xii [1952], 196 ff.). The average mediaeval Arab dhows had a length of about 75 feet with a displacement of about 100 tons. Modern Arab dhows can be as small as 1-10 tons (ḥābū) and as big as 100-200 tons (bāmū) (M. Lesourd, Notes sur les nauvahuit, navigateurs de la mer Rouge, in Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Arch. Naut., xxxii, ser. B, no. 25/1-2 [1960], 352).

The Umayyad period (661-750). After the most important Islamic conquests were accomplished in land warfare, the Umayyads eagerly undertook the development of the Islamic navy. The Umayyad period is characterised by efforts of the Arabs to construct warships; they realised that the consolidation of the rapidly acquired Islamic conquests and further expansion could not be achieved without a strong navy. But although there is ample information about the construction of ships and the recruitment of sailors at this period, little is known about attempts to build cargo ships and about the encouragement of the sea trade and activities of merchant shipping.

The recruitment of sailors in the Umayyad period, at least in Egypt, is recorded meticulously. Requisitions by the central government were addressed to the community, which had collectively the responsibility to recruit its share of sailors. The draftees were not forced to serve without pay, but received regular wages (H. Bell, Greek papyri in the British Museum. The Aphrodito Papyri, AP, vii [1930], 447). The wages of the recruited crews were not, however, uniform. The marines who functioned as fighting men (mawdlt) received higher salaries than the sailors (waṣaṣ), and even among the marines, the mawjūrūn (mawjūrūt) were paid higher salaries than the mawāṣī (Muslims of non-Arab descent) (mawāṣīt) (Bell, op. cit., Papyrus no. 2 1447). In addition, the bread which was prepared for the marines, as one Arabic papyrus informs us, was of better quality than that of the sailors (Christides, The conquest of Crete by the Arabs (ca. 824). A turning point in the struggle between Byzantium and Islam, Athens 1984, 54 ff.). During the Umayyad period, most of the skillful sailors of Egypt were Christians, while the marines were Muslims; but by the end of this period the situation gradually changed.

We do not have much information about the recruitment of sailors in Syria during the Umayyad period. Undoubtedly, a number of the inhabitants of the coastal towns were drafted into the Syrian fleets. There was, nevertheless, a considerable reshuffling of this population, famous from ancient times for its expertise in naval activities; Muṣawwiyah (41-66/661-80) transferred many Persian workers from Barlābakk to the Syrian coastal towns of Tyre and Acre to be used for ship building, perhaps an indication of the diminishing number of the Christian, Phoenician, shipbuilding workers.

Dockyards and naval bases; Muslim naval expeditions. After the conquest of Egypt, the Arabs continued the use of the Byzantines' dockyards [see trans al-sewās] in Alexandria and Clysma in Egypt as well as those in Syria, that of Clysma (Kulzum [q.v.]) being of particular importance.

Trajan's canal, uniting Egyptian Babylon with Kulzum, had become silted up, but was cleaned and used before 23/644 for the corn fleet which now, instead of going to Constantinople, was diverted to Dīrā, the port of Medina, to feed the inhabitants of the holy cities. Later Jeddah (Jeddah [q.v.]), the port of Mecca, was opened to the pilgrims, who needed a port of embarkation to Mecca; but by this time the pilgrim traffic contributed to the sea traffic on both sides of the
upper part of the Red Sea, whilst at the same time, the old incense route to the ports in the southern part of the Arabian Gulf and the Indian ports was also maintained. The Greek papyri of Aphrodito, in addition to the numerous references which they make to the construction and repairing of ships in Kulzum, report that Kulzum was also used as a naval military base, no doubt against the Red Sea pirates, whose activities had been notorious since Roman times.

The port of Alexandria still retained its fame in the Islamic period, though to a diminishing extent. Most of the Byzantine fleet would be on request by the Arabs, but a strong Jewish community, composed mainly of traders, remained there; moreover, the skilful Egyptian craftsmen continued the Byzantine tradition (see M. Rodziewicz, *Graeco-Islamic elements at Kom et Dikka in the light of new discoveries*, in *Graeco-Arabica*, i [1982], 44). The landmark of Hellenism, the Pharos (lighthouse) [see AL-ISKANDARIYYA and MANARA], was partly preserved during the Umayyad period; and even three centuries later, the Persian author Násir-i Khusrav describes the torches which were lit at night and which led safely the ships to the port of Alexandria. It is not, therefore, surprising that already from the time of Mu'awiyah, a great number of ships were constructed and repaired in Alexandria, and it was also from there that the most important Muslim military navies were launched.

While Alexandria in the Islamic period lost ground as a great entrepôt, the port of al-Faramá acquired great prominence. The group of Jewish merchants, known as al-Rádháníyya [q.v.] sailed from southern France, carrying merchandise which was unloaded in al-Faramá, from where it was transported on the back of camels as far as Kulzum, thence by ship to the Orient.

Meanwhile, naval bases were established in other parts of Egypt, e.g. at Rosetta and Damietta [see DIMIT] at the mouths of the river Nile in the Mediterranean, and at Tinnis. Damietta, in particular, on the eastern arm of the Nile delta, acquires great importance in the 'Abbasid period, whilst the Tinnis base near Damietta was founded on a little island. Moreover, in 94/713, a base was also established in the Pentapolis of Cyrenaica [see BARKA].

Syria also acquired bases from the beginning of the Umayyad period; the first dockyards started operating in 5' Akká (Acre) in 49/669, while those of Súr (Tyre) were also busy shortly afterwards (A. H. Fahmy, *Muslim sea power in the eastern Mediterranean*, London 1950, 52-3). The Syrian dockyards had the great advantage of drawing timber from the Syro-Lebanese forests, which also exported timber to France, carrying merchandise which was unloaded in e.g. Sicily and Crete, the result of a patient and persistent military preparation, backed by scientific progress in such fields as nautical instruments, efficient war machines and weapons. Also, the formation of large commercial Arab fleets was completed by this time, so that Muslim ships not only sailed side-by-side with the Byzantine vessels in the Mediterranean but dared to reach as far as India, South-East Asia and China (see S. M. Yusuf, *Al-Rana, al-barr al-ndm ayyan min al-Balad wa al-Gulf a Siam*, in IC, xxvi/1 [1955], 75-103). One should also note that in Egypt, the semi-independent dynasty of the Túlníns [q.v.] paid special attention to their navy, and the Egyptian fleet in its attacks on the Byzantines, often cooperated with the Syrian fleets, i.e. those of the semi-independent naval states of Tarsus and Tripoli.

Arab manuals of seafaring and warfare. The early Arabic manuals of navigational science are all lost. In his navigational text *Kitáb al-Fawa'id fi sunn ilm al-bahr wa l-kawdíd, written in 895/1490, Ibn Majíd [q.v.], a pilot as well as an author, mentions that the earliest dated pilots were Ahmad b. Tabáríya and Khwádh b. Yusuf (both apparently Persians) who sailed in ca. 400/1009-10 and were also authors of navigational texts. In addition, Ibn Majíd informs us that one hundred years later three writers appeared, known as the ‘three lions’ (*lubádh*), whose texts were read by him but which are no longer extant (see further below, 3. Muslim navigation in the Indian Ocean).

Information on Arabic naval warfare was usually incorporated into more general manuals of warfare, of which a certain number existed by the 4th/10th century. Ibn al-Nadim mentions in his *Fihrist* two such war manuals composed at the time of the caliph al-Manṣur (136-58/754-75) and al-Ma'mún (198-218/813-33) respectively (cf. J. T. Reinaud, *De l'art militaire chez les Arabes*, in JA [Sept. 1848], 195 ff.); Christides, *The conquest of Crete*, 29-31). Special mention should be made of the works of the Mamlúk author Ibn Mangíl [q.v. in Suppl.], whose works are a mine of information about Muslim ships, their technology, “Greek fire”, etc. Most of his works are still unpublished, but his treatise *al-Akháam al-muláikkiya fi fann al-kitál fi l-bahr wa l-dawdbit al-ndm ayyan* has been recently published by M. 'Abd al-Rahim in a typewritten dissertation of the University of Cairo (n.d.). In this treatise there are explicit references to and fragments of an Arabic translation of Leo VI's *Tactica* (see Christides, *The naval warfare in the eastern Mediterranean* (6th-14th centuries); an Arabic translation of Leo VI's *Navamachica*, in *Graeco-Arabica*, iii [1984], 137-48). Information about navigation is also found abun-
dantly in the Arab geographers from Ibn Khurdadhbih onwards, and also in al-Mas‘ūdī, in whose Murud al-dhahab there is ample information about the sea, sailors and navigation in general [see further, DUGHIYATIV], and in such material as that of the Cairo Geniza (see S.D. Goitein, A Mediterranean society, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1967 ff.).

The replacement of the Byzantine merchant fleet by Muslim fleets in the Mediterranean. During the 'Abbasid period, although Arab navigation developed in the Mediterranean, the Byzantine long-distance navigation and trade were heavily diminished. This is less to be attributed, according to H. Pirenne's theory, to the Muslim conquests which supposedly shattered the commercial unity of the Mediterranean (cf. A. Rissiing, The fate of Henri Pirenne's theses on the consequences of the Islamic expansion, in Classica et Mediaevalia, xiii [1992], 87-130; R. Lopez, Beati monoculi: the Byzantine economy in early Middle Ages, in Cultus et cognitio, Festchrift Alexander Gieszter, Warsaw 1979, 439-480) than to the effects of the strictly-controlled Byzantine financial system and the loss of several important Byzantine ports in the Near East and North Africa. Heavy taxation and strictly-controlled profits choked the maritime activities of the Byzantines, leaving little room for personal incentive; and simultaneously, the activities of foreign (Islamic and Arab) long-distance trade were heavily curtailed, limited, out of fear of spying, to restricted areas and compulsory lodging houses known as ṣūhir. Thus the great maritime Byzantine boom of the 7th century suffered a mortal blow, never to recover. Previously, at the end of the 6th and in the first half of the 7th century, Byzantine merchant ships had been very active in long-distance voyages. At this time, the word όμηρος, used almost interchangeably for "captain" and "shipowner", manifested the participation of captains in the profits, and Byzantine hagiographical works describe the financial support of these long-distance voyages by the Patriarch of Alexandria and the great prestige which the shipping magnates enjoyed (see Magoulis, op. cit., 303-30). But after this time, the land-bound Byzantine aristocracy showed little interest in investment in maritime ventures. Short-distance sailing uniting the various parts of the Empire continued, but this was a pale echo of former activities, and it was only in the second half of the 14th century that the Byzantine aristocracy, having lost its lands to the Turks, invested again its capital in maritime ventures (see N. Oikonomides, Hommes d'affaires grecs et latin en Constantinople (XIIIe-XVe siècles), Montreal 1979; A.E. Laiou-Thomadakis places this new tendency somewhat earlier in The Greek merchant of the Palaeologan period, a collective portrait, in Παλαιολόγια της Ακαδημίας Αθηνών, lvii [1982], 105).

Nevertheless, some Byzantine ships continued to visit the Arabian ports; Ibn Hawkal (4th/10th century) complains that, from the time when the Byzantine merchants were allowed to frequent the Muslim Mediterranean ports, the Muslims were exposed to dangerous Byzantine slying.

Muslim commercial navigation in the Mediterranean reached its peak in the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries, when vessels plied as far as Spain [see TIRAGIARA]. The most important trade routes at this period were those connecting the Egyptian port of al-Faramā with Constantinople, al-Faramā with southern France; al-Mahdiyya [q.v.] in Ifrikīya with Sicily and Italy; and two maritime routes connecting Algeria with Spain (see T. Lewicki, Les voies maritimes de la Méditerranée dans le haut moyen âge d’après les sources arabes, in La navigazione mediterranea nell’alto medioevo, in Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull’Alto Medioevo, Spoleto 1977, xxv [1978], 439-80).

The decay of Muslim naval power. At the end of the 4th/10th century, there was an obvious decay of...
Muslim naval power in the Mediterranean, signalled by the Byzantine reconquest of Crete (962) and Tarsus (965), and that of Sicily by the Normans (1090). In Spain, the reign of 'Abd al-Rahmân III (390-509/912-61) marks the turning point in the development of its naval power. By the 4th/10th century, the Muslims of Spain had constructed formidable war frigates in their shipyards as well as merchant ships whose naval architecture influenced the Western European equivalents (for the types of Spanish Muslim ships, see G. Oman, section "Imbarcazioni: tipi, costruzione", in his Voci marinresche usate dal geografo arabo al-Idrisî [XI secolo] nelle sue descrizioni delle coste otranto-paolinesi dell'Africa, in AIUON, viii [1963], 9-13). The historian Ibn Hayyân [q.v.] describes in his Maktabâtî [ca. 450/1057] the activities of the Spanish Muslim ships against the "Franks", and also the commercial relations between al-Andalus and Italy (Maktabâtî, ed. F. Chalmeta and M. Sulh, Madrid 1979). But after 'Abd al-Rahmân's death, the pay days of the Spanish Muslim navy were over.

A similar decline is visible in commercial navigation. All this was not due to any single factor such as severe depletion of the forests of the Mediterranean Muslim countries, as is sometimes suggested, but mainly to internal weaknesses of the Islamic states system, and to the rise of new powers, i.e. those of the Italian towns of Pisa, Venice and Genoa which became the dominant powers in both merchantile navigation and naval warfare (see A.R. Lewis, Naval power and trade in the Mediterranean A.D. 500-1100, Princeton 1951, 183).

The decadence of Muslim navigation was accelerated by the Crusaders' seizure of such Syrian ports as Tyre and Acre, although Alexandria still remained a trade centre where foreign ships were allowed to approach and passengers were permitted to remain in the funduks [q.v.], whilst the Franks in the Latin Orient established their own funduks in which foreigners were allowed to remain.

While at the beginning of the 6th/12th century, Muslim ships were still sailing as far as the Maghrib and Italy, by the end of this century most of the sailing between Western Europe and the Muslim Orient had fallen into the hands of the Italians (Cl. Cahen, Orient et Occident au temps des Croisades, Paris 1983, 137 ff.). Meanwhile, the Crusaders' conquest of Acre opened the Red Sea to the Franks, until it was retaken by Salâh al-Dîn in 1170, who transported thither dismantled ships on camel-back (see A.S. Ehrenkreutz, The place of Saladin in the naval history of the Mediterranean Sea in the Middle Ages, in JAO S, iv [1955], 104). It was he who gave to the Egyptian navy a last ephemeral glory, using it in his reconquest of the coastal towns in Palestine and Syria in 583/1187, being the last mediaeval Arab ruler who understood the importance of the navy in military affairs.

The coming of the Mamûlîs in the 7th/13th century marks the end of Muslim naval power. The Mamûlîs' naval policy was marked by two actions which brought about the destruction of Muslim naval power. After their conquest of the Frankish cities in the Levant, they applied a deliberate policy of destroying the Syrian ports in order to make them unattractive to any further Crusades (see D. Ayalon, The Mamûlîs and naval power, in Proc. of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, vi [1965], 7-12; D. Baraq, A new source concerning the ultimate borders of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem: the Israeli Exploration journal, xxix [1979], 213); and the system of recruiting for the navy was altered. Al-Makrizî laments that, while in the 4th/10th century the best were selected for naval service, which was considered an honour, now only the wretched served. Simultaneously, Muslim merchant ships lost their leading role not only in the Mediterranean but also in the Red Sea, where they were replaced after the 9th/15th century by the Portuguese.

The newly-developed science of underwater archaeology has yielded important information concerning navigation in the Mediterranean and Arab shipping activities in this sea. The recently-discovered ship wreck, dating to ca. 1025 A.D., at Serge Liman off the southern coast of Asia Minor, just opposite the Volos, is the most eloquent example of the invaluable services which underwater archaeology can offer.

The Serge Liman wreck furnishes concrete evidence of an important change on the technology of shipbuilding in the early 5th/11th century. It is the earliest example we know of a seagoing ship, constructed in the modern skeleton-first manner (see G.F. Bass and F.H. van Doorninck, Jr., An 11th century shipwreck at Serge Liman, Turkey, in International Jnl. of Nautical Archaeology and Underwater Exploration, vi/i [1978], 119-32; J.R. Steffy, The reconstruction of the 11th century Serge Liman vessel, in Jnl. of Glass Studies, xxvi [1984], 64, van Doorninck Jr., The medieval shipwreck at Serge Liman: an early 11th century Fatimid-Byzantine commercial voyage, in Orano-Arabica, iv [1986].

Moreover, the shipwreck of Serge Liman reveals that by the 11th century A.D. an international flavour prevailed in the composition of the crews of the merchant ships in the Mediterranean and that their cargoes could easily consist of objects originating from both the Byzantine and the Arab worlds. Some of the objects which were found in the Serge Liman wreck, such as cooking utensils, remains of food, arms and luxury items, betrays that there were, side-by-side, both Muslims and Christians among the members of the crew and passengers. The origin of the owner of the shipwreck of Serge Liman cannot be identified, but most probably he was from Fâtimid Egypt. It should also be noted that this vessel was not built in Asia Minor, but in the Levant, perhaps in Serge Liman, had headed freely towards the Byzantine ports of Asia Minor. Thus the evidence of underwater archaeology corroborates the information of the Greek and Arab literary sources, as well as that of the Geniza documents, that freedom of navigation for Arab and Byzantine cargo ships in the Mediterranean reached its peak at the turn of the 5th/11th century.


(V. CHRISTIDES)

2. In the later mediaeval and early modern periods.

This section will deal with both aspects of milâha, the mariner's art and seafaring in general, as they developed, chiefly among the Muslims of the Mediterranean, in the later Middle Ages and the early modern period; the treatment will also endeavour to reflect two stages, the earlier Arab one and the later Turkish one: although partly overlapping, they were distinctive in emphasis and intrinsic achievements.

The decline of Arab seafaring in the Mediterranean, mentioned in section 1 above of the article as beginning in the Fātimid and Ayyūbid periods, became pronounced under the Mamluks, and encompassed its three main aspects: military-naval, merchant shipping and corsair. It was contemporary with and partly due to the dramatic rise of European shipping in the Mediterranean that gained momentum in the 11th century.

An eventual result of the decline of Arab merchant shipping was the lack of Muslim participation in the new forms of improved navigation that were characteristic Mediterranean seafaring from the 13th century onwards. Three interrelated innovations marked these methods: the mariner's compass, the portolan chart, and an improved and expanded type of sailing directions.

The mariner's compass is first attested for 1187, and its perfection and widespread use became the dominant method of navigation for the rest of the Middle Ages continued to avoid availing themselves of the compass. The large Genoese and other Prankish instruments of incipient astronomical navigation such as the astrolabe (see section 3 below), characteristic of Muslim seafaring in the Indian Ocean. This was due, on the part of the Christians, not only to unfamiliarity with the methods of a different tradition, language and culture, but also to the reduced size of the Mediterranean where, unlike on the oceans, coasts and landmarks were never too far away; relative position according to the points of compass rather than latitude and longitude was the chief determining factor.

When viewed from a broader perspective, Muslim milâha, seafaring, in these final centuries of the Middle Ages lacked the rest of the growth features characteristic of the Christian one. A rapid evolution in ship-building technology was one of them. Enriched by elements introduced from the Atlantic, this technology developed newer and larger types of sailing ships driven by square sails and later by a combination of lateen and square sails; it remained the characteristic of the Mediterranean where, unlike on the oceans, coasts and landmarks were never too far away; relative position according to the points of compass rather than latitude and longitude was the chief determining factor.

Aside from using the above-mentioned third types of tools—mariner's compass, portolan chart and portolan text—Mediterranean seamen of the later Middle Ages continued to use rudimentary instruments of incipient astronomical navigation such as the astrolabe (see section 3 below), characteristic of Muslim seafaring in the Indian Ocean. This was due, on the part of the Christians, not only to unfamiliarity with the methods of a different tradition, language and culture, but also to the reduced size of the Mediterranean where, unlike on the oceans, coasts and landmarks were never too far away; relative position according to the points of compass rather than latitude and longitude was the chief determining factor.

When viewed from a broader perspective, Muslim milâha, seafaring, in these final centuries of the Middle Ages lacked the rest of the growth features characteristic of the Christian one. A rapid evolution in ship-building technology was one of them. Enriched by elements introduced from the Atlantic, this technology developed newer and larger types of sailing ships driven by square sails and later by a combination of lateen and square sails; it remained the domain of the Christians and further contributed to the domination of long-distance Mediterranean shipping by them. The large Genoese and other Frankish (sailing) ships, called in the lingua franca simply that—a gamut of variations on the Romance terms derived from the Latin nauti—or given more specific names such as adaptations of the Germanic "cog" or the
etymologically intriguing “carrack”, became the great freighters of east-west trade, and their arrivals and departures were among the memorable events in the economic life of such ports as Alexandria. Venetian galleys, however, tenaciously endured the competition, partly by pushing their volume capacity to the limit, at which point they became the gallerre grosse di mercato, the great merchant galleys of the Republic’s convoys. We see nothing of the sort on the Muslim side. Although Arab coastal shipping must have retained its local vigour and importance, the galleys—şüni or kılış in Arabic (cf. H. Kindermann, “Schiff” in Arabic, in K. Zwickau 1934, s.v.)—did not develop into a large commercial vessel but remained essentially the traditional warship. Arab long-distance shipping between Egypt and the Syro-Palestinian coast on one hand and the Maghrib and Spain on the other, still vigorous in the Fātimid period, appears to have receded under the Ayyubids and Mamluks. Characteristic of this are the voyages of Ibn Djubayr and Ibn Baṭṭūta. Ibn Djubayr, the young Muslim from Granada whose principal purpose was the hajjaḥ, nevertheless crossed the entire length of the Mediterranean on Christian ships (in 1183, Ceuta—Alexandria; in 1184-5, ʿAkkā—Cartagena; cf. Rihla, ed. Wright and de Goeje, Leiden 1907, 35, 312); Ibn Baṭṭūta sailed in the 1330s from Lādhīkiyya to Alanya on a large Genoese karaq (probably a carrack), and from Sinope to Kefe on a Greek (Rūm) ship (Rihla, ii, 254, 354).

This imbalance manifested itself not only in peaceful commercial relations between the Christian and Muslim halves of the Mediterranean, but also in their confrontational aspect: Muslim coasts and coastal cities suffered considerably more from Christian naval raids than Christian coasts did from the Muslim ones, a situation of which the Crusades were a component, a partial cause and a symptom. On rare occasions, one of the Muslim states would muster enough determination to give an effective naval response to the Christians, e.g. the Mamluk attack on Cyprus in 1425 in retaliation for the 1365 sack of Alexandria.

The naval imbalance was up to a point compensated for by the activities of Muslim corsairs, especially in the western Mediterranean [see Kopya]. In the later zone, Muslim refugees from Spain swelled the ranks of local corsairs, making especially the harbours of Algeria bases for efficient pirate fleets that were using small and fast types of galleys. Even their activities, however, lacked the magnitude of “Sarasin” corsair fleets of the early centuries of Islam, and did not match the grand scale of the contemporary semi-official Christian, especially Catalan, piracy.

The later Middle Ages were thus marked in the Mediterranean by a relative Arab passivity on all maritime fronts: navigational techniques, ship-building technology, merchant shipping, military-naval enterprises. This situation changed up to a point with the expansion of the Ottoman Turks in the course of the 15th century.

Like the Arabs of the first decades of Islamic expansion, the pre-Ottoman Turks who spread over Anatolia in the last decades of the 11th century were nomads unfamiliar with the sea. Again like the Arabs of the 7th century, some of these Turks proceeded forthwith (perhaps—as in the case of the Arabs—due to a predisposition derived from the nomad’s mobility and reliance on his markaz) to learn the seafarer’s art: the ghāzā of the Turkish horsemen quickly changed into a maritime ghāzā. It was led by the Saldjukid prince Şaka Bey and his followers in the bay of İzmir: the conquests of the islands of Lesbos [see Midilli] and Chios [see Sariś] during the 1080s and 1090s were examples of their signal, though only ephemeral, achievements (see A.N. Kurat, Čaka Bey, Ankara 1966).

After a few years, the Turks withdrew from the Aegean coast, but filtered back in the course of the 13th and 14th centuries when they formed the coastal principalities of Karasi, Sarukhān, Aydin and Menelikhe [q.v.]. Some of them—especially those of Aydin—launched a maritime ghāzā that rumbled in scope and energy the Unayyad and Cretan Arabs’ campaigns against Byzantium. The exploits of Unayyad Beg of Aydin (1328-48 [q.v.]) became legendary to the point of being evoked, a century later, by the epic of Enveri (see I. Mēlīkoff-Sayar, Le Destan d’Umur Pacha, Paris 1953; P. Lemerle, L’Emissat d’Aydin, Byzance et l’Occident. Recherches sur “La Geste d’Umur Pacha”, Paris 1957). The Anatolian coasts and nearby islands of the Aegean were the principal area of the Turks’ contact with the sea. It was there that they first learned the mariner’s trade, and their teachers were the indigenous Greeks who had been practising this art since antiquity. Conversion to Islam, intermarriage, turcification, all converged to produce a special seafaring population whose maritime vocation reflected this fusion in many ways. Turkish maritime terminology is one eloquent example. Thus the most characteristic type of the Mediterranean ships, the galleys, became known in Turkish by its Greek loanword, kadırga (Kahane and Tietze, no. 785).

Vigorous though it was, pre-Ottoman Turkish seafaring remained confined to the Aegean part of the Mediterranean. Turkish expansion over the rest of that sea took place only under the Ottomans, and became one of the most dramatic and noteworthy features of late 15th and 16th century Mediterranean history. Commensurably, Turkish maritime terminology further grew and absorbed much of the special professional vocabulary of Mediterranean seamen—the lingua franca that was based mainly on Italian but also included other components from Greek to Albanian and Arabic; this Turkish dimension of the Mediterranean lingua franca has been the subject of an outstanding scholarly study, the above-mentioned work by Kahane and Tietze.

The Ottoman Turkish milâha thus eclipsed the earlier achievements of the Mediterranean Arabs, but it retained some of the basic aspects of their seafaring that distinguished it from the Christian one. Thus in addition to its above-mentioned initial derivativeness from pre-Islamic elements, a characteristic feature of the Turkish milâha was its being based on the intimate relationship between the military-naval and corsair dimensions of seafaring; Ottoman merchant shipping, especially long-distance merchant shipping that crossed the boundaries between the Muslim and Christian halves of the Mediterranean, remained as restricted as it had been in the case of the Arabs. The Ottoman Turks caught up with the Christians in those aspects of milâha where the Arabs had slipped behind since the Mamluk period: in the art of navigation itself, in using and producing the principal types of nautical instruments, and in familiarising themselves with some of the newer types of ships and ship-building navigation technology. The Italian portolan chart and portolan text found their Turkish counterpart in the Kılıb-i Büşreci, a book where the two principles became combined so as to produce a unique type of navigational tool that also asserted the Turkish individuality within the framework of Mediterranean seafaring. Its author, Piri Reis (q.v.; see also P;
Kahle, Piri Reis, Bahriye, Berlin 1926; S. Soucek, A propos du Livre d'Instructions Nantiques de Piri Reis, in REI, xli [1973] 241-55, compiled it in two versions (926/1520 and 932/1526 respectively), producing a navigational description of the entire Mediterranean; the book is divided into a number of chapters of text, each of which is accompanied by a chart of the respective segment. Moreover, the second and longer version (one of whose manuscripts has been published in facsimile by the Türk Tarih Kurumu, Piri Reis, Kitab-ı Bahriye, 1935) is preceded by a versified introduction where the author expounds in considerable detail the art of navigation besides describing in broad terms the world's oceans and the ongoing voyages of Great Discoveries. As a book of sailing directions encompassing the entire Mediterranean and an atlas of enlarged charts of smaller segments of that sea, the Kitab-i Bahriye is unique in portolan literature; and as a text that includes, in the second version, the latest information about the discovery of America and another great voyages, it stands out in contemporary Islamic literature.

Piri Reis is also characteristic of the Ottoman milâha in another sense. His early training and voca-
tion was that of a maritime ghazi, whose trade com-
bined piracy in quest of booty with the conviction of performing the ghazi; Holy War for Islam, whenever the target was the Christian elements of the Mediter-
anian; intermittently, and especially in his later years, he also served the Ottoman sultan by joining the fleet on its naval campaigns. This double nature of the Ottoman milâha, sc. the individual, private one as an assortment of Turkish corsairs in constant strug-
gle with the Christians, and the organised, govern-
mental one as the domanma-yi hâmayên, the Imperial Fleet, represented two faces of the same coin, and car-
rried to its extreme a phenomenon that was universal (cf. for example the role—not devoid of a religious hue whenever the Catholic Spanish were the target—of Sir Francis Drake in Queen Elizabeth's time). It was its degree and exclusiveness that set the Ottoman case apart from the rest. Another and steadily revitalising and growing source of strength for con-
temporary and early modern navies of the Christian powers, sc. the merchant marine, remained negligible in the Ottoman empire.

Corsair participation thus played an often decisive role in most of the naval campaigns of the Turkish fleet, in the extension of the Ottoman maritime fron-
tier all the way to the western Mediterranean, and in the occupation of the post of chief admiral [see KAPUĐAN PASHA]. The case of Kâhyî al-Dîn Bar-
barossa [see Kâyâr al-Dîn] illustrates and combines all these three elements. In 1520, he presented Algiers to the Ottoman sultan as the nucleus of a new eyalet; in 1534 he was appointed to the upgraded post of kapudan pasha; in 1538, he led the Turkish fleet to the victory at Preveza that gave the Ottoman empire its reputation of naval invincibility which lasted until the battle of Lepanto [see AYNABAKHTI] in 1571. Although the Ottoman fleet was rebuilt remarkably rapidly after Lepanto, the decline—of which that bat-
tle was an incipient symptom—became accentuated in the course of the 17th century. The chief cause was the overall decline of the empire's earlier vigour, but among the contributing factors was the loss of ability to keep in step with the Christian powers' continuing modernisation of nautical sciences. Thus the shift from oar-driven galleys to sailing ships as the lynchnip of 16th and 17th century European war fleets only belatedly occurred in the Ottoman navy, and then again due to the efforts of a former pirate and gover-

nor of Algiers, Mezzomorto Hüseyin Paşa [q.v.]. This seaman, appointed kapudan pasha in 1689, intro-
duced this aspect of modernisation that had spread among the Algerian corsairs since 1605. The improve-
ment had followed the two naval victories of the Vene-
terians a few years later (1695). The inability to keep modernising on a par with European navies subse-
quently reasserted itself, however, and contributed to the destruction of the Ottoman fleet by a Russian one at the battle of Çeşme [q.v.] in 1770.

The Turkish polygraph Katîb Celebi (1609-57 [q.v.]) wrote a history of the Ottoman naval cam-
paigns (Tahfüt al-kibî fi aṣfâl al-hibâr, 1st printing, BRâhim Müteferrika Press, Istanbul 1141/1728-9), where he also recorded the organisation and structure of the Ottoman navy. The time of this compilation, mid-17th century, coincided with the first low ebb of the Ottoman Turkish sea power, exemplified by the recurrent Venetian blockade of the Dardanelles during the protracted conquest of Crete (1645-69), and the difficulties of the Ottoman fleet to break through it. This naval intrusion of a Christian war fleet into the Ottoman home waters was paralleled by a growing dependence on Christian merchant ship-
ning. If in the Middle Ages and early modern period Christian shipping dominated only that part of the traffic that crossed the boundaries between Islam and Christendom, by the 18th century it began to assume an ever greater share of the Ottoman carrying trade as well, when European, especially French, vessels circulated along the entire stretch between Istanbul, İzmir and Alexandria (D. Panzac, Les échanges maritimes dans l'Empire Ottoman au XVIIIe siècle, in Revue de l'Occident Musulman et de la Méditerranée, no. 39 [1965], 7-34).

In the latter decades of the 18th century, there began efforts to embark on a fundamental modernisation of the Ottoman navy that included the unprecedented novelty of theoretical training in naval schools estab-
lished with the help of French and other European experts (I. H. Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı devletinin merkezi ve bahriye teşkilâtı, Ankara 1948, 507-11; S. J. Shaw, Between old and new: the Ottoman Empire under Sultan Selim III, 1789-1807, London 1976). As a matter of fact, it was at this point that a counterpart to the term "nавigation" in the narrow sense appeared, probably for the first time, in an Islamic language: sârî-i sifun or sârî-i safeîn, no doubt a calque on the French model, as in a report of 1211/1797 to the sultan (Uzunçarşılı, op. cit., 535). These efforts heralded a growing awareness at the centre of the state that adop-
tion of European scientific methods was a prerequisite for the empire's survival; a realisation of Turkey's potential, based on her strategic maritime-economic position, to develop a strong merchant marine, how-
ever, occurred more gradually and only in the 20th century.

Navigation in the Indian Ocean and its Persian Gulf and Red Sea ramifications is covered in section 3 below, chiefly in the specific sense of the word; it may thus be appropriate to add a brief survey of Muslim seafaring there during the later Middle Ages and the early modern period as a counterpart to the sketch of its development in the Mediterranean.

The radical and all-embracing difference between the Muslim milâhas of the Mediterranean and of the Indian Ocean could hardly be over-emphasised, and is one of the intriguing aspects of Islamic history. Real enough were the appearances of Islam and during the time of the 9th to early 12th centuries, periods it became even more pronounced in the later Middle Ages. An almost total absence of military navies and naval warfare, in
contrast to their importance in the Mediterranean, continued to mark the oriental dimension until the arrival of the Europeans in 1498. Another difference was the complete mutuality of Muslim and non-Muslim merchant shipping in the Indian Ocean, in contrast to its increasing one-sidedness in the Mediterranean; this mutuality was compounded and in a sense caused by remarkably peaceful relations, in fact, the coexistence of Muslims and non-Muslims in India. The western coast of the Indian subcontinent could be compared in the maritime sense to that of southern Europe; but whereas the Arabs and Turks of the Mediterranean rarely and reluctantly crossed the religious boundary as merchant shippers, their Arab and Persian coreligionists of the Indian Ocean kept sailing to India and East Africa just as their ancestors had done before Islam. This activity had two significant results. One was the ‘maritime’ spread of Islam to the Malabar [q.v.] region of India, East Africa and, eventually, also Indonesia; the other, more directly relevant to our subject, was a certain degree of ‘Islamisation’ of seafaring in the Indian Ocean. If in the early Abbásid period Arab or Persian shippers calling at such ports as Kjambayät [q.v.; anglicised as Cabay] were Muslims, the Indians sailing to Aden or other Near Eastern ports were not; by the time the Mamluks ruled in Egypt, Kjambayät had become the most important port of Muslim-ruled northern India (a good example of the two stages are the accounts of al-Mas′ūdī [Murudi, i, 253-4 - § 269] and of Ibn Batṭūtā [iv, 53], who visited Kjambayät in the 4th/10th and 8th/14th centuries respectively); its Gudjarātī sailors and merchants became the third group of Muslim seafarers, after the Arabs and Persians, characteristic of the Indian Ocean mɪlah₂. The Arab-Persian coreligionists would be the seafarers of the western Indian Ocean; in its eastern half and beyond to Indonesia, on the other hand, Gudjarātī Muslims appear to have played the principal role, especially when the Chinese in the post-Yung-lo (ruled 1403-24) period and after the final expedition of 1433 withdrew from those waters and chose Malacca, instead of such South Indian ports as Kōlām and Kumbhakonam, as their western terminus of their voyages. Alongside the Gudjarātī, the Māppīlas [q.v.] of Malabar deserve mention as a prominent Muslim seafaring people of the Indian Ocean from the late Middle Ages onwards. In a sense relevant to our subject, the Māppīlas stand out among all others, for they were formed as a distinct human group directly through the effect of Arab and Persian sailors and merchants visiting this part of the Indian coast, often settling there and intermarrying with certain castes of the Hindu population. This integration of Muslim seafaring and maritime trade with the non-Muslim ones in the Indian Ocean, in contrast to the rigid separation in the Mediterranean, is further exemplified by the fact that the Gudjarātīs pursued their maritime enterprise alongside the Hindu Vanyas (or Banyas), while both groups were subjects of an Indian Ocean sultanate (and eventually, of the Mughal empire), and that the Māppīlas never rose to the positions of the ruling class, but in this early period lived peacefully alongside the dominant Brahmī, Nayar and other Hindu groups (as well as the Christians of Malabar) and were well treated and in fact favoured by the Hindu rulers of Kālikāt, the ‘Zamorin’ (al-Sāmārī, in Ibn Batṭūtā, iv, 88, who gives an excellent account of this situation).

One of the significant results of this purely commercial nature of seafaring (except for the often bothersome piracy, endemic on most seas) in the Indian Ocean was the above-mentioned lack of a military-naval tradition. This circumstance, no doubt beneficial for centuries, had near-catastrophic consequences when the Europeans made their entry on the scene once Vasco da Gama, guided by the Arab mu′allim Ibn Mājīd, crossed the Indian Ocean from Malindi [q.v.] to Kalikat in 1498. The Portuguese immediately began to suppress native seafaring between India and the ports of the Near East both for economic reasons—re-routing the Spice Route trade around the Cape of Good Hope to Lisbon was the goal—and religious ones, especially when the target of their attack was Muslim ships or those whose destination was the Islamic Near East. Eventually, native seafaring recovered from the initial shock and by the 1540s, through its sheer volume and resilience, broke the Portuguese blockade; it was this vitality of the chiefly Muslim merchant marines of the Indian Ocean, rather than the sometimes over-emphasised effect of the entry of the Ottoman naval power on the scene, that caused the recovery of the Spice Route traffic through the Near Eastern ports. On the other hand, the natives never managed to create navies that could seriously challenge those of the Europeans; after the failure of the Mamluks and Ottomans to defeat the Portuguese in the western Indian Ocean (roughly between 1508 and 1552), and of the Javanese to wrest Malacca from the Portuguese in 1511, the last major naval battles were fought among the Europeans themselves once the British, Dutch and French joined the fray in the 17th century. This inability appears to have been caused by the absence of a native naval tradition rather than by a lack of the appropriate ship-building technology: for the natives, especially Indian shipwrights, had both the skill and resources to build large and sturdy sailing ships that were superior to European ones like the Portuguese carracks.

Finally, mention must be made of an aspect of commercial seafaring in the Indian Ocean whose effect was powerful and lasting: the bahdi, or pilgrimage trade to Mecca. Despite the perils of sea voyages, the maritime route was the only really feasible way for most Muslims of peninsular India, Malaysia, Indonesia and the islands of the eastern Indian Ocean, a large number of pilgrims from such ports as Surat or Acheh contributed to the economic vigour and resiliency of Muslim mɪlah₂ in the Indian Ocean.

The Arab-Persian inspiration of Muslim navigation in the Indian Ocean also left its permanent stamp on the maritime vocabulary of the seafaring peoples all the way to Indonesia. Thus mu′allim (whose principal connotation is ‘teacher’), the standard Arabic word for ship’s captain or pilot, spread in this connotation over the entire span of the Indian Ocean; similarly, the Persian word nāḥiḥūlā ‘ship’s master, owner’ (G. Ferrand, L’élément persan dans les textes nautiques arabes des XV et XVI siècles, in JA [1924], 238-9), also found universal application all the way to Indonesia. Bibliography: In addition to the works mentioned in the article, see S. Source, Certain types of ships in Ottoman-Turkish terminology, in Turcica, vii (1975), 233-49; C. H. Imber, The navy of Suleymān the Magnificent, in Archivio Ottomano, vi (1980), 211-82; J.-L. Bacqué-Grammont, Soutien logistique et présence navale ottomane en Méditerranée en 1517, in ROMM, xxviii (1985), 7-34; R. Mantran, La navigation ottomane et ses concurrents en Méditerranée orientale aux XVII et XVIII siècles, in Colloque International d’Histoire Maritime, 1962, 375-91; M. Şukrī, Esfdr-i bahνye-yi Uthmdniyye, Istanbul 1936; F. Kurtoğlu, Türklerin deniz mahalleleri, Istanbul 1932; H. Tezel, Anadolu Türklerinin deniz tarihi, Istanbul 1973; D.A. Encyclopaedia of Islam, VII

Literature on Muslim navigation south and east of the Mediterranean is vast, and only a brief typology combined with a few examples can be attempted here. The most important and directly relevant primary sources are the Indian Ocean/Red Sea/Persian Gulf counterparts of the Mediterranean portolans, the sailing directions by Ibn Māġīd and Sulaymān al-Mahrī discussed in section 3 below. Travel accounts are the next fundamental source; the Muslim ones are relatively few, but Ibn Battūţa's is probably the single most valuable source. European travellers, whose testimony chronologically coincides with the period discussed in this section (13th century onwards) are truly remarkable, not only for their multitudes but frequently also for their power of observation and comprehension of an initially alien world. The earliest generation, in which Marco Polo, Bolognese Ludovico di Varthema and the Portuguese Duarte Barbosa and Tomé Pires (English trs., the Hakluyt Society, 1863, 1921 and 1944 respectively) tower above all the others. Finally, the British, French and Dutch accounts compiled in their 17th and 18th centuries gradually evolved into reports by employees of the semi-official trading companies and eventually of the incipient colonial administrations now often integrated in governmental archives; Alexander Hamilton's A New Account of The East Indies, 1st ed. Edinburgh 1727, new ed. William Foster, London 1930, can serve as an example. Official documents in the archives of European powers have been fairly exhaustively used by historians, but those of Ottoman Turkey, relevant for the period of the Great Discoveries; here, the Bolognese Ludovico di Varthema and the Portuguese Duarte Barbosa and Tomé Pires (English trs., the Hakluyt Society, 1863, 1921 and 1944 respectively) tower above all the others. Finally, the British, French and Dutch accounts compiled in their 17th and 18th centuries gradually evolved into reports by employees of the semi-official trading companies and eventually of the incipient colonial administrations now often integrated in governmental archives; Alexander Hamilton's A New Account of The East Indies, 1st ed. Edinburgh 1727, new ed. William Foster, London 1930, can serve as an example. Official documents in the archives of European powers have been fairly exhaustively used by historians, but those of Ottoman Turkey, relevant for the period of the Great Discoveries, have only recently begun to be studied. Aside from the pioneering essays by Safvet (for example Bir seldanî filosunun Sumatra seferi, in TOEM, i (1937), 605-9, 680), it has been chiefly the late C. Orhonlu (Hent kaptanîğî ve Per Reis, in Belleten, xxxiv (1970), or his Osmanlı imparatorluğunun siyasî Hâbîb eyâleti, Istanbul 1974) and S. Özbaran who have worked on this subject; the latter's concomitant use of Portuguese and other European archival documents (his ongoing research is at this point exemplified by Osmanlılar imparatorluğu ve Hindistan yolu, in Tarih Dergisi, no. 11 [1977]) complements J. Aubin's account of the Portuguese in the 16th century, Cambridge 1938, and A. Madjid [see IBN MADJID], who was also the most prolific and most important writer of such literature has survived in Arabic and Turkish relating to the Indian Ocean.


(S. SOUCEK)

3. In the Indian Ocean.

Naviagation was well developed in the Indian Ocean by mediaeval times, and utilised the regular monsoon winds of that Ocean. These winds and the general shape and situation of the Indian Ocean encouraged homogeneity in nautical matters throughout the whole area, and the techniques of navigation were probably common throughout the Ocean in spite of the different cultures which could be found around its coasts. However, our knowledge of Indian Ocean methods comes almost entirely from Muslim sources, hence it is difficult to generalise. These navigational techniques differed considerably from those used in the Mediterranean, which were again common throughout that Sea, and Muslim sailors were usually conversant with the techniques used in their own sea and were not normally capable of navigating in both seas.

Quite a corpus of Middle Eastern navigational literature has survived in Arabic and Turkish relating to the Indian Ocean, so that we are able to reconstruct easily and in some detail the methods used. The earliest navigational texts to survive are those of Aḥmad b. Māġīd [see IBN MĀḠĪD], who was also the most prolific and most important writer of such
works. He was an Arab from Djulfar, who lived in the second half of the 9th/15th century, and his dated works range from 866/1462 to ca. 1500. About forty of his writings are extant (although not all navigational works were) and he was treated as a rhymist used for mnemonic purposes. His longest poem, the Hāsinya, and his large prose work, the Fawā'id, are mines of information regarding Indian Ocean navigation. Ibn Mādjid was followed by Sulaymān al-Mahrī from Shūrī, who wrote around 917/1511 and died some time before 960/1553. His works are arranged more clearly than those of his predecessor, and deal systematically with theory and with practical results. It is from his works that the principles of mediaeval Arab navigation can be extracted and formulated. The details can then be filled in from the more verbose works of Ibn Mādjid.

Finally, the Turkish naval commander Sīdī Afī Čelebī wrote a work on navigation in 961/1554 entitled al-Muhīt which is a compilation of material translated directly from the Arabic of the two preceding authors (mainly from Sulaymān al-Mahrī). The art of navigation was known as ʿilm al-bahr or al-ʿulām al-habriyya. Arab sailors and ocean pilots (muwallāmān) presumably learned their profession through a long apprenticeship, and much of their art was learned by rote through the medium of ṣadr). It is these poems, written down by the more literary Ibn Mādjid, which form the basis of the surviving literature. Ibn Mādjid then devoted himself to writing navigational poems in kāṣīda and other forms, finally attempting his long prose work as a sort of navigational encyclopedia.

As all the precepts of this art were committed to memory, no actual recording or logging of information was regarded as necessary. No charts of the oceans seem to have been kept; at least, charts are never mentioned by the writers. Measurements were taken, but the only instrument for measurement used was a plate of wood through which a knotted string was threaded. This is called a khāṣaba by Ibn Mādjid and Sulaymān al-Mahrī, and in the Turkish of Sīdī Čelebī, a laute. The khāṣaba was used for measuring the actual altitude of a star above the horizon. (It was set at fixed distances from the eye using the knots placed on the string, and this enabled the height of the plate to measure different angular altitudes. Some models, however, had strings of different length for the different measurements, and some had several differently sized plates. The latitude of the observer could then be estimated from the altitudes of certain stars. Latitudes of well-known ports, as well as the latitude of the observer, were given in terms of the height of the Pole Star (al-Lejāh) above the horizon, and when the Pole Star was out of sight, the Guards of the Little Bear (al-Parkadān) (By Ursae Minoris) were used and after them the handle of the Plough (dhīn Ursae Majoris) (Banū Naʿāṣ). Measurements were taken on many bright stars and often on combinations of stars, and the readings were usually converted to a figure representing one of the groups given above. However, some altitudes like those of the Southern Cross (al-Murūbah) were memorised as they were and not converted.

The khāṣaba originally represented the hand of the navigator held at arms' length and the unity of measurement was a finger (ṣaba) [q.v.]. The standard khāṣaba was four ṣaba wide, i.e. a handbreadth, and this angular distance was known as a khashāba. This art of measurement (kāṣā) of stellar altitudes became very involved. The navigators took into account the variation in the height of the Pole Star at certain seasons (bādi) and many other refinements (see Tibbett, Arab navigation, 312-53).

In addition to the khāṣaba, in the later Middle Ages the Indian Ocean sailors used the magnetic compass [see MAGHNATIS. 2]. At the time of Ibn Mādjid, the compass was so well-known to the ordinary navigator and its use and was so self-explanatory that the texts have very little to say about it. It was known in Arabic as al-hukka, with the compass needle as al-ībra. The latter was re-magnetised by a lodestone (al-maghnīt) [see MAGHNATIS. 1]. One must possibly imagine some form of a rudder, and perhaps with the needle fixed to a pivot card. However, this is by no means certain from the text. The compass rose, known as bayt al-ībra, consisted of a circle divided into thirty-two rhumbs (ākhnān) and these were named after prominent stars whose risings (maṣā'a) and settings (maghīth) were approximately on these rhumbs. Thus each star name was used twice, e.g. maṣa' (Ursa Major) and maghīth (Ursa Minor), the rising and setting of Canopus for SSE and SSW respectively. In addition, the North Pole was kūth al-Djāf (Polaris) and the South Pole kūth Subayl, so that the latter star (Canopus) was used three times in the system. The finer points of compass work, like the recognition of magnetic variation, were hinted at by the Arab authors but were probably circumvented by them in practice. Bearings (maṣā'a) were known for all well-known stars, and as bearings were never read off a chart, magnetic variations would be incorporated into the bearing. As the risings and settings of stars were used for the equidistant rhumb system in conjunction with the magnetic compass, it seems certain that a system based on these risings and settings was used in earlier times before the compass was available. Polynesian sailors used a similar system in much more recent times, and traces of this system occur in Arab classical literature, when al-Masʿūdī speaks of kūth Subayl and al-Hamdānī uses maṣa' (Ursa Minor). Other stars are occasionally mentioned by Ibn Mādjid in connection with bearings, and these may be survivals from an earlier period.

These two components, stellar altitude (kāṣā) and bearings (maṣā'a), enabled the Indian Ocean navigators to find changes of course over the ocean. In the Arab classical literature, when-al-Masʿūdī speaks of kūth Subayl and al-Hamdānī uses maṣa' (Ursa Minor). Other stars are occasionally mentioned by Ibn Mādjid in connection with bearings, and these may be survivals from an earlier period.

Finally, the art of measuring the distance (ṣām) and the difference between practical and theoretical ʿāms was given prominence in the texts. Ṣūqātī was the art of measuring the crew and the passengers, and was regarded as a serious part of navigational practice. Legally, the navigator was responsible for maintaining order and seeing that the ship and its contents, human and material, arrived safely at its destination. Finally, the theory of the monsoon [see MAWSIM] and also of irregular winds was an important part of navigational technique. It involved a knowledge of the calendar, using the stars as a guide, i.e. a knowledge of what the position of the heavens was at any date and time. A corollary of this was the use of the Great Bear as a clock for calling the watches during the night. The calendar was based on 365 days counted
from the new year (Nayruz) which was originally the Sāsānid year of Yazdagird III. However, as this had no intercalation, the Nayruz made a slow retrograde movement through the solar year until it appeared in November in the time of Ibn Mājid and Sulaŷmān. In more modern times, it is reckoned from the date when it coincided with the beginning of the South Arabia-India sailing season and at that date became fixed.

Using this calendar, the navigator memorised the correct times for starting any major voyage so as to coincide with the correct monsoon wind, the word mawdīm being derived from the Arab word used for these sailing seasons, sc. mawṣim, pl. mawṣūms. Mawṣīm was actually the time for setting out on a particular voyage. The navigational texts give long and detailed lists of these mawṣūms, divided into three sailing seasons, one with the north-east wind (ṣiyāb) and two with the south-west monsoon (kaus). There was a closed period (ghalk) during the middle of the kaus season, because of the height of the swell and generally heavy seas. Before this was the awwal al-kaus and after it the dámnī seasons.

How much of the Indian Ocean was covered by this system of navigation, and for how long a period of time, is difficult to determine, as the detailed texts come only from the Arab peninsula shores and from the mid-9th/15th century to the mid-10th/16th century. As shown above, al-Maḏīḏi uses a term common in the navigational texts, and he claimed to have interrogated sailors in the Persian Gulf. These sailors sailed during the heyday of Sīrāf [q.v.] when there was considerable trade between the Persian Gulf and China, and there is no reason to suppose that the same navigational techniques were not used then as were used in the time of Ibn Mājid, except for the use of the magnetic compass (which first appear around 1230 A.D. in the western Indian Ocean). This same tradition could have gone back to the beginning of the Islamic period, because of the height of the swell and generally heavy seas. Before this was the awwal al-kaus and after it the dámnī seasons.

While this work was in the press, an edition of the Arabic texts was prepared by Ibrahim Khouri, *Arabic nautical sciences: navigational texts and their analysis (al-ʿUlam al-bahriyya ʿind al-ʿarab)*, 3 vols., Coimbra 1979. Recently, T. Shumovski has edited manuscripts of Ibn Madjid's *Fawḍūd* and translated the man up as a Mediterranean sailor, was well-acquainted with European methods, although it is doubtful if his work had any influence on Indian Ocean practice. Among other things, the Arabs soon learnt from the Portuguese how to use the sun for navigation. However, there is a gap in Arab navigational literature until the 19th century when the few surviving pilot guides were written, and these are based completely on European guides of the same sort. Surviving examples of Ibn Mājid's *Fawḍūd* were found in the Maldives in the early 19th century and were known there as a *kāmil* and, the same century present-day sources tend to give the impression that the medieval names for the rhumbs. There are little beyond these few traces, and the how captains of the 20th century have forgotten even these, so that Ibn Mājid's methods of navigation have become a lost art.

*Bibliography:* A guide to the publications relating to this subject can be found in G.R. Tibbetts, *Arab navigation in the Indian Ocean before the coming of the Portuguese*, London 1971, General introd. pp. xi-xv. There is also a bibliography of works on the subject, pp. xix-xxvi. This work was based on the manuscripts from the Bibliothèque Nationale given by G. Ferrand, *Instructions nautiques et routiers arabes et portugais*, 3 vols., Paris 1921-8, and those from Leningrad given by T.A. Shumovski, *Tri ni zvestni listet Afhama Ibn Madjadi*, Mosc. 1957, together with a manuscript which is now in the library of the Arab Academy in Damascus.


them into Russian in Kniga pol'z ob osnovakh i pravilakh morshoy nauki, Moscow 1985 (this work contains a full bibliography). Grossot-Grange has also produced Les manuscrits nautiques anciens (Ocean Indien). Considérations relatives à certains termes particuliers, in Arabica, xxvi (1979), 90-9, and Les marins arabes de l'Ocean Indien in Jeune Marine, xlviii-xlii (1983).

4. In modern times.

There exist at least four lists of names of boats of the historical past: Gildemeister 1882, Kindermann 1934, Habib al-Zayyāt 1949 and Darwich al-Nukhayel 1974. The number of the Arabic names for boats ranges from Gildemeister's 40 to al-Nukhayel's 247 [see σάρινα]. It should be noted that these lists were probably put together by combing through the literary sources. Consequently, they do not usually have any mention of technical details, such as tonnage, length, breadth or crew, which might give a clue to what type of vessel is involved. Also, in the second place, these names have no geographical locus and appear to be hard to date; taking into account their number, one might imagine that these names vary according to the place of construction. In this section of the article, the region under consideration is restricted to the seas around the Arabian peninsula, the terminology has been brought into prominence by specialists, and its chronological stretch is, grosso modo, from 1900 to 1980.

The geographical conditions along the coasts of the Arabian peninsula washed by the Persian Gulf, the Arabian Sea and the Red Sea would not appear very much to favour human settlement. In fact, the number of ports there is relatively limited: in the Gulf, Kuwait and Bahrayn; in the Red Sea, there still exist some thirty names, several of which have no geographical locus and appear to be hard to date; taking into account their number, one might imagine that these names vary according to the place of construction. In this section of the article, the region under consideration is restricted to the seas around the Arabian peninsula, the terminology has been brought into prominence by specialists, and its chronological stretch is, grosso modo, from 1900 to 1980.

Boats driven by a motor include: (1) abu bāz (= "having a snout"), a simple but functional transport vessel with a prow which resembles that of a schooner, and which is built at Sur. In the Gulf, Kuwait and Bahrayn; in the Arabian Sea, Maskat and Sūr (saveq); in Sur there are Sur boats which derive from the "launch" (English "launch"), in Kuwait, a motor launch, provided with one or two sails, and employed, though not a great deal, along the Bātina, whereas in the Red Sea, the term is found from ʿAkaba to as far as Ghardaka and Port Soudan; (2) balams and (4) mafrūna, which according to Cifoletti, la terminologia, are large boats with motor drive.

The two generic terms which are most frequently applied to "local" type boats are, for French speakers, sambou and for English ones, dhow. In fact, there still exist some thirty names, several of which refer to types of boat which have at present completely disappeared. Amongst those still in use, two further types may be mentioned, the balam and the badan, as being, in some ways, model types, representing precisely-defined sectors. Balam is a typical ʿIrāqī term for a barque which has both bows and stern pointed in shape, with a flat deck and a capacity of transporting from 5 to 10 tonnes, and used on the Euphrates river. The badan is typical of northern ʿUmān, and is constructed according to two models, one for fishing (badan yayāf), and the other for the transportation of goods and for cabotage (badan sūfār). This is the typical boat with an entirely sewn hull, a procedure which is resorted to in order to avoid damage to the hull in case of a collision with reefs at water level; it is however a procedure which appears to have been completely abandoned at the opening of the present century.


(G. Oman)

AL-MILAL WA ’L-NIHAL (a.), the religions and sects, a division of the stock phrases taken over from the literature known as ‘‘heresiographical’’ (which would be more accurately described as ‘‘doxographical’’), to denote an enumeration of religious and occasionally philosophical doctrines, as well as the various groups or schools which profess them.

The origin of the expression is obscure, and its meaning is imprecise and variable. On the general sense of the first term, see MILA. Al-Shahrastâni claims, in one passage, to establish a distinction between MILA and DIN, the latter signifying religion as such while the former would represent a certain sense of the first term, see MILLA. Al-Shahrastâni, Livre des usul al-nihal (Fruhe arabische text, 9, § 2), and also to al-Djahiz.

As for the ms. of Istanbul mentioned by de Goeje, 4, 11. 2 and 19; 155, 1. Note the usage in the classical period does not seem to make this distinction, seeing MILA simply as an equivalent of DIN or SHARIA, as is attested, inter alia, by various formulae of al-Mas’udi, such as al-gharîya wa’l-milal, al-madhdhib wa’l-milal, al-didâ wa’l-milal (al-Tanbih, ii, 98, 11. 19 (on the Jews); ABL a-milal without further qualification being the Muslims (cf., for example, al-BâkJàliînî, al-Tamhid, ed. McCarthy, 358, 1. 8 and 359, 1. 4).

While MILA is widely represented in the Kur’ân, NIHIL occurs there only once, in the verse IV. 4: wa âdîn l-nisâ’a sadkâtîhanna nihâbîn, and its interpretation is controversial; see especially the commentary of al-Râzi. One of the meanings accepted by the exegetes makes it an equivalent of DIN, DIYAMA, MILA and GHAIRA. The only distinction normally established by the ‘‘heresiographers’’ seems to be that NIHIL is said to be a concept of narrower scope than MILA; AL-NIHIL is said to denote the various doctrinal trends within a particular religion. In any case, this is the sense in which it is quite clearly meant by Ibn Hazm (cf. al-Fisal, i, 98, 11. 19-20; ii, 110. 1. 11, and 111, 11. 2-6 on the NIHIL al-Islâm), the same applies apparently to al-Nâghî al-Akbar, presumed author of the book published by J. van Ess under the title K. Uajil al-nihal (Frühe mu’tazilische Heresiographie, Beirut-Wiesbaden 1971, Arabic text, 9, § 2), and also to al-Dîbiah. al-Hayyini, i, 9, 1. 8, and iv, 206, 1. 12.

The expression ahl al-milal wa’l-nihal is attested in hadith (al-Bukhârî, ghâbâdaa, 29, in a formula attributed to al-Shâbî; Ibn Hanbal, Musnad, iv, 410, 1. 1 and 17), to denote the followers of religions other than Islam, essentially, no doubt, Jews and Christians. Among the works of the Mu’tazilie theologian Dîrâr b. ’Amr, there is mention of a refutation of the ahl al-nihal (Ibn al-Nadîm, ii, 110, 11. 13; i, 215, 11. 3-4).

It is not known how the expression ahl al-milal wa’l-nihal, which hardly seems to have been used before the end of the 4th/10th century, came to be constituted. It is found (for the first time?) in the K. Mâfîfî al-’ulamî, 109, 1. 15, 230, 11. 9-11, 272, 11. 1-2, 326, 11. 20-1, 334, 11. 2-3, 358, 11. 22 ff.) as well as in the Fisal, as well as in the Tafsir asrâm Allah al-husnî, ed. G. van Vloten, 35, 1. 12: al-fasîl al-khâms fî asrâm arba’ah al-milal wa’l-nihal al-mukhtala. Under this heading, al-Dîbiah describes the followers of religions other than Islam, Christianity and Judaism (which form the subject of the three preceding chapters), these being atheists, Buddhists and Brahmins, Sabians, Maz- daeans, dualists of various persuasions and ‘‘sophists’’.

The first work to have born the title of K. al-Milal wa’l-nihal is that of the Abî’îrî theologian and ‘‘heresiographer’’ Abû Muhîîr al-Bâjdâlî [a.e.]. This book, unfortunately, has not been preserved. Albert N. Nader claims to have rediscovered it, following information from the akhbar al-Kuwthari, in an unheaded ms. of Baghdad, which he has published under this title (Beirut, Dâr al-Mâhrikh, 1970); but in the opinion of the present writer, examination of the text shows that this identification is mistaken (see on this point, Gümaret-Monnot, Shahrastani, Livre des religions et des sectes, i, Peeters/Unesco 1986, 11, n. 2).

As for the ms. of Istanbul mentioned by Brockelmann, S. I, 667, this is in fact a copy of the K. al-Fisal of Ibn Hazm (information supplied by S. Yıldırım). However, from various references made to it by al-Bâjdâlî in his K. al-Fard bayf al-furak (ed. ’Abd al-Hamîd, 109, 1. 15, 230, 11. 9-11, 272, 11. 2-2, 276, 11. 20-4, 334, 11. 2-3, 358, 11. 22 ff.) as well as in his Tafsîr asrâm Allah al-husnî (ms. B.L., Or. 7547, fol. 273b, 11. 1-3), it emerges that the work in question dealt with all religions and doctrines without exception: Muslims of all sects, adepts of metempsychosis, philosophers, ‘‘astrologers’’ and other varieties of mulhidîn. The work seems also to have contained (as is implied by Fisal, 334, 11. 2-3) considerations comparable to those of Tafsîr, fol. 253a-253a, concerning dualists, Mazdaeans, Sabians, etc. The fact remains that it is not known exactly what al-Bâjdâlî means by the two words MILAL and NIHIL and how he distinguishes between them.

Well-known, on the other hand, is the work of Ibn
Hazar [q. v. entitled K. al-Fisal fi 'l-milal wa 'l-ahwa wa 'l-nihal. Although the author does not explain the precise meaning of his title, it may be assumed that the first element, al-milal, corresponds to the first part of the book, i.e. as far as ii, 110 (cf. ii, 111 ii. 2: yad akhmad... al-kalam fi 'l-milal), where there is discussion of religions and doctrines other than Islam: 'sophists', Dahriyya, philosophers, Mazadaeans, dualists, Brahmins, Jews and Christians; and that the second element, al-ahwa wa 'l-nihal, corresponds to the second element, from ii, 111, to iv, 227 (cf. iv, 227 ff.), where there is discussion of the religions non-bibliques, in addition of G. Monnot, Les entnts musulmans sur les religions non-bibliques, in MIDEO, add. mention there of the formula arbab al-diyadh im al-milal wa-ahl al-ahwa wa 'l-nihal, which corresponds to the first part al-milal, and al-Safadi mention a work entitled K. Tabakdt al-umam (Cairo ed. Matba at ref. in his K. al-Milal wa 'l-nihal, which deals with heresies internal to Islam.

A disciple of Ibn Hazm, Sā'īd al-andalusī [q. v.], refers in his K. Tabakdt al-umam (Cairo ed. Maṭba'at al-Sā'īda n. d., 18, ii. 15-16), in the context of the religions of the Indians, to a book which he says he has written fi makdès al-milal wa 'l-nihal wa 'l-ahwa of the principality of Menteshe about 730/1330 in Ibn Fadl Allah al-Sā'īd (ed. Taeschner, 21: Jām, corrupted from firak al-Muslimm wa 'l-mushrikin
dualists, Sabians and philosophers), without taking account of the distinction proposed by al-Shahrastani.

It is to these major categories that the two parts of the work correspond: (1) arbab al-diyadh im al-milal (47 ff.), dealing with, in this order, Muslims, Jews, Christians, Muslims, Jews, Christians, Mazadaeans, dualists, labelled as disciples of a "pseudo-Book" šubah kitūb; (2) al-ahwa wa 'l-nihal (639 ff.), where there is consideration of Sabians, philosophers, pre-Islamic Arabs, and then Indians.

In the bibliography of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Dīn ar-Rāzi [q. v.], Ibn Abī Usbā'ī and al-Safādī mention a K. al-Milal wa 'l-nihal, the reference is apparently—although these terms do not appear in it—to a monograph otherwise known, and edited, under the title Kitābdšt firkl al-Muslimin wa 'lmushrīkīn (cf. Fathalla Kohlef, A study on Fakhr al-Dīn ar-Rāzi..., Beirut 1966, 193, no. 38). In an extremely condensed fashion, al-Rāzī deals here successively with the whole range of religions or doctrines (Muslims, Jews, Christians, Mazadaeans, dualists, Sabians and philosophers), without taking account of the distinction proposed by al-Shahrastānī, whose work, in fact, he criticises very severely (cf. F. Kohlef, op. cit., text of the Munāzara, §§ 98-100).

To be mentioned in conclusion is a Kitābdšt al-Milal wa 'l-nihal by al-Zaydī Imām Ahmad b. Yahyā b. al-Murtadā (d. 840/1437), placed at the head of the corpus entitled K. al-Milal, which corresponds, at the head of the second corpus of the same author (and commentary on the first) entitled Ghāyūt al-ğfhr..., a commentary bearing the title K. al-Munṣa wa 'l-firāq fi sharh Kitābdšt al-Milal wa 'l-nihal. The two works have recently been published by Dnawād Maṣḥūr (Beirut, Dār al-Fikr 1399/1979). It is from the second of these, it may be recalled, that there are drawn the Tābaštāl al-Muṣalla, definitively edited by S. Dowid-Wilzer (Beirut-Wiesbaden 1961). Bibliography: Given in the article, with the addition of G. Monnot, Les écrits musulmans sur les religions non-bibliques, in MIDEO, xi (1972), 5-48. (D. Gimaret)

MİLĂS, modern Turkish spelling Milas, in mediaeval and modern Western sources Milaso, Milasos, Melaso, the classical Mylasa, capital of Caria, a town in south-western Anatolia and an important centre of the beylik of Menteşe (see MENTEŞE-EII and MENTEŞE-OGULLARII) in pre-Ottoman times. It lies at an altitude of 60 m./185 feet in lat. 37°19' N. and long. 27°48' E. and is 25 km./15 miles inland from its seaport Gullük on the Gulf of Mendelē (Mandalya Körfesi).

1. Geography and history. Milas lies on a low eastern spur of the Sodru Dagi, here commanded by the once powerful mediaeval fortress of Pech (three miles south of Milas). The bay itself was in the Middle Ages defended by the island citadel of Asin Kalesi (Judæisch, Isak; Athen. Mitt., xv, 139) and later by a castle at the harbour built by Mehmed II (Piri Reis' [Tur. Baṭriyye, ed. P. Kahle, ch. 21).

At Milas met the old, and although difficult, only roads to the west to the important mediaeval port of Balat [q. v. (Miletus), to the north into the fertile plain of Karpuzlu Ovas and Gine and into the Maender valley, a road toward Menteşe, an important town of the district. This, and its protected situation near the sea within a broad fertile plain, destined the town to be once more a capital when the region again attained political independence under the Turkish dynasty of the Menteşe-Ogulları.

The region first passed temporarily under Turkish rule after the victory of the Śāhīds at Mantzikert (1071) and K. al-Milal wa 'l-nihal, the walled town of Milas, which as a church of the eparchy of Caria was in the hands of the monks of the neighbouring Patmos had to leave their monasteries on account of the Turks (in 1079; cf. Th. Wiegand, Milet, iii/1, 185). But Byzantine rule was not restored. It was only when the centre of the imperial government was withdrawn to Constantinople after the victory over the Latins in 1261 that this region finally passed into Turkish hands. When and how the final conquest took place we do not exactly know. Melanudion, which with Milas formed a theme of the period of the Commenei (W. Tomaschek, Zur hist. Topographie Kleinasiens im Mittelalter, in Abh. Wiener Ak. Wiss. 145) Tur-
while Fökeh = Phocaea which appears as a capital in the Genoese report, ibid., 47, is probably an error of the writer and is not to be corrected to Mughla) and in Ibn Battûta (ed. Defrémery and Sanguinetti, ii, 278-80, Eng. tr. Gibb, ii, 428-9) also, who here enjoyed the hospitality of the Akhî [q. e. gîld (on a FatuwwetÊ-nâme written in Milas at the end of the 8th/14th century, see Taescher, in Islamica, iv, 40) and who admires the wealth of the town in gardens and orchards and gives the name of the lord of the country as Shudja Ê-al-Dîn Orkhan b. Menteshe, whom he visited in his capital Pecin, not far away. The Menteşeh-Oghullâr built very little in Milas, as they were engaged in embellishing their residence. It is noteworthy that the two mosques of this period lie outside the old town, still largely enclosed in its old walls; one to the south, in the Hâddi Şîyâr quarter, the little Şâlîh al-Dîn Dâmmî with outer court and stepped minaret, built under Orkhan Bey in 730/1330; the other just outside the walls to the east, the mosque of Ahmed Şâhîz, built in 780/1378, which with its entrance in the narrow side (without an outer court) and the stepped minaret built above it (Ismail Hakkî, Kitâbeler, Istanbul 1929, fig. 47) looks as if it had once been a church (cf. Wulzinger, Die Piruz-Moschee zu Milas, in Feiste. d. Techn. Hochschule in Karlsruhe, 1925, p. 10 of the reprint). The minaret of this mosque is mentioned in 1376, and its Čîvâhâ Kiosk in Istanbul. From the position of these mosques, it may be deduced that the old town remained in the occupation of the Christians, who still held most of it in quite recent times. The only mosque in the old town, just in its centre, and in the highest part of it, the Bûlend Dâmmî, seems also to have been a church and was probably used by the garrison, if it is old. The madrasa of Khodja Bedr al-Dîn, which dates from the 8th/14th century, see Taeschner, in TOÊM, v, 311 ff.), on the site of a church of St. Xene, who died here (Bull. de Corr. Hell., xiv, 616-17).

In late Ottoman times, Milas was the chef-îluÊ-e of the kadîÊ-e of the same name in the vilayet of Mughla, earlier the sanjak of Menteşeh; it is now the chef-îluÊ-e of an îmÊ-lân (a quarter of an îmÊ-lân) in the Çiçekli, Kiosk in Istanbul. Towards the end of the 19th century, Cuinet numbered the town’s population at 9,373 Muslim Turks and 1,930 Greeks, but the SâhîmÊ-yi Aydın of 1326/1908 gave a total population of 7,261, including 3,200 Greeks and 739 Jews. The Greeks were removed in the exchanges of populations of 1922, and the urban population in 1955 was 10,145, which has grown now to 19,188 (1990 census reports, i.e. in the city itself and 67,765 for the surrounding rural area, marking a grand total for the île of 91,387.


2. Milas rugs. A notable product of Milas has for centuries been fine rugs (used in the modern definition of small pile objects, “carpets” being larger ones). They are predominantly village products of medium size, made in the hinterland of the town. The three main types are Ada Milas (“island”, after an off-shore island), Tıhtac (after the Türkmen group called “woodmen”) and Karasawa (after a village to the southeast of the town). Wool, worsted pile or, more rarely, “Turkish” knot is used for the medium-to-coarse pile. Most surviving examples date from the late 18th century, though earlier ones are known, but the largest output was during the middle
to late 19th century. Like other provincial Turkish rugs, including those of Gordes and Bergama, they show the influence of 17th century Uşak and Transylvanian carpets, particularly in the borders of meandering plant ornament. Milas carpets used only plant and geometric ornament, and these are stylised, with flattened palmettes, serrated leaves, carnations and rosettes. A feature of Milas rugs is the choice of soft yellow as the second colour to red instead of the more common blue. Ivory and aubergine are used for detail. “Traditional” floor rugs are distinguished by very narrow central fields, the ovals (,,millet group, or the less common square boxes or “compartments” with wide borders which predominate in late 19th century pieces. A later “Baroque” or “Mediterranean” style is a Europeanised one popularised by Sultan Abd al-Medjīd (1839-61 [p. v.]), builder of the Dolmabahçe Palace in Istanbul. The most distinctive type is the prayer rug, which retains the mīhāb arch and columns of earlier Ottoman prayer rugs but in different detail. The distinctive Milas type has an angular, waisted arch, supposedly derived from the horseshoe arch, on a ground of sharp red, the “columns” made up of floral ornament, and ivory span-drels filled with plant detail. The wide floral borders are generally on a yellow ground.


MILEUS [see BALĀṬ].

MILH (M.), salt.

1. In the medieval Islamic world. In pre-Islamic times, the ancient Arabs were already familiar with salt and used it, not only for seasoning their food but also in certain rites, e.g. for the oath which cemented an alliance, made around a fire (al-Dhībž, Ḥayāna, iv, 472-3; Ibn Kutayba, ‘Uyun, iii, 39; al-Nadjarīm, Ṭamīn, 1924, 30-1; al-Raghib al-Ḥafranī, Muḥādānat, ii, 623; al-Marzūqī, Ankina, ii, 155; cf. T. Fahd, Le feu chez les anciens Arabes, in Le feu dans le Proche-Orient antique, Leiden 1973, 61). But it appears that certain tribes were not able, or did not want, to utilise salt for these rites, Now following their custom, even when the salt used symbolically to seal this alliance was substituted by milk, the latter substance indicates that it was an isolated case (Ibn Kutayba, ‘Uyun, 111, 39; al-Ḥaḏīlīyān, Tīfāb, ed. S. Dahnān, 120, 192, 207; al-Raghib al-Ḥafranī, op. cit., i, 261; al-Waṭwāt, Ghurār, Cairo 1248/1832-3, 448).

As in other languages, the word denoting salt contains several senses in Arabic: not only that of table salt (sodium chloride, see A. Siggel, Gābir, Wiesbaden 1968, 215) but also several kinds of natron and other substances resembling salt. There is found tanners’ salt (milh al-dabbūغ), naphtha salt, smoke salts (milh al-saḵkh), etc. (Ṭabīb b. Ḫurra, ed. Sobhy, 39; al-Waṭwāt, Ghurār, ii, 153; M. Mounin, Mammouth, glossary; Anawati, Droges, 142). The medical qual-

ities of salt, with or without garlic, etc., are well-

known in medical literature and in badīḥat (al-Rāzī, Manṣūf‘al-‘aghdhiya, Beirut 1982, 203; Ibn Kayyim al-

Dāwiyya, al-Tīb al-nabawi, Cairo 1975, 309-10; al-

Rahma fi ‘l-tīb, attributed to al-Suyūṭī, Beirut n.d.,

ch. 85; Sounthier, loc. cit.; and see section 2 below); It is called ‘the king of spices’ (Ibn Kayyim, loc. cit.; it was added to several items of food and used to preserve the freshness of fish and other products (al-

Dhībž, Būkhārā, ed. H. ad-Dājīri, 120; Rodinson, in REI [1949], 141, 152, 154), and mixtures of salt and spices were prepared called milh mutayyab (lit. “per-


Bibliography: Given in the article. See also H. Kindermann, Über die guten Sitten, Leiden 1964, 308-9. (J. SADAN)

2. In medicine. Knowledge of the manifold heal-

ings powers of salt, already praised by Dioscorides, was taken over by the Arabs and enlarged by their own observations. Together with common salt, rock

salt (sībūk), to which probably corresponded Ar. milh su’dun, was considered to be the most valuable. Distinction was also made between salt
smelling of naptha (al-nqfti) and of boiled eggs (al-baydi), the black Indian salt, uric salt (milk al-bawf), the black Indian salt, uric salt (milk al-bawf), and of open wounds after an extraction; the same

removes phlegm from the mouth. solution, if heated, soothes teeth and, used as gargle, important role in dentistry: dissolved in vinegar and

K. al-Tadjribatayn ald adwiyat Ibn Wdfid

crystallised or rock salt (madden tuzu). Based on [q.v.] Mehmed Ashfk distinguishes seven distinct and through export to foreign countries. Although Mehmed 2. The salt trade in the Ottoman empire. Salt was a very significant contributor to Ottoman state treasury revenues, both from taxation (resm-i milh) and through export to foreign countries. Although Mehmed 2. The salt trade in the Ottoman empire. Salt was a very significant contributor to Ottoman state treasury revenues, both from taxation (resm-i milh) and through export to foreign countries. Although Mehmed 2. The salt trade in the Ottoman empire. Salt was a very significant contributor to Ottoman state treasury revenues, both from taxation (resm-i milh) and through export to foreign countries. Although Mehmed

1. nemek-i Efik (Transylvanian rock salt) = 11.8 tons

2. nemek-i Aggyolu (sea salt from the Black Sea coast) = 58.9 tons

3. nemek-i Ko^h^i^s^i^r (lake salt from the central Anatolian salt flats near ^h^e^r^e^l^i^ Ko^h^i^s^i^r) = 2.6 tons

Like other minerals, salt was subject to the assessment of a one-fifth tithe, the khum-i shar'i, and the state typically farmed out the management of salt works to private interests and collected its share by means of the mudâla'a [e.g.] mechanism. However, in order to ensure maximum profitability and productivity of this resource, the government imposed special conditions on the operation of salt works. A detailed description of the terms of leasing and conditions of operation at a salt bed in Zwornik province (Handzâ, in Prilozi..., 171-3) provides a solid framework for analysing state concerns. From this document, we learn that to prevent the works from remaining idle due to lack of sufficient fuel to operate the crystallising pans, the state ensured that the available wood supplies should first be distributed for use on the days devoted exclusively to the production of treasury salt (miri tuz), and only if any surplus should remain was it to be made available for production benefitting the mine workers and shareholders (renjgerân) at the salt works. Furthermore, to prevent loss of revenues due to price competition, government regulations provided that all treasury salt had to be sold first before the shareholders' salt could be put on the market. These measures helped to ensure a regular and steady income to the treasury from its tax-farm leases for salt production. The location and level of production of some of the principal sites in Anatolia and Rumelia as indicated by the akçe-value of one year’s lease of the tax-farm are shown in Tables A and B below.

Table A: Anatolia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Annual Valuation of the tax farm in akçes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Belas (Haleb)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Djabâl (Haleb)</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ko^h^i^s^i^r (Kirg^e^h^e^r)</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sarîkâmîl of Co^r^ûm (Ankara)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Khorkhîn (Sivas)</td>
<td>230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hînîs (Erzurûm)</td>
<td>66,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tûrtûm (Erzûrûm)</td>
<td>84,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Çanîkîr (Ankara)</td>
<td>117,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Batnos (Aydîn)</td>
<td>505,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Pe^fîn (Mugh^h^a)</td>
<td>333,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Karesi province</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total for Anatolia and northern Syria 3,757,099* 

Source: Ba^b^â^c^â^kâ^l^în Arj^i^v, MM 7075, summary tax-farm register for Anatolia and parts of northern Syria for the year 1046/1636-7.
Table B: Rumelia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Annual Valuation of the tax-farm in akçes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akhyolu/Pomorie</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avlonya/Valona</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enez and Kavik (Edirne)</td>
<td>1,901,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Urfan/Orfanı (Selânik)</td>
<td>586,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for the four sites in Rumelia</td>
<td>7,207,501**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Akhyolu—Istanbul, BBA, KK 2024, 127; entry dated 1051/1641. Avlonya, etc.—State treasury budget for the year 1079-80/1669-70; Barkan, in IFM, xvii, 210; notations dated 1101/1690-1.

** cf. the figure of 92,000 ducats (x 50 = 4,600,000 akçes) given in Japoca de Promontorio’s account of 1475 (Babinger, in SB Bayr. Ak. [1956], 68). Note that this earlier figure excludes both eastern Anatolia and northern Syria, which at that time had not as yet been made part of the empire.

The salt works at ‘Urfan situated east of Thessaloniki on the Gulf of Stromonikos (Mostras, Dict. Géographique, 34; Inciciyan, Osmanlı Rumelisi, 37) is also singled out for mention in the Menâzîr al-Tâlibîm, loc. cit., as one of the empire’s most important sources of sea salt, a concentrated form extensively used for both industrial and domestic purposes.

** cf. the figure of 92,000 ducats (x 50 = 4,600,000 akçes) given in Japoca de Promontorio’s account (Babinger, op. cit., 63). Gümüş (in IFM, xxiii, table at 130-1) calculates the composite revenues derived from 27 separate Rumelian and Anatolian mukâfat as, dating mostly from the late 10th/16th century and about equally distributed between the two halves of the empire, as having yielded an annual revenue of 8,387,943 akçes.

Although the combined production of these scattered salt works in the Anatolian and Rumelian provinces was by no means inconsequential, major concentrations of salt lay in areas outside the sphere of direct Ottoman administrative control. Large quantities of salt entered the Ottoman territories via the Danubian ports from Wallachia. According to the data presented by Gümüş (in IFM, xxiii, 115) a yearly quantity amounting to some 4,000 wagon loads of salt entered Ottoman lands as a commodity of trade, and it is known that still further amounts were sent as part of a yearly tribute to the Ottoman sultan, both from the vovodas of Wallachia and from the khâns of the Crimea. According to a document housed in the Istanbul archives (BBA, KK 5024, 122), the annual production of the khâns was set at the level of 40,000 kîles which, using the conversion rate of 32 okkas per kilo or 41 kg, specified in the document, equalled 1,640 tons. Of the several sites in the Crimea which were exploited for purposes of salt extraction, Perekop (Or-kaçî) was the most productive. The vital importance of the salt trade to the khâns as a source of revenue was already noted in the mid-13th century account of William of Rubruck (Hutkays, Soc., 2nd Series, iv, 52), and the continuing large scale of operations at Perekop is indicated in a succession of later sources as well. Ewliya Celebi estimated the value of the state-operated concession at Perekop in the mid-11th/17th century as 10,000 gurush (x 100 = 1,000,000 akçes) (Sevdihat-name, viii, 561), but this clearly only represented a fraction of the total production which was estimated ca. 1900 to have been in the neighbourhood of 759 million pounds or 345,000 metric tons (Rubruck, loc. cit.). A large proportion of this was consumed internally and used for preservation of the fish catch and as an important element in regulating the diet of the sheep flocks, both mainstays of the Crimean economy (on the use of salt to help maintain the body weight of sheep, administered on a regular basis after their return from grazing pasture, see Peysonnel, Traité, i, 172-3; and S. Parkes, A letter to farmers..., 50-2, 66-7). The extent of the export trade in salt in the 10th/16th century may be gauged from the figure of 4,000 wagon loads referred to above. While a “wagon load” constitutes a rather imprecise basis for measurement, and varied from as little as 1,000 to as much as 8,000 okkas, if we take the conservative value of 1,500 okkas or 1,942 tons to represent the average arabâ, and use it as a basis for estimating the proportion of total production destined for export, the 4,000 arabâ figure corresponds to about 7,768 tons, only a small fraction of what was consumed locally. This situation, in fact, matches rather well with what we know of the strictly-controlled system of market distribution, both for salt and for other minerals, which was developed on a similar basis in mining districts known as ânâ (see MA, 3). As was the case with other forms of mining, the method of labour organisation involved registration of elements among the population of villages near the centres of salt production as tuzgâr reţûyâ. For salt production, the labour force was divided, according to the scale of production at each evaporation pond (golet), into work crews of various sizes with 30, 50, 60 or even 80 members, each group under its individual foreman called teârî, each of whom in turn reported to their common administrative director, either a tax-farmer (amîl) or the sultan’s commissioner (emin) (for further details and examples, see Gümüş, in IFM, xxiii, 101-8).

On the celebrated salt mines of Wallachia and Transylvania, we have information dating from a variety of different periods which indicates a continuous, intensive production of salt throughout the Ottoman period. Fichtel’s classic account of the late 12th/18th century refers to the operation of as many as 120 separate mines in Transylvania alone, while from the mines centred around Târgu-Ocna on the eastern skirts of the Carpathian mountains (presumably the same as the “Hosni” mentioned in Peysonnel’s account, i, 188), the annual production of the five principal state-operated mines approached the 100,000 ton mark (detailed figures for the years 1887 and 1888 may be found in Istrati, Steinsalzwerke, ... 423). After the state monopoly (inhisâr) on salt production in the Ottoman empire passed to the jurisdiction of the Public Debt Administration in 1882, a more centralised system of accounting was introduced to replace the system of individual taxfarm leases (mukâfat). Under the new system, the empire was divided into regional and provincial bureaux (mudûrîyet), each of which regularly reported its production statistics to the central office in Istanbul (for a report of one of the roving treasury inspectors (müllüye müfettishî) named Ali Bey on the operations of the salt flats at Đâbâbîl and at Sîrt in the 19th century, see his Sevdihat zhurnall, 6, 15-16). As a consequence of these administrative changes, very detailed and accurate figures are available, both for overall salt production and for the individual mines.
production, and for export destinations in the post-
Tanzimat [q.v.] period. From figures for the first
decade of the 20th century, it appears that, despite the
existence of much greater potential reserves, produc-
tion of salt was deliberately limited to about one-half
of full capacity, presumably in part to maintain a
reasonably high price on the international market. The
regular annual production of all mines and salt ponds
in the empire at this time varied between 230,000 tons
(table in the Ihsd-iyydt-i mdliyye for 1325 A.H., 192-3)
and 300,000 tons (table in Solakian, 83). In contrast
to the situation of the 10th-14th/16th-17th centuries,
a very large proportion of this increased production,
from one-third (Solakian, 3) to almost one-
half (Ihsd-iyydt, 194: 114,000 tons exported out of a
total production of 240,000 tons) was set aside for
export, especially to the Muslim East (on this, see
Ihsd-iyydt, loc. cit.; 114,000 tons were sent to the
Yemen, where production for 1908 was 100,500 tons).

The explanation for this reversal of traditional pat-
terns is clearly to be sought in the compelling
existence of much greater potential reserves, produc-
tion in antiquity and modern times: E.M. Brodd,
The history of salt, with a section on its
geographical distribution, London 1881; W.
Brownrigg, The art of making common salt as now prac-
ticed in most parts of the world, London 1748; J.
von Buschman, Das Salz: dessen Verwendung und Verkauf
in sämtlichen Staaten der Erde, 2 vols., Leipzig 1806-9;
H. Hauser, Le sel dans l'histoire, in Revue economique
de I'Asie Mineure, iii (1927), 270-87; P. Krusch et al., Die
Lagerstatten der nutzbaren Mineralien und Gesteine,
Stuttgart 1923; E. Rockhill, London 1881; M. Edwards,
Fichten, Beitrag zur Mineralgeschichte von Siebenbürgen.

Other important regulations in this collection bearing on
the question of salt production are the following: 1.
Kdnunndme-i iskele-yi Trabulus-i Sham (979/1571),
2. Kdnunndme-i Rodos ve Istanbul (1061/1650), in
Barkan, op. cit., 340; 3. Fethi kdnunndmesi, para. 18, in
Barkan, op. cit., 394; 4. Kdnunndme-i Istankoy, Boma
(1820/1840), in Bankan, op. cit., 399. See also ibid. (ed.),
1079-1080 (1669/1670) malih yilina ait bir Osmanli bâceti,
in IFM, xvii (1955-6), 304-47; L. Gütter, XV-XVII. aslarinda
Osmanlitasalranda engin inisvar ve tuzlarn sininlete
nizami, in IFM, xxii (1963-2), 81-143; A. Handžić,
Zakonski odredba (kanun) o tuzlanskim solanama,
in Prisio za Orientalnu Filologiju, viii-ix (1959-1968), 169-
79 (contains two pages of a document from Tabu defneri,
no. 23, 1947, nos. 155/154), in (R. Murphey)
Miliiana [see Milyana.]
Militia, Military [see DJAYSH; DJUND].
Milk (A.), a legal term denoting ownership.
One must not expect to find in the earliest fikh texts
a definition of ownership. Certainly, the term milk
is found, but forms part of such expressions as fi milkih
"in his ownership", fi ghayr milkih "not in his own-
sHIP" and khdndja min milkih "it left his ownership".
The verb "to own", malaka, is often used, and the
phrase malaka "alaykh is employed when the object
in question passes from one person's ownership into
another's. Ownership (milk) is to be distinguished
from possession (wad). The characteristic feature
of ownership is its perpetual nature. If a tenant or
lessor has only temporary possession, the ownership itself
cannot be the subject of an act of relinquishment (ikdâ
[q.v. in Suppl.]).

The person exercising ownership is the owner or
proprietor. The term milk is very little used; rabb
al-mâl or sâhib is preferred to it.

The object of ownership is the thing taken into
ownership, nusluk. Slaves, landed estates, houses,
etc., can be the subject of this.

Ways of acquiring ownership. The thing, the
object of ownership, can be acquired or become the
property of a person by means of purchase (zinaq),
of a gift (hiba), an act of charity (sadaqah) or of a testamen-
tory disposition (wasiyya).

Confusion between the right of ownership

Bibliography: A. General works on salt pro-
duction in antiquity and modern times: E.M. Brodd,
The history of salt, with a section on its
distribution, London 1881; W. Brownrigg, The art of making common salt as now prac-
ticed in most parts of the world, London 1748; J.
von Buschman, Das Salz: dessen Verwendung und Verkauf
in sämtlichen Staaten der Erde, 2 vols., Leipzig 1806-9;
H. Hauser, Le sel dans l'histoire, in Revue economique
de I'Asie Mineure, iii (1927), 270-87; P. Krusch et al., Die
Lagerstatten der nutzbaren Mineralien und Gesteine, Stutt-
gart 1938; R.P. Multhaupt, Neptune's gift: a history of
common salt, Baltimore 1978; J. Jenquin, Salt,
a study in economic pre-history, in Dissertationes
Archaeologicae Gandenses, vi, Bruges 1961; Das Salz, in
Pauly-Wissowa, 2nd ser., i, 2073-99; S. Parkes, A
to farmers and graziers on the advantages of using salt
in agriculture and in feeding various kinds of farming stock,
4th ed., London 1819; R. J. Schreiden, Das Salz:
seine Geschichte..., Leipzig 1875. B. Travellers' accounts and first-hand obser-
vations on salt production in the Ottoman empire and
neighbouring countries: 'Ali Bey, Seyahat shurnaz, Istanbul 1314/1898; Ehlâyî Celbeli, Seyahat-nâme, 10 vols., Istanbul 1314/1898-1938;
Dewli-i 'Aliyey 'Othmânîyey Müllerî Nezâreti, Ihsd-iyydt-i mdliyye, 1325 senesi, Istanbul 1317/1909; E.D. Clarke, Travels in Russia, Tatarie, and Turkey,
Philadelphia 1811; M. Edwards, Notes on mines in the
Ottoman empire, in Transactions of the Institution of Min-
ing and Metallurgy, xiiii (1914), 192-210; J.E. von
Fichtel, Beitrag zur Mineralgeschichte von Siebenbürgen.

Teil 2: Geschichte des Steinsalzes und der Steinsalzgruben
in Grossfürstentum Siebenbürgen, Nuremberg 1870; J.
Heers, Génes au XV siecle, Paris 1961 (349-36 on salt
production in the Crimea); Iacopo de Promontorio,
Die Aufzeichnungen des Genuesen lacopo de Promontorio
der Campis uber den Osmanenstaat um 1475, ed. F. Bab-
ing, in SR Bayr. Ak. (1956), Heft 8; P.L. Inciciyan-H.D. Andreaeyan, Osmans Pamûrlarî yetâr ve çevrâyats, in Istanbul U., Guney-Dogu Avrupa
ve cografyasi, III, 1980; P. Krusch, Die Steinsalzwerke in Rumâniyen, in Österreichische Zeitbche für Berg und Hüttenwesen, xxviii (1889), 493;
C. Mostras, Dictionnaire géographique de l'empire
Ottoman, St. Petersburg 1873; Claude de Payyse,
Praté de la commerce de la Mer Noire, 2 vols., Paris 1917. William of Rubruck, Journey to the
eastern parts of the world, 1253-1255, tr. W.W.
Rockhill, London 1900 (The Hakluyt Society, 2nd
Series, vol. iv); A. Solakian, Les richesses naturelles et
economiques de l'Asie Mineure, Istanbul 1923.

Archival sources and documentary studies: documents recording the terms of assign-
ment for tax-farm leases on salt from the records of the
milk, mîlik, a legal term denoting ownership.
On this, see Ihsd-iyydt, loc. cit.; 60,000 tons were sent to the
Yemen, where production for 1908 was 100,500 tons).
and the thing or object of ownership. Al-
DjurdjanT defines the term milk thus: “It is a legal
and the thing or object of ownership. Al-
da thing (shay^)
and
a thing (ittisdl shar^i)
which allows that person to dispose of
between a person
which has become ownership. More-
more,
milk
thing. The difficulty arises in effect from the fact that
in Islamic law, a piece of property can only be cor-
poral and material, and a thing which is not con-
sidered to be a piece of property cannot be the object
of an act of disposition. This is the reason why claims
are not transmissible. By a kind of legal fiction, cer-
tain departures from this principle are admitted in
practice. Hanafi law, for example, allows ownership
of a tenure. On the other hand, the term milk is some-
times applied to an obligation (dayn [q. s. in Suppl.]).
In any case, the ideal of ownership (milk) predomina-
tes over that of obligation (dayn), and in certain texts,
one even reaches a point where the obligation is reduced
to a kind of ownership whose object is a piece of property
taken in a figurative sense (mal hukmi).

Bibliography: Chaïk Chehata, Études de droit musulman, Paris 1973, DjurdjanT, Ta'refiz, 100; Mäwardi, Add al-kifid, i, 229 no. 340.

(A.M. Delcambre)

MILLA (a.), religion, sect.

Although the Arab philologists claim this term as a na-
ively arabo-latin word (cf. Nödeke, in his Givv, lxi
[1903], 413), their explanations are so farfetched as to
render it almost certain that the term stems from
Hebrew and Jewish and Christian Aramaic milla,
Syrian mullii “utterance, word”, translating the
Greek logos. It does not seem to have any pre-Islamic
attestations, hence may have been a borrowing by
Muhammad himself. In the Kur^an, it always means
“religion”. It occurs fifteen times, including three
times for the heathen religions (VII, 86-7/88-9; XIV,
16; XVIII, 19/20), once for the religion of the Chris-
tians and Jews (II, 14/15) and twice for the religion
of former prophets (XIV, 6, and ? XXX八年, 6/7).
The word acquired a special significance in the Medinan
period, in which the Kur^an speaks no fewer than
eight times of the “religion of Abraham”; the mullah
Ibrahim [see IRAHIM] (II, 124/130, 129/135; III,
89/95; IV, 124/125; VI, 162/161; XII, 38, XVI,
124/123; XXII, 77/78). Islamic literature follows this
Kur^anic usage, but the word is not in frequent use.
With the article, al-milla means the true religion
revealed by Muhammad and is occasionally used
eliptically for alhi al-milla, the followers of the Islamic
religion (al-Tabari, iii, 813, 883, 4); just as its op-
posite al-dhimma is an abbreviation for alhi
al-dhimma, the non-Muslims who are under the protec-
tion of Islam; e.g., Ibn Sa'd, iii/1, 238, 21; cf. also
the derivative milla opposed to dhimmi, client (al-Baybak,

In more recent and modern Arabic, milla still
means “religion, confession, religious community”;
although the word is largely obsolete; but in Persian
and Turkish, it has undergone semantic change. In
modern Persian, milla means “people, nation” and the
adjective from it, milli, means “national”. In
Ottoman Turkish, milt [q.v.] became a technical
term and came latterly to denote the internally-
autonomous religious groups within the Ottoman

empire (Jews, Armenians, Greek Orthodox, etc.); but
in 20th century Turkish it has come rather to mean (as
in Persian) “nation, people”, with milti meaning
“nation”, milliye meaning “nationality” and miltiye7
“nationalist”.

Bibliography: Ṭabari, Glossary, p. CDXC; Snouck Hurgronje, Het Mekkaanse Feest, Leiden 1880, 30 ff.; T. P. Hughes, A dictionary of Islam, Lon-
don 1885, 248-9; Th. Nödeke, Orientalische Skizzen,
Berlin 1892, 40, Eng. tr. Sketches from eastern history,
London 1892, 38 A. Jeffery, The foreign vocabulary of the
Qur^an, Baroda 1938, 268-9; B. Lewis, The polit-
tical language of Islam, Chicago and London 1988,
38-9, 41-2, 131-2 n. 27. See also AL-MILAL WA L-
NIIHAL.

(F. Buhl [C.E. Bosworth])

MILLET (Tkish. rendering of A. milti [q.v.])
indicates religion, religious community, and
nation. These three basic meanings of the term were
used in the Ottoman empire concurrently until the
Taizim period and afterwards.

(1) Religion, confession, rite. In the Kur^an, milla
is largely identical with din and in fact only to be
translated with “religion” (R. Paret, Der Koran Kom-
mentar und Konkordanz, 30-1). The term occurs here
most frequently as the millat Ibrahim, “the religion
of Abraham”; i.e. “the only true, monothestic
religion” and less frequently as the religion of the
heathens; only rarely does it indicate the Christian
and Jewish religions (in contrast with the confession
of Muhammad, 120). For further details, see milla.
No example in the Kur^an suggests the translation of milti as “congregation, people, nation”.

In post-Kur^anic usage, milti/millet/millat (the latter
being the Persian form) appears in the meaning of
“religion” or has this as its sole legitimate meaning.
Whenever al-milla (with the article) indicates “the
followers of the religion (of Muhammad)” (e.g.
al-
Tabari, iii, 813, 883), it is used as an ellipse for ahli
al-milla [cf. milti]. Documentary evidence for this is
found in a decree of Talâ'î, a vizier of the Fatimid
Caliph al-Fâ'iz, dated 393/1158, al-milla wa l-dhimma
stands here for “Muslims and non-Muslims” (S.M.
Stern, Fatimid decrees, 76 ff.). Milli/millet/millat is the
(Kur^anic) meaning of “religion, confession, rite”
and is still recorded in the 19th century. The term appears
here primarily in the language of official documents,
such as those of the Ottoman empire and neighbour-
ing Muslim states, including Mamluk Egypt and
^Satavid Persia, and in particular, when they are
intended for (prominent) Christians (and occasionally
Jews). Such documents are not necessarily limited to
the international correspondence between states; they
can also originate from internal administration.
For example, a letter of Kâ‘it Bây to the Doge Nicolò
Trono, dated 10 Sha°ban 877/10 January 1475, is
addressed to the “Glory of the Christian religion”
(magii al-milla al-mashriqya), an expression which, in
the contemporary Venetian translation, is rendered
by “Honor de la fede de christiani” (J. Wansbrough,
in BSOSA, xxiv/2 [1961], 204-5). A permit for the
Carmelites of Isfahan of 1052/1642, issued by Šâh
‘Abbâs II, speaks of the Pope as “Chief and leader
of the followers of the Christian religion” (mukaddam wa
mukadda-yi ta^ri^an-i millat-i mashriqya) (H. Busse,
Unter-
suchungen zum islamischen Kanzleiraumen,
191). In a
hukum, containing the answer to a petition of the
Armenians of Istanbul and dated 1108/1697, the
dhimmi (whose names are listed) are said “to have
abandoned their old customs and to be now ready to
follow the papal rule” (kadimi âylerl^in terk sdb^a popa
millietine mi-baabat eyledikleinden) (A. Refi^ [Altunay],
Istanbul hayatı 1100-1200, 21-2, no. 34). Parallel to papa milled, the same text uses firenk medhhebi with the same meaning of "this shining, radiating confession". Fekete-Lorenz's translation of millat by "people" does not seem acceptable, because the meaning "religion, confession" (see Sandwänd, quoted above) can also be based on lexicographical sources of approximately the same period. Bernardo di Parici, for example, in his Vocabulario Italiano-Turchesco (1665) renders millet with "religion", and milllet-il-mesihyye with "religione di Christo" (this was followed by Meninski and other lexicographers, see B. Braude, Foundation myhti, 72). The formula kudawt imera2 el-millet el-mesihyye, often used and enlarged upon in Ottoman chancellaries at the reception of high-ranking Christians, is translated by Zenker with "Model of the chiefs of the Christian religion" (J. Zenker, Türkisch-Arabisch-Persisches Handwörterbuch, 876). Examples of early usage of this formula are found in a firmân and a niğâh of Bâyazid II, both of 891/1486, for Mara Branovkó, stepmother of Mehmedmed II (see Belkov, in Hilendarski zbornik, v, 208 f.; however, he interprets millat as "people") is still part of the formula used in a berât for the metropolitan bishop of Manastir (Bitola), Gerasimos, of the year 1249/1833 (see P. Dzambazovski (ed.), Turski dokumenti za makedonskata istorija V (1827-1839), 71, no. 230). It should be pointed out here that the expression millet-il-mesihyye is also the equivalent of "Christianity", and not only in documents originating from Ottoman chancellaries. A document to be dated before November 1650, issued by Islam Giray III, ruler of the Crimean Tatars, and addressed to the Polish king, mentions John Casimir IV as "the noble ruler of the entire Christianity" (bara millet-il-mesihyyen ulugh padishahi; T. Geml (ed.), Relațiile Tătălor Române cu Poarta Oтомan în Documente Turcesti 1601-1712, Bucharest 1984, 274-8, no. 125 f.). (2) When millet is mentioned in the meaning of "religious community, community of the same confession or the same rite", the question whether those who are designated in this way are (Ottoman) dhimmis is important in view of the discussion around the so-called millet system. For, on the one hand, this system is traditionally understood as being the structural framework which was destined specifically for the Ottoman dhimmis whereas, on the other hand, it has been maintained that millet, in one of its traditional meanings, indicated "the Christians outside the (Ottoman) empire", and that it was not typically used to indicate the ahl al-dhimm specifically until the 19th century (Braude, Foundation myhti, 73-3). It has rightly been pointed out that millet may very well also denote the Islamic religious community. But it is not correct that, before the beginning of the period of reform, the notion has been used in Ottoman-Turkish sources mainly in the meaning of "the community of Muslims" (Braude, op. cit., 79). The documents from the mukimme defterleri of the divân-i hümâyün, published by Reffk in Istanbul hayatî, which are informative for the Ottoman practice, rather bear witness of the opposite. Wherever the term millet is used here in the meaning of "religious or confessional community" (at least fifty times in eleven documents dating from before the beginning of the Tanzmâni: 1689-1785, nos. 34, 194, 223, 224, 249, 264, 265, 268; 1786-1839, nos. 20-2), it refers invariably to non-Muslim subjects of the Ottoman empire (Greek Orthodox, Armenian and Roman Catholic Christians as well as Jews with the status of dhimmis). A few examples may illustrate this. In the above-mentioned document of 1108/1697, the activities of Latin missionaries are described as follows: "they travelled from province to province and instigated the Greek Orthodox, Armenian and (many) other Christian religious communities to give up their former practices and to submit to the Latin rite, while sowing discord and trying to persuade them from the right path" (sizdet sizdet getik gerek Rum ve gerek Ermeni ve gerek sair milletleri nasayı idal ve tisâde kadi midem ayinlerden dindarâr firenk mezhebin mâhiat itdirâr). The formulation used here proves that, at least to the end of the 17th century onwards, the Orthodox and Armenian religious communities, comprising Ottoman dhimmis, were known as millets to the Ottoman authorities in the capital of the empire, or at least to the inditer of the document. Even if this document does not indeed give information about whether and to what extent such a millet was already understood as being an empire-wide corporation (i.e. as a religious community holding the same status throughout the entire empire and as such deserving the same protection everywhere), yet such a claim is already clearly expressed here by part of the members of the millet, namely the Armenians of Istanbul, who request the same position, and consequently the same treatment, as was given to their co-religionists in the province of Tarabulus al-Shám.

In another document from the mukimme defterleri, dated 1591/1746, the millet-i Ermenyan is already designated as an empire-wide religious community (menalti mahrušed saxet millet-i ermenyan) (see Reffk, op. cit., 160 ff., no. 194). In the same mukimme defterleri, the Greek-Orthodox millet is mentioned as millet-i Râm for the first time in a document of 1170/1757 (ibid., 183 ff., no. 223; other examples of millet-i Râm/Rûm millet-i Râm in 184 ff., no. 224, 205-6, no. 249, 219 ff., no. 264, 227 ff., no. 260), while the notion Tâhir millet-i (religious community of the Jews) (and Katolik millet-i, religious community of the Roman Catholics) occurs here only in 1255/1839 (Reffk, 31 ff., no. 22). Towards the end of the 18th century, the Ottoman fiscal administration even used the collective notion of "the three (non-Muslim) religious communities" (millet-i üçlîye, see Y. Cezar, Osmanlı maliyesinde bunahm ve degerim dönemleri, 185). Evidently, Muslims cannot be meant here, for the subject is the dyes on alcoholic beverages (zelgîye). The term thus can refer only to the Orthodox, Armenian and Jewish millets, and should be considered as an indication that the notion millet had become an accepted element in the administrative language of the central bureaucracy to indicate the non-Muslim religious communities of the Ottoman empire before the 19th century had even begun.

On the analogy of the above-mentioned communities of Ottoman dhimmis of the same confession, musta'mina of the same nationality, living in the Ottoman empire under the Capitulation Treaties, have apparently been indicated as both a tâ'ife and a millet [see İMYAYAAT]. Even non-Muslim religious communities who did not live (or no longer lived) under Islamic rule, such as the Kipâk Turkish-speaking Armenians in the kingdom of Poland, occasionally indicated themselves and others as millets or as tâ'ife (D. Deny, L'Arménien-Coman et les "Ephémérides" de Kamieniec 1604-1613, 62: Ermeni
MILLET

milleti [for Ermeni millati]). They also indicated "nations" or "peoples" with these terms, e.g. Oladhi milleti "la nation valaque (ici: moldave)" (ibid., cf. Noma propre, 85 ff.: Alans, Syrian Christians, Abyssinians, Hellenists, Indians, Medes, Persians and Egyptians were all designated as millets).

This use of the term may have been influenced by the notion of nations in the Middle Ages, if milieu is not simply the translation of natio. This observation leads to a third use of the term.

(3) Millet in the meaning of "[sovereign] nation, part of a people". In various Ottoman documents of the period between 1652 and 1687, the so-called Transylvanian "three nations", called Madjar, Sigel and Saz in the Turkish sources, are indicated as the ul millet. Here are meant "nations" as the term is used in the context of estates whose delegates, together with the ruler of Transylvania, represented the territory which was a vassal state (Erdel [q. v.] in Turkish) of the Ottoman empire, until it was officially annexed by the Ottomans in 1691 (Gemil (ed.), op. cit., 40, and nos. 126, 175, 178). Millet in the meaning of "peoples under direct Islamic rule" occurs in translations from western languages.

In the Turkish translation of a document issued by George Rażoczy I, Prince of Transylvania, dated 4 Raglağ 1046/24 December 1636, the peoples of the "lack of a central administration" are designated as (O)nlmusul milletleri (ibid., 233, no. 101). In the Turkish text of the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca (1774), the European nations (i.e. England and France) which, like "a sovereign nation in the enemy's territory". The rebellious Serbs who, as Ottoman reşâyâ, had risen in armed revolt against Ottoman rule, were also considered as harbis (memleketeri dâr ul-harb ve kendiileri harbi, in Manastır sigilli, no. 82, fol. 27a, dated 24-ul-i Şafe 1222/10-19 April 1807), because they had forfeited the protection which had been granted to the "lack of a central administration" peoples. Sometimes later, the Porte commented upon this by saying that the Serbs had claimed to form a "separate nation (baş-kodja bir millet) with Belgrade and the other fortresses and fortified places under their own control, with Kara Yorgi as chief of all of them" (S. Kemura, Prsi Srpski Ustanak pod Karajgorjem, Sarajevo 1332/1914, 314). In the official correspondence with the Bosnian governors after the Peace of Bucharest (28 May 1812), published in Kemura's work, the Serbs are indeed more often than not mentioned as "the Serbian nation" (srb milleti) (ibid., 313-25), and it is repeatedly emphasised that one should try at any price to bring the Serbs back into the "râ'îyet relationship. After this had been realised, the same documents, inasmuch as possible, speak only of "Serbs" (srbiu or srbi râ'îyes), "Serbian rebels" (srbi 'uvalet) or "Serbian traitors" (srbi khaunesei). As in the case of the Serbs, the Porte began to speak of the rebellious Greeks of the Peloponnesus as "nation, group of people" (millet) only after it had become clear that the "treaty of protection" (dhamma) had to be considered as definitely retracted. In November 1827, one-and-a-half years after the fall of Missolonghi, representatives of the Porte indignantly stated that the Greeks "by having deserted upon the frontiers established by the "râ'îyet relation, finally had begun to call for (the status of an independent) group of people (millet)" (hadî-n râ'îyeti teşfîge eni millet dar'eçwâsme 'Ibâd, Ahmed Lutfi, Ta'rîkh, i, 330) (quoted after the Ottoman text of the minutes of a confidential discussion between the Porte and the representatives of the great powers in the office of the Re'is Efendi on 5 Çumârîdî 1243/24 November 1827. This text contains important information about the way the Ottomans understood millet before the beginning of the (Rûmânija) have to be considered...
viewpoint of the central authorities. It is perhaps permitted to interpret the material provided by Refik's *Istanbul hayâlât* in such a way that the term *millet* was given the above-mentioned meaning only after the religious regulations of the empire became increasingly threatened by the intensified missionary activities from the West in the 17th century. The consequence of the latter may have been that the central government, as the guarantor of the existing order, saw itself more and more forced to interfere in extensive parts of the empire in order to protect the traditional religious communities (for the missions of Jesuits, Lutherans, Calvinists and Anglicans in the Ottoman empire, and the attitude of the Porte towards them, see S. Runciman, *The Great Church in captivity*, 226-319). It is conceivable that the idea of describing as empire-wide *millet* traditional religious communities based on identity of confession may only have emerged in the course of the development of this kind of empire-wide "religious policy" of the Porte.

**Bibliography:** An extremely informative collection of sources for the use of the notion *millet* in Ottoman administration is Ahmed Refik [Altınyal]‘s work in 4 vols. on life in Istanbul: vol. i. *On altıncî əzîrda Istanbul hayâlât (1553-1591)*, Istanbul 1917; vol. ii: *Hicrî on birincî əzîrda Istanbul hayâlât (1000-1100)*, Istanbul 1931; vol. iii: *Hicrî on ikinci əzîrda Istanbul hayâlât (1200-1209)*, Istanbul 1950; vol. iv: *Hicrî on üçüncü əzîrda Istanbul hayâlât (1200-1255)*, Istanbul 1932 (reprint of all four volumes, Enderun Kitabevi, Istanbul 1988, under slightly different titles). The most comprehensive and critical discussions on the notion and the phenomenon of *millet* are found in B. Braude and B. Lewis (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire. The functioning of a plural society*, New York-London 1982, in particular, Braude, *Foundation myths of the Millet system*, i, 69-88, containing the severest criticism so far of the traditional concept of the Ottoman millet system. From the point of view of legal history, serious doubts of the traditional interpretation, overlooked in the above-mentioned discussions, had already been formulated by H. Scheel, *Die staats-rechtliche Stellung der orthodoxen Kirchenverbande der alten Türkei*, in *Abh. Pr. Ak. Wiss.* (1942), Phil.-hist. Kl., no. 9, Berlin 1943. (M.O.H. Üssünus)

**MILYANA,** Miliana, a town of Algeria, situated 56 miles/9 km to the southwest of Algiers. It is built on a raised plateau at an altitude of 2,361 ft./720 m. on the side of the Zakkar Gharbi (3,179 ft./1,579 m.) and dominates to the east and south the valley in which an important river, the Chelif, flows and drives numerous mills. The comparative freshness of the temperature and the abundance of flowing streams support a rich vegetation. The town itself is surrounded by gardens and orchards cultivated by the indigenous people, whilst European colonists raised on the nearby slopes vines with notable products.

Miliana has grown up on the site of the Roman town of Zucchabar, whose ruins were still visible in the time of al-Bakrî and of which some traces, noted by Schaw in the 18th century, still existed at the time of the French occupation. The actual town dates from the 4th/10th century, its foundation being attributed by al-Bakrî to the Sanhadji chief Zîrî b. Manâd, who assigned it to his son Buluggîn. The same author mentions it as a prosperous, well-populated town, well-supplied with foodstuffs and with a well-frequented market. Al-Idrîsî records the many streams there and the fertility of the surrounding countryside. After the fall of the Hammadid dynasty, Miliana passed into the power of the Almohads, who was temporarily occupied by 'Abî and Yahyâ b. Ghânîyâ, and then was, for a century and a half, disputed by the Hafsjids, the 'Abîd al-Wâdî of Tlemcen and the Marfînîs.

In the 9th/15th century, Miliana, together with Mêdîa and Ténès, formed part of an independent principality founded by a Zayyânî pretender, it became once again dependent on Tlemcen when this pretender's son brought together under his own control the united principality. Nevertheless, Leo Africanus states that the inhabitants enjoyed a virtually complete independence. But they lost this when the Turks arrived, for *Arûdî* [q.v.] seized control of Miliana soon after the capture of Algiers. Under the Turkish rule, the town came within the dâr al-sulûf, sc. the territory directly administered by the Pasha of Algiers. Various Turkish officials resided there, one of them having the job of going round the tribes each year and extracting taxation with the aid of troops specially sent for this task from the capital. After the capture of Algiers by the French, Miliana was for a while independent, and was then occupied in 1834 by 'Abîd al-Kâdir [q.v.], who installed there a bey. The French in turn took control of the town on 8 June 1840, but were closely blockaded within it by the amîr's partisans until 1842, when operations conducted in the western part of the Mitidja, in the district of Médéa and in the Chelif valley, assured freedom of communications.


*MîM,* the twenty-fourth letter of the Arabic alphabet, transliterated as *m* with the numerical value of 40 according to the eastern order [see *ABDîD*].

**Definition:** occlusive, bilabial, voiced, nasal (Cantineau, *Études*, 28; Fleisch, *Traité*, i, 58). For Sibawaih (*Kitâb*, ii, 454), its place of articulation is situated between the lips; it is an "open sound" (*maghab*), emitted from a base in the mouth and the nasal cavities (*khaydshim*), where nasalisation (*ghunna*) is produced; it is also a "hard sound" (*shadîd*), by means of which the sound (*sawt*) is transmitted. As for al-Khâlîl, he calls this letter "occlusive" (*mutbik*), because it closes the mouth when one articulates it (*K. al-‘Ayn*, 65). For Ibn Sînà, the place of articulation of *mîm* is partly between the lips and partly the nasal region, so that the air, when it passes through the nasal cavities and the open space there, produces a humming sound (*sawt*). (Roman, *Étude*, i, 265).

In phonology, the phoneme *m* is defined by the oppositions *m-f, m-b* and *m-n* (Cantineau, 167).
Alterations: in final place in a word, -m in Semitic tends to pass into -n in Arabic. Between the final place in a word and the initial of the following one, one finds either the assimilation -mb>bb or its disappearance (ikhfd) leaving just nasalisation. Before a dental, palatal or velar, one has the assimilation m>n. In the neighbourhood of a nasal n or m of the bilabial u, one finds the dissimilation m>b (Canteneau, 29-30; Fleisch, i, 74, 80, 94).


MIME, MIMIC [see HIKĀYA].

MIMIYYA [see MUHAMADDIYYA].

MINA, later often pronounced Minā, a place in the hills east of Mecca on the road from it to ‘Arafā (q.v.). The distance between the two is given by al-Mukkaddasi as one farsakh, while Wavell calls it five miles and says the continuation to ‘Arafā is nine miles. Minā lies in a narrow valley running from west to east, 1,500 paces long according to Burckhardt, surrounded by steep barren granite cliffs. On the north side rises a hill called Thābir. Travellers from Mecca come down into the valley by a hill path with steep steps in the ‘imārāt of Minā (also called a pillar and lastly at a similar distance the third (the so-called “first gāmrā”)). As one approaches the east end of the valley, there is on the right of the road a square mosque surrounded by a wall, the Masjiid al-Khayf, which was rebuilt by Śalāḥ al-Dīn in 874/1467 reconstructed by the Mamlūk Sultan Kāthīr Bey. Along the west side of the surrounding wall is a colonnade of 168 pillars, but there is none on the other sides. It was different earlier, for Ibn Rusta (ca. 300/912-13) tells us that the mosque had 168 pillars, of which only 78 supported the west wing. The north side of the wall is pierced by several doors. In the centre of the court of the mosque is a little domed building with a minaret built over a fountain. There is another dome over the colonnade on the west side.

The most striking feature of Minā is the very great difference, noted already by al-Mukkaddasi, between the quiet and empty streets of the greater part of the year and the tremendous throng and bustle of the pilgrimage month when, as Wavell says, half a million people with heavily laden beasts of burden hope to cover nine miles in the period between sunrise and 10 a.m. Every spot in the valley is then covered with tents in which the pilgrims spend the night. Al-Mukkaddasi talks of fine houses built of teak and stone in the neighbourhood of the countless animals sacrificed. In the minaret building with a minaret built over a fountain. There is another dome over the colonnade on the west side.

The circumcision must have contributed to prevent a permanent settlement of the town, which is also true of other places on the pilgrims' route, namely the incredible filth and dreadful stench which is caused by such masses of humanity at the Ḥaḍidj. Complaints are made, even of the cleanliness of the Masjiid al-Khayf, and at Minā there are further the decomposing remains of the countless animals sacrificed.

The Ḥaḍidj ceremonies in Minā date back to the old pagan period [see ḤAḌĪDĪ], for Muhammad, as usual in taking over old customs, contented himself with cutting out the too obviously pagan elements, the result being that we can no longer reconstruct the old forms with certainty. The old poets make only passing references to them [see ḤAḌĪR], that they were similar to the Muslim practices is evident, for example, from an interesting passage in the Medinan poet Khays b. Khāṭīm (ed. Kowlakis, no. 4, pp. 1 ff.), where there is a reference to the “three days in Minā” and where we further learn that the festival held there offered an occasion for entering into and carrying on love-affairs. The stone throwing is certainly a very ancient; its significance is quite unintelligible in Islam, although it is doubtful if there were already three heaps of stones in the pre-Islamic period [see ḤAḌĪR]. It is also clear that the ceremonies in Minā formed the conclusion of the Ḥaḍidj even in ancient times. Muhammad, however, made some serious alterations here, for he inserted a visit to Mecca before the stay on Arafāt and deprived it of its importance by saying that all Minā is a place of sacrifice: a clever procedure which he also used in the case of ʿArafāt [see ḤAḌĪR].

According to the law of Islam, pilgrims who arrive in Mecca on 8 Dhū 'l-Hijādja should leave this town in time to be able to perform the mid-day salāt in Minā and remain there till sunrise on the 9th and only then go on to ʿArafāt. The majority, however, do not do this but go on the 8th straight to ʿArafāt where they arrive in the evening. After performing the ceremonies of the pilgrimage in ʿArafāt and Muzdalīfa [q.v.], they go before sunrise on the 10th to Minā to celebrate the day of the great sacrifice (yaum al-adhā or yaum al-nahr) (in contrast to the pre-Islamic practice, which was to start only after sunrise). Here the concluding rites are gone through, the slaughtering, the clipping of the hair and nails and the lapidation. There is not complete agreement on the order of these ceremonies, which one tradition (al-Wakīdī, tr. Wellhausen, 429) makes Muhammad declare to be quite irrelevant. The modification of the stone throwing is noteworthy, for on the day of sacrifice it is only done at the ʿAkabah heap, while on the three following days each pilgrim daily throws seven little stones on all three heaps (see Burton, ii, 205). The conclusion of the whole pilgrimage is the three Minā or taḥGR, the 11th, 12th and 13th Dhū 'l-Hijādja [see MuṣR]. They are days of rejoicing which are celebrated with great jubilation, illumination and the firing of shots. All the pilgrims, however, do not wait for these three days but set off on their return journey before then.
MINA — MINĀ

In contrast to this relative proliferation and differentiation in Arabic, bandar remained the only widely used term in Persian; on the other hand, Ottoman Turkish, in addition to liman and bandar, also used iskele, a Mediterranean word that has been used both in the general sense and for designating the specific landing place rendered in English as pier, wharf or quay (thus Mehmed II orders Yūnus to go to the iskele [of Istanbul] and sail with ten ships to the liman of Enoz [Enez]; cf. 'Aṣāṛī-Pasha-zāde, Taʾrīḥ, ed. F. Giese, 135-6; see also A. Tietze and A. Kahane, The lingua franca in the Levant, Urbana 1958, no. 801 (liman), no. 841 (iskele); the broader meaning approached the connotation of Arabic furda, as in Ewliya Čelebi, Seyhâne-nâme, ix, 803, Mekke 'in iskeleli Qaddедин “Djudda is the port of Mecca.”

(b) Historical survey. A general distinction can be made between the Islamic ports of the Mediterranean basin and those on the other side of the isthmus of Suez. The harbours of the Mediterranean often displayed a sophisticated building technique, a bequest of their Phoenician or Roman past: those of the Syro-Palestinian coast, the prime examples, found their counterpart in the Egyptian; the entrance was further protected by a chain stretched at will, especially at night, between the two towers. In contrast, the ports south and east of Suez lacked such features and were as a rule natural bays or inlets, coastal or island anchorages, or river estuaries: Ubulla, Sirāf, Subāb, Aden, Djudda, for example, although some of them did have fortifications protecting their rearward. This absence, in comparison with the Mediterranean, of naval warfare in those seas until the arrival of the Europeans and Ottomans in the 16th century.

It is worth nothing that this dichotomy, which antedates Islam, was reinforced and received a special character due to the confrontational nature of the Islamic and Christian halves of the Mediterranean; Muslims displayed a lasting reluctance to frequent Christian ports as cargo shippers and traders, whereas Christians seldom suffered from reciprocal inhibitions (in this respect, a fatwa given by a fakih of Mahdiyya in 484/1091-3 is significant; see H.R. Idris, La Berbere orientale, 664). In eastern waters, on the other hand, no religious confrontation of such magnitude and nature occurred, and Arab and Persian Muslims kept sailing, chiefly as merchants, to India and East Africa. As a result, a number of harbours along the western coast of India became regular ports of call of these Muslims, some of whom proceeded further east to the ports of Malaya and Indonesia, a penetration that proved of capital importance for the eventual Islamisation of those regions.

1. The ports of Arabia. The ports of the Arabian peninsula—from 'Ummān in the east to those of Hijāz in the west—were those from where the Arab seafaring tradition had issued well before the appearance of Islam. It was at the same time an international tradition: Persians, Ethiopians, Indians had a share in Damascus, and has a fine harbour”.

Moreover, marṣā is attested in the Kurʾān, XI, 41, in the passage Ḳubāb fiḥā bismi ‘l-Lāhi maḏрафa wa-mursda = “Embark in it! In God’s name shall be its course and its berthing.”

In the order to stay in Minā during the “nights of Minā”; Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca in the latter part of the 19th century, London 1931, 74-5, 96, 241.

In the eastern part of the Mediterranean, the enemy fleets. Inner harbours often had a special entry gate formed by guard-towers on either side; the entrance was further protected by a chain stretched at will, especially at night, between the two towers. In contrast, the ports south and east of Suez lacked such features and were as a rule natural bays or inlets, coastal or island anchorages, or river estuaries: Ubulla, Sirāf, Subāb, Aden, Djudda, for example, although some of them did have fortifications protecting their rearward. This absence, in comparison with the Mediterranean, of naval warfare in those seas until the arrival of the Europeans and Ottomans in the 16th century. It is worth nothing that this dichotomy, which antedates Islam, was reinforced and received a special character due to the confrontational nature of the Islamic and Christian halves of the Mediterranean; Muslims displayed a lasting reluctance to frequent Christian ports as cargo shippers and traders, whereas Christians seldom suffered from reciprocal inhibitions (in this respect, a fatwa given by a fakih of Mahdiyya in 484/1091-3 is significant; see H.R. Idris, La Berbere orientale, 664). In eastern waters, on the other hand, no religious confrontation of such magnitude and nature occurred, and Arab and Persian Muslims kept sailing, chiefly as merchants, to India and East Africa. As a result, a number of harbours along the western coast of India became regular ports of call of these Muslims, some of whom proceeded further east to the ports of Malaya and Indonesia, a penetration that proved of capital importance for the eventual Islamisation of those regions.

1. The ports of Arabia. The ports of the Arabian peninsula—from 'Ummān in the east to those of Hijāz in the west—were those from where the Arab seafaring tradition had issued well before the appearance of Islam. It was at the same time an international tradition: Persians, Ethiopians, Indians had a share in
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MINA (a.), port, harbour.

(a) The term. Arabic minā has been little used in either Persian or Turkish, although it is routinely listed in their dictionaries (thus J.W. Redhouse, A Turkish and English lexicon, 205; F. Steingass, A comprehensive Persian-English dictionary, 1364; ‘Ali-Akbar Dihkhuda, Lughat-nāma, Tehran n.d., s.v.). In Persian, the standard term is bandar [q.v.], in Turkish, liman. Bandar was widely used in Ottoman Turkish and, in later centuries, also in Arabic (thus Ibn Batūṭa, iv, 89, in reference to Kālīkūr, has Ḥab‘l-banādīr al-‘izām; Ibn Mādjid: bandar Qaddāda, in G. Ferrand, Instructions nautiques et routiers arabes et portugais des XV et XVI siècles, Paris 1921-23, i, fol. 78b; S. de Sacy, Chrestomathie arabe, Paris 1827, iii, 132, in a late 18th century reference: bandar Maksūt).

Minā itself is attested since the 3rd/9th century (al-Balāsī, Fawā'id, ed. Mudnijjādī, 151; al-Yaḥṣūbī, Buldān, 327), and appears to be of non-Arabic origin, derived either from the accusative of the Greek limen (Nōdeke), or from ancient Egyptian; if the latter is the case, the word would have entered Arabic either via the above-mentioned limena, or directly through Egyptian’s Coptic stage (M. Lubetski, The early bronze age origin of Greek and Hebrew līman, “Harbor”; in JQR, n.s., ixels [Jan. 1979], 58-68). The non-Arabic origin of minā is also suggested by the hesitancy of classical Arab authors whether to treat this word as a masculine or a feminine, and whether to write it with or without a hamza. Moreover, a passage in Nāṣir-i Khusraw’s Safar-nāma, ed. Wazīnpūr, Tehran 1350/1971, 20, shows that the term was new to this other author likewise familiar with Arabic, and that he understood it to denote a special type of harbour along the Syro-Palestinian coast, the region where the bor-
rowing is believed to have taken place.

Minā has become the comprehensive term for both nuances expressed by the English words “port” and “harbour”, at the expense of the classical terms marṣā, furda and marṣa, of which the first two were common in the early centuries and expressed the two nuances: marṣā (as well as minā) referring more specifically to the maritime aspect implied by “port”, furda to the economic function implied by “harbour” (thus Abu ‘l-Fidā’ī, Tawāín, 248: Bayrūt furda Dimāḵṣ ... wa-lahād minā dqālī = “Beirut is the port of
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it as well. Persian participation was the strongest; some of the basic Arabic maritime terminology is of Persian origin, and Persian was the language of one of the principal ports of 'Umân in the 'Abbasîd period, Suhrâ [q.v.]. To quote the 4th/10th century geographer al-Mukaddasî, "The language of this province (i.e. 'Umân) is Arabic except in Suhrâ, where they speak Persian; the majority of the people of 'Adan and Djudda are Persians [too] but [now] they speak Arabic..." (96). The Arab mariners of Suhrâ and Maskat, as well as their companions from the ports of the southern coast, acquired a remarkable skill at exploiting the seasonal monsoon winds for voyages to India and East Africa.

The ports of Arabia were connected by caravan routes with inland market towns such as Mecca, or by coastal shipping with ports in the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea. These market towns and ports in turn often functioned as relay ports for goods that ultimately reached the Mediterranean ports of the Syro-Palestinian coast and Egypt. At the height of the prosperity of Trâk in the 'Abbasîd period, however, the Persian Gulf ports rose proportionately in importance and some of the Orient trade passed directly to Sirâf, Ubulla and Basra; at other times, Aden may have been bypassed by ships that proceeded directly to Djudda. However, both the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea were fraught with navigational problems and danger, different from those of the Indian Ocean, and it seems that except for the three centuries of 'Abbasîd prosperity, during which Baghâdîd and Basra resembled magnets attracting "China ships" to their outposts of Sirâf and Ubulla, most of this long-distance ocean traffic preferred to use the more familiar termini along the coast of 'Umân, Hadramawt and Yemen. In the later Middle Ages, Aden [see 'Adan] became the most important transshipment port for the Orient trade, much like Alexandriâ did for Mediterranean trade. The two ports, linked by a combination of local maritime, overland and river connections, functioned in tandem as the two termini of the Spice Route, the maritime counterpart of the transcontinental Silk Road. The heyday of Aden's supremacy coincided with the Fatimids, Abbasids and Fātimids periods, but both ports were already in the early 'Abbasîd centuries. Hence, 'Ya'kûbî (319) mentions it as "the port of the China [traffic] ships"; al-Mukaddasî (97), describing its trade, speaks of the wealth of its merchants much as other contemporary authors do of the wealth of those of Sirâf [q.v.], stating that "the wealth of its merchants has become proverbial." Aden may have been the most international of Arab ports. Its principal direct partners overseas were the ports of India, and Indians as well as Egyptians seem to have formed a sizeable proportion of Aden merchants, judging from Ibn Bâjûtha's description (ii, 177-9). Another important segment of the business people of Aden in this period were Jews, who stood out among all others on account of their far-flung connections from Europe to India (S. D. Grottier, A Mediterranean society, see Bibl.).

Baghâdîd and the Persian Gulf. Basra, founded by Muslims in 17/638 on the order of the caliph Umar b. al-Khattâb, lay some 4 farsakh (about 24 km) west of the Šatt al-îrâb (Ibn Hawkal, 235), with which it was connected by two canals, the Nahr al-Ubulla on the south and the Nahr al-Ma'kul on the north. These two, issuing from the Šatt, formed a semi-circle and met at the vicinity of Basra, ramifying into a network of smaller canals that criss-crossed the city. The two principal canals were affected by the tide and ebb which, if expertly exploited, allowed sea-going ships of lesser tonnage to reach Basra's harbour quarter of al-Kalâ'â (Abu 'l-Fidâ', Tabarîn, 57; Ibn Hawkal, loc. cit., and map on p. 20; this map shows a third canal to the south of the Nahr al-Ubulla, not mentioned in the text). The large merchantmen did not proceed to Basra but stopped at Ubulla, situated on the Šatt's western bank, or at Sirâf on the Persian coast; these two ports were the termini of the ships that came from India and China (al-Ya`kûbî, 323, 365; 'Abd-al-Tâbârî, i, 2384). Islamic al-Ubulla was the classical Apologos, the port of the maritime merchant kingdom of Mesene or Chattareae [see MAYSAN], thus suggesting a continuity in the role played by the Šatt in long-distance maritime and caravan trade. The importance of Sirâf, despite the obvious convenience of Ubulla as a place of trans-shipment closer to Basra, may be seen in two factors. One was the difficulty of approach and entry into the Šatt's estuary. Even ships facing head winds for Ubulla were first of all treacherous shoals, whose avoidance was sought by means of wooden scaffoldings, the khugha (kha). Some distance offshore, with guards and fires lit at night forewarning the arriving ships (al-Mas'ûdî, Muraqqu'd, i. 230 – 242), the other danger was a whirlpool (kha) near the Šatt close to Ubulla's harbour itself, where many ships met their doom until an 'Abbasîd princess reportedly solved the problem, at her own expense, by dumping large quantities of rubble on the site (Ibn Hawkal, 237). The other reason for Sirâf's prosperity was its additional function as a terminus for caravan routes linking it with Shirâz and other centres of Iran's interior.

The fact that large sea-going ships could not proceed beyond Ubulla was no obstacle. Goods were transferred on to smaller craft that could reach not only Basra but also Baghâdîd and even proceed further north; in any case, the river harbour of al-Kalâ'â on the eastern side of Basra was paralleled by the caravan quarter of al-Mîrîbad [q.v.] on the west, just as the river harbour of Baghâdîd was near the place where the Tigris communicated with the Euphrates by means of the 1îsà canal. All these factors combined to form an interdependent network of maritime, river and caravan routes between Sirâf, Ubulla, Basra and Baghâdîd, playing an essential role in the vast dimension of East-West trade. Classical Arab historians and geographers recorded this in their works, e.g. al-Tâbârî, who makes the caliph al-Mansûr, while founding Baghâdîd in 145/762, assess the role of its location in the following manner; "This is the Tigris: there is no obstacle between it and China; everything that is overseas (lit. "in the sea") comes to us by it. And the provisions from al-Djazira and Armenia and from what lies beyond them come to us [here]. And this is the Euphrates: everything from Damascûs and al-Rakka and from what lies beyond them comes to us by it" (iii, 272).

The first three 'Abbasîd centuries thus witnessed the primacy of the Persian Gulf ports as the great stages on the route that linked the Islamic Near East and the Mediterranean with the Orient; it was at this time that Muslim ships may have sailed as far as China itself. Khânfu, usually identified as Canton, was the Far Eastern terminus of these Muslim mariners and merchants of Sirâf, Ubulla, Basra and Baghâdîd, while Sirâf may have been the regular port of call of their Chinese counterparts, if this is how we are to understand the marâkh al-i'nîyya of the Arab authors of the period. This remarkable direct connection between the ports of the Islamic Near East and China has not only been duly recorded by Muslim historians and geographers (J. Sauvaget, Abîl ar-Rîm 
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... the prevalent use of the Nile as part of the route goods were unloaded at such Red Sea ports as Ax-elbáb or Kusayr, transported by caravans to the river ports of Aswan, Kús or Kuná, and thence carried on barges to the Mediterranean coast; in addition, the ports at the northern end of the Red Sea (Kulzum and its successor Suez, Tur, Ayla) were also used. The fact that the westernmost branch of the Nile did not extend to Alexandria never prevented it from overshadowing the ports at the estuaries—Rosetta, Damietta, Tinnis. The reason for this was the vastness of Alexandria’s two harbours, as well as other factors such as the canal that branched off at Fuwwa and connected the Nile with Alexandria; this canal, intermittently silting up and being dredged and repaired, may have been used as a waterway during the Nile floods, as in the early centuries (Ibn Hawkal, 140), but later, judging from the testimonies of European travellers, the standard mode of transportation between Alexandria and the Nile was the short overland march to the Rosetta estuary. Overland transportation on pack animals to points further south or to Cairo itself became exceptional: the cheapness of water transport (thus Nasir-i Khusráw, 55, where he states that one river barge carried a load equivalent to that of 200 mule-loads), combined with the difficulty of fording or crossing the numerous canals of the Delta, especially in the flood season, led to the almost exclusive use of the Alexandria-Rosetta route.

The harbours of Alexandria were a product, as in many other cases, of both natural and man-made features, but the former predominated. A narrow peninsula, protruding northward, had a tip that extended eastward and westward, thus creating two large and somewhat sheltered bays: these were the sites of the two harbours of Alexandria, the eastern and western (see for example Pirí Reıs, Kitáb-i bahriyye, 700-3, and map on 704-5). The western side of the eastern harbour was the main international port and the only one accessible to non-Muslim ships; the western one, also called Old Harbour, was reserved for Muslim ships. The famous lighthouse built in antiquity, that stood on the peninsula, still evoked the marvel of classical Arab geographers and gave rise to such legends as that of the magic mirror, but it was ruined by the time of Ibn Batútá’s second visit in 1349 (i, 30). The Mamlúk sultan Kârî Bây built a guard-tower on the ruins of this lighthouse in 877/1472-3, and the Ottoman sultans Selîm I and Süleymân the Magnificent further fortified it and equipped it with heavy cannon (Ewliya Celebi, Seyyid-nâme, x, 691).

At the height of Alexandria’s prosperity, William of Tyre (1130-86) calls it “the mart of the two worlds,” and states that “all the aromatics, jewels and other precious objects that Europe lacks are brought from the two Indias, from Saha, Arabia, the two Ethiopias, Persia and neighbouring countries, by sea and by the Nile to Alexandria...” (Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum, in RHC, i [1844], xix, 26,27). The sultan’s customs house levied various types of taxes on ships, goods and passengers, and the inspection of both in- and outbound traffic was thorough, without much distinction between Christians and Muslims, or merchants and pilgrims; judging by such testimonies as Ibn Qudawayr’s, who passed through this port in 579/1183 (Rihla, 40-5). The revenue to the sultan’s treasury must have been considerable, but the
scattered nature of the reports makes it difficult to form a consistent picture; thus in 703/1303 a Frankish ship paid 40,000 dinārs' duty on its cargo; in the entire year of 721/1321, the revenue was 50,000 dinārs; a governor in the 9th/15th century assessed Alexandria to be worth 1,000 fraini (dinārs) a day [see AL-SIKANDARIYYA]. In any case, customs revenues were only one part of the asset to Egypt represented by Alexandria as a port; the main benefit rested in the role it played for trade and economic activity in general. Moreover, at least in the initial centuries of the boom characteristic of the later Middle Ages, the ships owned by the sultan as well as by other high officials on a private basis also participated in this trade. Traffic between Alexandria and the main ports of Christian Europe, however, appears to have been assured chiefly by Christian merchants and ships. Moreover, the principal trading partners such as Venice, Genoa, Marseille or Barcelona established permanent commercial missions and facilities usually referred to as fondacchi (fonduks [q.v.] in Arabic) in Alexandria as well as in some other Muslim ports. The goods passing through Alexandria were of various kinds, but the single most important article was spices from the Orient on the way to Europe; an always coveted type of imports from Europe was strategic materials such as timber, iron, pitch and wax—all subject to frequent papal interdictions and exemptions. Importation of slaves, chiefly from the Pontic and Caucasian regions via Turkey, also figured prominently. Furthermore, a special and lasting type of traffic through the port of Alexandria was that of pilgrims, both Muslim and Christian. Muslim pilgrims from the Maghrib often arrived by sea to Alexandria and thence proceeded on the Nile to such rurally ports as Kūs or Aswān, the Overland to Kusayr or ʿAyyādhāb in order to cross over to Ḍjudda, the port of Mecca; others crossed lower Egypt to Kulzum, and from there they either continued overland or again embarked and sailed to Ḍjūr or Ḍjudda. Christian pilgrims, although they more commonly sailed to Jaffa or other ports closer to Jerusalem, also often passed through Alexandria: this applied especially to those who added a visit to Mount Sinai or their pilgrimage to Jerusalem was of the lasting type of traffic through the port of Alexandria. Thus in the 11th/17th century, Ewliya Čelebi describes Alexandria as a large port frequented each year by some three to four hundred Frankish ships, and as a place where there reside consuls of several (lit. "seven") [Christian] kings (Sevāḩāt-nāme, x, 678-9; Ewliya's description of Alexandria, 668-707, is especially thorough and informative).

The discovery of the Cape route proved fatal to Alexandria's pre-eminence as the foremost port of East-West trade, but this happened only gradually; moreover, Alexandria did retain some importance in all respects, and only the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 may be considered as the terminal date of this port's function as a hub of transit trade and travel. Thus in the 11th/17th century, Ewliya Čelebi describes Alexandria as a large port frequented each year by some three to four hundred Frankish ships, and as a place where there reside consuls of several (lit. "seven") [Christian] kings (Sevāḩāt-nāme, x, 678-9; Ewliya's description of Alexandria, 668-707, is especially thorough and informative).

Cairo functioned in combination with Alexandria. Rosetta, Damietta and Tinnis as a river port, not unlike Bāghdād in combination with Bāṣra, Ubbulla and Sirāf. This function shifted in the Ottoman period to Cairo's suburb of Būlāk, whose role is vividly portrayed by such observers as Leo Africanus [q.v.] and Ewliya. According to the former, one could sometimes see as many as one thousand barges in the harbour of Būlāk, and a certain number of the sultan's customs offices were stationed there (Description de l'Afrique, tr. A. Épaulard, Paris 1958, 508-9). Ewliya Čelebi mentions it as a port whither converge goods "from the seven climates", which is annually visited by ten thousand ships of various kinds, and where there is the sultan's arsenal; moreover, the records and administration of the traffic passing through other Egyptian ports such as Damietta, Rosetta and Aswān were located in Būlāk. Ewliya also states that there were in Būlāk 73 lāhāt belonging to rich merchants who had partners in India, Yemen, Europe and Turkey (Sevāḩāt-nāme, x, 291-4). Nevertheless, Būlāk did not really function as a full-fledged maritime port in the proper sense of the word; all the evidence suggests that most goods were transferred at the Rosetta or Damietta estuaries on to such river craft as djergins for further transport.

Other busy ports of Egypt's Mediterranean coast were Rosetta [see RASHID], Damietta [see DIMYAT], and Tinnis [q.v.]. Rosetta, long a military port, became open to foreign shipping only towards the end of the Mamluk period (Heyd, ii, 428-9; see Bībī; for the Ottoman period, see Ewliya, Sevāḩāt-nāme, x, 707-16). Damietta declined after the 7th/13th century, when Crusaders' attacks and Mamluk counter-upstream, did continue to function as a port, even though goods had to be hauled from ships anchored at the estuary by means of small boats (for the Ottoman period, see Sevāḩāt-nāme, x, 737-45). Tinnis, situated on an island in Lake Menzala connected with the Damietta branch of the Nile, also functioned as a port; Nāsimi Kušraw mentions as many as 1,000 ships mooring there (Safaī-ṭūnāma, 50). Tinnis, however, eventually disappeared because of repeated attacks by Christian warships and pirates.

A special case was that of al-Faramā (or al-Farmā), the ancient Pelusium, which still functioned as a port in the early Islamic centuries. Its location on the coast due north of al-Kulzum [q. v.] offered the shortest overland connection between the Mediterranean and Red Seas. Al-Faramā is singled out by Ibn Khurradād-bih (153-4) as the port used by the Rādhiyya Jewish merchants, who arrived there from western Europe (Firandja) with their goods and transported them across the distance of 25 farsāds to al-Kulzum; there, they re-embarked and sailed to Ḍār, the port of Mecca; from there, they re-embarked for India and China. Likewise on their return trips, they brought oriental goods to al-Kulzum, transported them to al-Faramā, and re-embarked for western Europe or Constantinople. Al-Faramā, however, ceased to function by the end of the 4th/10th century, in part due to the drying-up of the Pelusiac branch of the Nile.

4. The ports of the Syro-Palestine coast. The ports along this coast can be divided into three groups: those in the south that communicated mainly with Jerusalem, those in the middle that connected with Damascus, and those in the north that served mainly Aleppo. The principal ports of the southern group were Ḍhaza (q.v.), Ṭskalkān and Jaffa [see YΑΦΑ]; of the middle group, Acre [see AΚΡΑ], Tyre [see ΣΥΡΟΣ], Sidon [see ΣΑΙΩΝ], Beirut [see ΜΙΣΥΡΙ], and Tripoli; of the northern group, Lādikjīyya, Tartūs [q.v.], Antioch [see ΑΝΤΑΙΧΙΑ], Iskandarūn [see ΙΣΚΑΝΔΑΡΥΝ] and Payas. Coastal roads also linked these ports with each other and with Egypt and Anatolia at the two ends. It was here that Muslims initially and lastingly came into contact with the Mediterranean Sea, although this contact received a traumatic upheaval during the two centuries of Crusaders' principalties. It is difficult to single out any one of these ports as surpassing the others in importance, but certain general trends can be discerned. Jaffa stood out as the Jerusalem-
bound pilgrim's port. The role of Damascus as one of the major inland termini of that part of the Spice Route which proceeded from Aden or Dhu dda northward through Arabia instead of swerving, across the Red Sea, to Egyptian ports, enhanced the role of the ports of the middle groups such as Beirut, Tyre and Acre. In the Ottoman period, the northern group gained prominence; this was due to the growth of Aleppo as an entrepôt of long-distance trade resulting from the renascence of the Persian Gulf and Iran routes, as well as to the proximity of the route from the Ottoman capital to Aleppo and Bahrain.

The fate of the above-mentioned inner harbours of many of these ports displays an evolution characteristic of much of the Islamic Mediterranean. Those of the inner harbours which relied on manufactured structures such as walls in the sea declined, because that technology, chiefly of Roman origin, gradually became forgotten; an example of this process is cited by al-Mukaddasi in his description of Acre (162-4). He narrates how Ahmad b. Tūhin (234-70/688-84) wished to have the breakwater wall of Acre strengthened, but was told that architects expert in such techniques no longer existed; eventually, one—the geographer's own grandfather—who still knew the art, was found. On the other hand, harbour fortifications flourished throughout the Islamic period: the 'Abbāsid caliph al-Mutawakkil (223-47/837-61) had a whole series of Mediterranean harbours further fortified, in order to counter devastating raids by Byzantine fleets. The inner harbours continued to decline, however, and judging by Piri Reis's Kitāb-i bahriyye, by the 10th/16th century most were silted up or accessible only to small vessels.

5. The ports of Firīksa and the Maggrib. Both historical continuity and dramatic change due partly to external circumstances marked especially these ports. Continuity was dominant throughout the Middle Ages, when such ports as Bougie (Bidjawa), Tunis, al-Mahdiyya, and Tripoli functioned much as their direct or indirect predecessors had done since antiquity, namely as commercial ports, naval bases and centres of pirate activities. Commercial links with the Islamic East and the Mediterranean basin intensified the dominant feature, despite the above-mentioned confrontational nature of the two sides of the Mediterranean. The change occurred in the 10th/16th century, when the transformation of Algerians, Tunis and Tripoli into corsair principalities, nominally subordinate to Istanbul as qālīs but in fact independent [see Kurša], reversed that order and made the confrontation the chief theme. The purpose was again economic, but the religious zeal of these initially Turkish maritime ghāzis played a catalytic role in the formation of the three principalities.

In Umayyad Spain, both its economic prosperity and the need for a war fleet stimulated the development of busy ports, especially on the Mediterranean coast. Almeria (from Martyyyat Badjdjana, or just al-Mariyya [q.v.]), the principal naval base and site of the caliph's arsenal, was also the busiest commercial port; its overseas connections included Alexandria and the ports of the Syro-Palestinian coast; ships sailing between it and Alexandria often did so directly without stopping (Goitein, A Mediterranean society, i, 302). From among the other ports, that of Denia [see Danyya] deserves mentioning as the seat of the principality of Mudjādih [q.v.], whose maritime ghāzeh in the 5th/11th century presaged the formation of the Turkish principalities in North Africa about a millennium later. Finally, Cordova and Seville, both on the Guadalquivir, played some role as river ports. The gradual completion of the Reconquest eventually put an end to the functioning of all these harbours as Muslim ports, a situation not without effect on the configuration of Muslim shipping in the Mediterranean.

In conclusion, one general observation can be made in respect to the ports of the Islamic West. In comparison with those of the eastern Mediterranean, they played a secondary role. The reason may be sought in the fact that those of the East occupied a vital position on the hub of long-distance East-West trade, travel and, eventually, European expansion. The ports of the West, on the other hand, fulfilled only a local role, however important it often was; the trans-Saharan movement of gold and slaves through these ports never approached the magnitude of the Orient trade.

6. The ports of Turkey and of the Black Sea. In pre-Ottoman Anatolia, the ports of the south and north coasts had a significant share in transit trade that linked the Pontic regions of Russia, the Caucasus and Inner Asia with the Mediterranean and Europe. Mention should also be made of Tarsus [see Tarsus], the principal naval base of the ‘Abbāsid caliphate in the Mediterranean during its first three centuries. That role, however, was extinct by the time much of Anatolia entered the Dar al-Islām through Sālājid conquests. It was under this dynasty that Alanya and Antalya, with south coast rapids, became connected by caravan routes with Samsun and Sinope on the north coast; the latter two in turn had as their main partners the ports of Suđuk, Kefe and Tana (Aşağı in Turkish, present-day Azov) on the north side of the Black Sea. Laçazzio (Ayas in Turkish; the site, on the north-western coast of the bay of Ikserduren, is marked today by the settlement of Yumurtalik) and Trebizond, longer in Christian hands than the others, played a parallel role and also received a greater share of the Silk or Spice Routes traffic coming from Central Asia or from the Persian Gulf. Among the goods passing through the ports of the Black Sea, slaves from southern Russia and the Caucasus were the most valuable and constant commodity; this trade lasted well into the Ottoman period and played a role in the Turkish and European trade with the entire eastern Mediterranean as well as toward other countries, including Italy.

The ports of western Anatolia such as Balat, Ephesus, Izmir or Foça played a relatively secondary role in pre-Ottoman times. The dramatic rise of Izmir (Izmi 'q. v. in Suppl.) to a position of primacy in the Levant and possibly the entire eastern Mediterranean occurred only toward the end of the 10th/16th century. This prosperity, which peaked in the 11th/17th and 12th/18th centuries, was partly due to the above-mentioned renascence of the Persian Gulf route, for which Izmir became one of the Mediterranean outlets; another cause seems to have been the hitherto underestimated economic strength of 11th/17th century Anatolia itself. Izmir functioned as the terminus of a latter-day silk route, or silk-and-mohair route, for the silks from Iran and mohair from Anatolia formed a valuable portion of exports to Europe. Ewliya Celebi mentions large and frequent caravans that kept arriving from Iran, and ships from a whole gamut of European countries that called regularly—some 1,000 ships annually. The inner harbour had long silted up, but the large bay offered a comfortable anchorage. A European merchant colony became permanently established in Izmir to the point where one would think one found oneself in Frengistan. The Franks had their own quarter along the harbour waterfront, and small boats handled the loading and unloading of goods, for large ships had to anchor some distance off
shores (Seyahat-name, ix, 96-7). From among the European merchants, consular representatives and visiting ships, those of England, France and Holland were the foremost: the supremacy of Italian and Catalan ships about the shores was by then a thing of the past. As for the Ottoman subjects, alongside Muslims, an active role was also played by Armenians, Jews and Greeks.

While Izmir was the principal international port of Ottoman Turkey, Istanbul [q. v.] as a port functioned mainly as the receiving end of a traffic designed to sustain the imperial capital. This alone sufficed to make it, mainly as the receiving end of a traffic designed to sustain the Ottoman subjects, alongside Muslims, an active role was also played by Armenians, Jews and Greeks.

... earned international shipping; the southern side with its part in fact extended along the Bosphorus, served as a point of departure on their further sailings to such ports as Aden, Zafar or Hormuz (Ma Huan, Ying-yai sheng-lan, "The survey of the ocean's shores" (1433), tr. Feng Ch'eng-chun, Cambridge 1970 (Hakluyt Society, Extra series, xlii, 151-71). Ibn Batūta sailed in April-May 1347 from Kālikūt to Zafar (iv, 310-11); and it was at Kālikūt that Vasco Da Gama, reportedly guided by the Arab pilot Ibn Majid [q. v.], arrived in 1498, after having crossed the Indian Ocean from the East African port of Malindi [q. v.].

The final group of important harbours of the Islamic world begins by Atjeh [q. v.] of Northern Sumatra and extends through the archipelago all the way to Sulawesi (Celebes). Their Islamisation had begun by the time Marco Polo and Ibn Batūta sailed through these waters in the 13th and 14th centuries, and was well-nigh complete when European penetration and colonisation started gaining momentum in the 16th and 17th centuries. In northern Sumatra, the ports of Pedir, Lamuri (Lambrī), Paséi and Perlak were among the earliest exporters of spices and recep-tors of Islam. They were by the 16th century eclipsed by Atjeh, the chief port and capital (also known in the latter capacity as Kutaraja, a name that reveals the older pre-Islamic Indian influence) of a sultanate whose prosperity and might rested on spice—mainly pepper—exports and piracy. Atjeh lay at the northern tip of Sumatra; across the narrowing strait further south, the port of Malacca [q. v.] became the seat of a sultanate on Malaya peninsula. Like the ports of Sumatra, Malacca was useful as a relay station along the strategic passage through the strait of Malaysia on the route to other Indonesian ports such as the pepper-exporting port of Bantam at the western tip of Java, and to China. In early ʿAbbāsid times, a role similar to that of Malacca had been played by Kalah [q. v.] further north near the narrow neck of the peninsula (Sauvaget, AKBHAR, 8, 43).

Once converted, Indonesians and Malays became fervent Muslims, and such ports as Atjeh served as the principal gateways on their pilgrimage to Mecca, and in general as the points of communication with the centres of Islam further west. The rise of Atjeh in the 16th century coincided with two dramatic developments in the Indian ocean: the arrival of the Europeans, and the attempts of the Ottomans to stave off the consequences of that event. One quaint result of this clash was an embassy sent by the third sultan of Atjeh, 'Abbāṣ al-Dīn Ri'yāṭ Shah al-Kahhar (1573-71) to Istanbul in 1573/1574, requesting military aid from Sūleymān the Magnificent. Eventually, a fleet of nineteen vessels left the Ottoman naval base at Suez.
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but most remained in Yemen. Two ships did reach Atjeh, however, and delivered cannon and other ammunition as well as gunnery experts (Saffet, Bir 'Oğlunun filolounun Sunatça sefere, in TOEM, x [Oct. 1911], 580-19; i [Dec. 1911], 678-83).

9. Khafnû and Zaytun. These two ports, identified with Canton and Ch'ien-chou (the latter located at the level of Taiwan), never came within the Dîr al-Islâm, but their special role as the Oriental terminus of Muslim sea-farers and traders should allow us to include them in this discussion. Ibn Khuraradâbih, 69, mentions Khafnû as the greatest market (port of call) of China. Al-Mas'ûdî (Munâqî, iii 302-3 § 329) statements that Khafnû lay on a river which was the destination of ships coming from Başra, Siraf, Umân, India and other countries, and adds that there lived in Khafnû colonies of Muslims, Christians, Jews and Zoroastrians. One of al-Mas'ûdî's sources was the above-mentioned Aḥkhâr al-Sin wa T-Hind, dated 236/851, which refers to Khafnû as a port of call of ships and a market place of Arabs and Chinese (ed. and tr. Sauvaget, Aḥkhâr, 6-7). Moreover, the interior of T'ang China was open to Muslim merchants if provided with a passport issued by Chinese authorities; there was also a Muslim colony in the T'ang capital city of Changan, the eastern terminus of the transcontinental Silk Road. The simultaneous presence of Muslim and other Near Eastern traders in both Changan and Canton then have resulted in some linkage between the overland Silk Road and the maritime Spice Route (Rita Rose di Meglio, Il commercio arabo con la Cina della Gdhiliyya al X secolo, in AIFUN, n.s., xiv [1964], 523-52). Disturbances that accompanied the final decades of T'ang rule also proved fatal to the Muslim colony in Khafnû/Canton: the death-blow was dealt by a rebellion in 879 A.D., when the entire colony was captured by the rebels and burnt. The long-range effect of this upheaval, however, cannot have been absolute, for western visitors such as Marco Polo and Ibn Batûtâ speak of Yuan Zaytun in terms not unlike those characteristic of some wares.
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MINA'I began only in the 1930s. A.U. Pope, writing in the Survey of Persian art (1939-40), describes mina'i as "simply a name given currently by the Persian dealers." Other authors of this period such as K. Erdmann and R. Ettinghausen use the term in quotations marks or qualify it as "so-called Mina'i faience." More recently, however, the term mina'i has gained acceptance among both scholars and their public, and qualifications are seldom used. The precise mediaeval name of this ware is uncertain. It may have been "seven-colour ware", a term used by Abu'l-Kasim al-Kashani, a member of the family of potters who are thought to have produced both mina'i and lustre-painted ceramics.

Certain examples of this ware have been repeatedly published, and a substantial quantity of it has been found in public and private collections; overall, however, it is poorly documented. Only a few signed pieces have been noted: two by "Ali b. Yusuf" and two by "Abü Zayd al-Kashani". Dated pieces are also rare, and, curiously, four of the six published examples are dated to either Muharram 583/1186-7 or Muharram 583/1187-8. The authenticity of those dates was questioned already in 1939 by R. Ettinghausen, who noted that the dates were written over the glaze and should be seen, if examined by x-rays, as having been accepted as fact. Similar reservations were voiced by A. Lane. These caveats, however, have seemingly been largely ignored, for the objects continue to be cited in current publications and used as the foundation for a wider chronology.

Iranian authors of the 11th/14th centuries link the terms mina' and mina'i to translucent or luminous substances such as the sky or wine vessels. Often, mina'i is said to be blue. Mina'i is also used as a technical term to describe a type of glass. The most detailed references are found in the Tansâh-nâma-yi Ilkâni by Nasir al-Din Tusi, who describes mina'i as a type of lead glass of which the best quality is made in Syria, Egypt and the Maghrib. Green mina'i was most prized and was used to imitate emeralds as well as to make vessels that were sometimes decorated with inlays in precious materials. This suggests that mina'i was cast rather than blown and worked as if it were stone.

Later authors use the terms mina' and mina'i to describe glass vessels that had been painted and gilded. During the 18th and 19th centuries vessels of this type appear to have reached Iran from India or Europe, although some were also made locally. It is probable that the description of emerald glass as mina'i led to the designation of polychrome glazed ceramics as mina'i.


MINANGKABAU or menangkabau, the most numerous of the peoples of the island of Sumatra [q.v.] in the Indonesian Republic (1980 population estimate, 6 million). They inhabit the Padang highlands of west-central Sumatra, but there are also appreciable numbers of Minangkabau emigrants, including to Negro Semblan in the Malay peninsula [q.v.]. Originally under Indonesian cultural and religious influence, as the centre of the Hindu-Malayan empire of Malaya, by the early 17th century much of their land had become Muslim through the influence of the Sultanate of Aijih [q.v.] at the northern tip of the island. Although the Minangkabau are enthusiastic Muslims, they retain many of their former matrimonial practices in the reckoning of genealogies, marriage and inheritance, in flat contradiction to the Qur'an. They are also skilled farmers, with terraced agriculture on the hill slopes, and notable woodcarvers, metalworkers and traders, in this last respect rivaling the Chinese. In the movement for Indonesian independence in the earlier half of this century, they played a significant rôle, and several of the Minangkabau filled important government positions in the post-1949 republican period.


MINAR, MINARET (see MANARA).

MINAR (a.), the raised structure or pulpit from which solemn announcements to the Muslim community were made and from which sermons were preached.

1. Early historical evolution and place in the Islamic cult.

In contrast to the minâb [q.v.], the minbar was introduced in the time of the prophet himself. The word, often pronounced minbar (cf. Brockelmann, Grundriss, i, 161), comes from the root n-b-r "high"; it could be derived from the Arabic quite easily with the meaning "elevation, stand", but is more probably a loanword from the Ethiopic (Schwally, in ZDMG, i li [1898], 146-8; Nöldke, Neue Beiträge z. spr. Sprachw., Strassburg 1910, 49). Its case is therefore somewhat similar to that of mojadid. It means "seat, chair" (cf. Wüstenfeld, Chon. Mukka, ii, 8; Aghâni, xiv, 75) and is used, for example, for saddle (al-Tabarî, Gloss.) and of a litter (Aghâni, xiii, 158; cf. Schwally). It is therefore identical with majlis (al-Bukhari, Dq'ana, b 23), with sarîr (al-Mubarrad, Kamil, 20; Aghâni, iii, 3), takht or kurî (ibn al-Athîr, Usd al-ghaba, i, 214; cf. also Becker, Kanzil, 8). The use of the word for the pulpit is in keeping with its history.

When the khâbah [q.v.] spoke among the Arabs, he usually did so standing (cf. Fadlalidâyat, ed. Lyall, xc23); al-Dîjâzât, Bayân, Cairo 1332, i, 129, ii, 143) frequently beating the ground with bow and lance (ibd., i, 198; Labîd, 7, 15, 9, 45); or he sat on his mount as did e.g. Kuss b. Sâ'idâ (Bayân, i, 25, 31, ii, 141). The Prophet did both of these things. In 4Ara he sat on his camel during his Khûtha and on other occasions, when addressing the community during the early period, even as late as the day of the capture of Mecca, he stood (cf. Kûrân, lxii, 11). The people sat on the ground around him (al-Bukhari, Dq'ana, b 28; Ithbân, b 6). In the mosque in Medina, he had a particular place, as is mentioned in the stories.
of the introduction of the minbar. Sometimes, we are told, he stood beside a tree or a palm-tree (al-Bukhari, Manakib, b.25; ed. Kreli, ii, 400); as a rule however, beside a palm-trunk (didda), so Ibn Sa'd, i/1, 9, 10, 11, 12 and on a few occasions beside one of the pillars (al-Bukhari, Manakib, b. 25, ed. Kreli, ii, 401; al-Diyarbakri, Khamsi, ii, 75). This is undoubtedly the original tradition: the Prophet stood beside one of the palm-tree trunks used as pillars in the mosque. For ‘beside’ (usually kama; al-Bukhari, Bayan, b. 32; ‘inda) ‘up against’ (kama ‘ala; already in al-Bukhari, Qum’a, b. 26) is sometimes found later and for the column or trunk, we find a stomp on which he sat.

Various passages record how the minbar was introduced, notably the following: Ibn Sa'd, i/1, 9-12; al-Bukhari, Salat, b. 18, 64, 91; Qum’a, b. 26; Bayan, b. 32; Hiba, b. 3; Manakib, b. 25; Masalid, tr. 10; see also Wensinck, Handboek, s.v. Pulpit; Usd al-ghaba, i, 43 below, 214; Wustenfeld, Medina, 62-3; Ibn Battuta, ii, 275-6; the whole material is in al-Diyarbakri, Khamsi, i, 129, ii, 75-6, and Sirat al-halabi, ii, 146-7. The details are variously produced, notably the following: Ibn Sa'd (djdjft, ii/1, 9-12; al-Diyarbakri, Khamsi, ii, 75; ‘inda al-Bukhari, Qum’a, b. 23; mas‘ad al-Tabari, i, 1591). After the time of the Prophet, it was used in the same way by Abi Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthman (see below). Its significance as a throne is seen from the fact that in the year 50, Mu‘awiyah wanted to take it to Syria with him; he was not allowed to do so but when he returned later, ‘Abd al-Malik and al-Walid are said to have wanted to take the Prophet's minbar to Damascus (al-Tabari, ii, 92-3; Khamsi, ii, 75; Ya‘kubi, Tarikh, ii, 228; Ibn al-Fakih, 23-4; Wustenfeld, Medina, 63). In the time of the Prophet, it stood against the wall so that a sheep could just get past (al-Bukhari, Salat, 91). In the time of al-Mukaddasi, in the centre of the Muhajirun there was pointed out the position of the old minbar, also which Mu‘awiyah was said to have built his new one (82; cf. Ibn Hawkal, 26, and al-Kazwini, ed. Wustenfeld, ii, 71). According to some hadiths, it was over the hazin of the Prophet (al-Bukhari, Salat fi Makka, b. 5; Fad’al al-Madina, b. 5, 12 and passim). At a later date, new minbars were erected in the mosque (see Wustenfeld, Medina, 64, 96).

That the Umayyads should have a minbar of their own was natural; they sat on it, just as their predecessors had done (cf. Goldzieder, Muh. Stud., ii, 42). Mu‘awiyah took it with him on his journey to Mecca (Chron. Mecca, i, 333); he also had taken it to the festivals on the musallah (al-Ya‘qubi, Tarikh, ii, 265), just as Marwan used to do in Medina (see above); it was therefore still portable and indispensable for the sovereign when he wished to make a public appearance as such. In Ibn Qubayr’s time, the minbar al-khutba in Damascus was in the central makṣura (Ribta, 265). According to Ibn Khaldun, Mu‘awiyah was the first in Islam to use the throne (sarir, minbar, taβkh, kursi) but he is clearly not referring to the minbar of the mosque (Mukaddima, Cairo 1322, 205-6, fasc 3, 37).

The minbar taken to Mecca by Mu‘awiyah remained there till the time of al-Raûghid; when the latter visited Mecca on his Pilgrimage in the year 170/786-7 or 174/790-1 a minbar mankush with nine steps was presented to him by the amir of Egypt and the old one was put up in ‘Arafa. At a later date, al-Waithik made minbars for Mecca, ‘Arafa and Minâ (Chron. Mecca, i, 333, iii, 114). The Meccan minbar was a portable one. It usually stood beside the makâm but was put beside the Ka‘ba during the khutba (Ibn Qubayr, 95, 97; cf. Chron. Mecca, iii, 429). According to al-Batanûnî, this custom was kept up until Sultan Süleyman Kânûnî (926-1520-66) built a marble minbar, north of the makâm (al-Riba‘a al-Hâjidyya, 100).

It seems at first to have been doubtful whether
manabir should be put up in the provinces or not. According to al-Kuday', 'Amr had a manabir made in al-Fustat but 'Umar ordered him to take it away; he was not to raise himself above the Muslims so that they would have to sit below his heels (al-Makrizi, iv, 67). Ibn Taghibirdi, i, 76; al-Suyuti, Hsn al-muhabara, i, 63, ii, 135). The idea obviously was that the throne belonged to the caliph alone. After 'Umar's death, however, 'Amr is said to have used a manabir (al-Makrizi, iv, 27). It stood there probably in Kura b. Shariq (q.v.) rebuilt the mosque. During the rebuilding, it was put in the Kaysariyya, which was completely in the year 92/711 did Kura put up a new minabir. Tradition, however, is uncertain. The manabir removed by Kura perhaps dated from the time of 'Abd al-'Aziz b. Marwan, who had taken it from the Nubian king (al-Makrizi, iv, 8; Ibn Taghibirdi, i, 78). Kura's manabir remained till 379/989, when the Fatimid vizier Ya'qub b. Killis replaced it by a gilded one. A large new manabir was placed in the mosque of 'Amr in 405/1014-15 by al-Hakim (al-Makrizi, iv, 8; Ibn Taghibirdi, i, 78-9).

We heur of no objections in other places to the manabir in the mosque in Jericho in the year 166/683, Sa'd b. Abi Waqqas erected a manabir in the mosque improvised in the 'Iwan of Kairar (al-Tabari, i, 2451, 9). In Baṣra, Abu Musa put a manabir in the middle of the mosque. This was, however, found inconvenient because the imam had to cross from the minabir to the kibla "over the necks" of the (seated) believers. Ziyād then placed the minabir against the south wall (Yākūt, i, 642). On the other hand, we are told that 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abbās (governor of Baṣra 36-40/656-60) was the first to mount the manabir in Baṣra (al-Dāhījī, Baṣayn, i, 179). When Ziyād had fled to Baṣra, he saved the manabir which he put up in his Masjid al-Haduddān (al-Tabari, i, 3414-15). The minabir was the symbol of the ruler, and the governor sat upon it as representative of the ruler. It therefore formed a feature of the Masjid al-Qamā'a, where the community was officially addressed. In the year 64/683-4, therefore, there were manabirs in all the provinces. In this year, homage was paid to Marwan b. al-Hakam not only in the capital but in the other manābirs in the Hijāz, Miṣr, 'Shām, Dājrāz, 'Irāk, Khuwarāsān, and other amāz (al-Mas'ūdī, Tānṣib, 307). Special mention is made of the fact that Tabariyya had no manabir.

In the 1st century and beginning of the 2nd one, we find the wali in the smaller towns delivering the khutba with the standing staff only. But in 132/749-50 the governor 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwan had manābirs put up in the kura of Egypt (al-Makrizi, iv, 8, 17 f.; Ibn Taghibirdi, i, 350-1). When the khutba became purely a religious exhortation and the ruler was no longer the khāṭib, the minabir became the pulpit of the spiritual preacher, and every mosque in which the Friday service was celebrated was given a minabir. At the same time, i.e. after al-Rashid, the change was gradually completed and the preacher spoke, standing on the pulpit. Hadīṣ therefore came into existence, according to which the Prophet used to deliver two Khutbas on Friday, standing "just as is done to-day" (al-Bukhārī, Lqm'a, bāb 27, 30) and "Umar (ibid., bāb 2).

The minabir was thus now quite analogous to the Christian pulpit. It is very probable that this latter also influenced its form. We have already noted above, regarding a minabir in the mosque of 'Amr, that it was said to be of Christian origin. The same thing came to be said of the Prophet's minbar (Wustenfeld, Medina, 63). Mu'awiyah made the Madīna minbar larger, while the one brought by him to Mecca had only three steps and was of course portable. We again hear of portable minabirs later, which did not exclude their being large (cf. above, on the minbar of Mecca).

Thus the manābirs in al-Maghrib are said to have been portable. Ibn al-Hajjāq regards this (the oldest) custom as bid'ah and therefore ascribes it to al-Halidī b. Idrīs (al-Tabari, ii, 75 f.). The minābir, that is, hadīṣ which says that the Prophet had a kūṣa of wood with iron legs for the reception of Tamīm (Usd, i, 214, 8 from below; cf. Lammens, Mu'awia, 273, n. 3); it is however uncertain what relation this had to the manabir. A minabir of iron was made as early as the Umayyad period (Ibn Taghibirdi, i, 78, ii, al-maṣr al-hadid, probably correct in spite of Becker, Kanzel, 10, n.; cf. 79, 4, and see below); and also of stone (Goldzitter, Mkh. Stud., ii, 42, n. 5, with a reference to Ibn Hajjar); later, they were also built of brick (Wustenfeld, Medina, 64, 96). As a rule, the minabir stood against the kibla wall beside the mihrab. Al-Mahdi had tried to reduce the manābirs to their original small size (al-Tabari, iii, 486, 12; al-Makrizi, iv, 12, 13 f.), but he could not arrest the development. In the larger mosques several manābirs were even built. Ibn al-Fakih, in about 300/912-13, already mentions five minbars in the mosque in Jerusalem (100, 8 f.). In the Sultān Hasan mosque in Cairo, four were planned and three erected, when a minaret fell down in 762/1361 and diverted attention to other work (al-Makrizi, iv, 117, 18 f.).

The importance which the manbar already had in the time of the Prophet caused special reverence to be paid to it, and the sanctity of the mosque was concentrated round this and around the mihrab. The governor of Kufa, Khaḍīb b. 'Abd Allāh al-Kasri (105-20/723-38), received a letter of censure from the caliph because he had prayed for water on the minbar (Kamīl, 20, 15). A false oath taken on or beside the minbar of the Prophet absolutely led to hell (Ibn Sa'd, i/1, 10, 3 f., 12, 19 f.; Ibn Hanbal, Musnad, ii, 329; cf. J. Pedersen, Der Eid bei den Semiten, 144, 147). Legends grew up which represented the Prophet seeing into the future from the minbar (al-Bukhārī, Lqm'a, bāb 29) and being able to follow the battle of Mu'ta (q.e.) from it (cf. al-Wakidi, tr. Wellhausen, 311; Ibn Ḥādīq, 798) and also telling how his prayers on the minbar were specially efficacious.

Just as the Ka'b was covered (kāṣa), so was the same thing done to the minbar. Uthmān is said to have been the first to cover the minbar of the Prophet with a kāṭifā (Khāṣṣ, ii, 75, 1 f. below). Mu'awiyah did the same thing when he had to give up his attempt to abolish it (ibid., 76, 4; al-Tabari, ii, 92, 4). It was not quite the same thing when al-Hakim rediscovered the already-mentioned iron minabir and covered it with gilded leather because it was covered with dirt (read: kadhar) i.e. rust (Ibn Taghibirdi, i, 79, 5 f.). Under the Abābāsids, a new kiswa was sent every year for the minbar of the Prophet from Baghdād; the sultans later did not renew it so frequently (Wustenfeld, Medina, 64). We find other references to the covering of the minbar on special occasions (Ibn Djabayt, 149, 16). Ibn al-Hajjāq (Madāhir, ii, 74) demands that the imām should put a stop to the custom of putting carpets on the minbar.

Bibliography: In addition to references given in the article, see C.H. Becker, Die Kanzel im Kultus des alten Islam, in Orientalische Studien Th. Nöldeke ... gewidmet, Giessen 1906, i, 331-51; Islamstudien, i,
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(J. PEDERSEN)

2. Architectural features: the Arab, Persian and Turkish lands.

As noted in 1. above, the minbar was in early times used as a seat by the ruler or his governor, from which he addressed the Muslims at the Friday worship, consistent with the use of mosques in the Umayyad period as places of political assembly also (see MASJID. I. E. 1, and J. Sauvaget, La Mosquee Omeyyade de Medine, Paris 1947, 134-5, 142-4). According to C. H. Becker, the change in the purpose of the minbar from the ruler's or governor's seat to the purely religious pulpit occurred towards the end of the Umayyad period (Die Kanzel im Kultus des alien Islam, in Orientalische Studien Th. Nödeke... gewidmet, Giessen 1906, i, 344-7). Unfortunately, we do not have any examples or even descriptions of how minbars looked during the Umayyad period. Evidently it took some time before minbars were generally in use. In 132/749-50 provincial cities in Egypt were provided with minbars by order of Marwan II, and we may therefore presume that they became standard mosque furniture in other parts of the Islamic world as well.

Little is known of minbars during the ʿAbbāsīd period. It is reported that the caliph al-Mahdī ordered Muhammad b. Abī Dījaʿfar al-Mansūr in 161/777-8 to reduce the height of minbars to make them the same size as that of the Prophet (al-Makrizī, Khiṣaṣ, Bâlûk 1853, ii, 247). This incident would suggest that minbars at that time were high, a possibility borne out by the fact that the Great Mosque of Samarra had, according to its kibla wall plan, a minbar which, on architectural evidence, was about 3.90 m high (J. Schacht, An unknown type of Minbar and its historical significance, in Ars Orientalis, ii [1957], 156). The only surviving minbar from the early period of Islam is in the Great Mosque of Kayrūwān in Tunisia. Made of teak and measuring 3.31 m with eleven steps, it is a magnificent example of carved woodwork. It has been preserved in Baghdad by the Aghlabid amīr Abū ʿĪbraḥīm Ahmad (242-249/856-63), and was probably completed in 248/862-3 (K. A. C. Creswell, Early Muslim architecture, Oxford 1940, ii, 314, 317-19, pls. 89, 90). It is the earliest extant example to have the basic elements of a wooden minbar, that is, a platform with steps and a portal without a door at the entrance to the steps. The framework consists of upright and transverse strips of wood with rectangular and triangular panels fitted in by the tongue-and-groove technique. The framework is decorated with vine tendrils forming circular loops enclosing a vine leaf and bunch of grapes, a composition found in the tie beams of the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem. Most of the panels on the minbar are geometric grilles, but on the eastern side there are ten very beautiful panels carved in arabesque. The naturalistic style of the design on these ten panels and, in particular, the pine cones encircled by vines, recall wooden panels found near Baghdad. In Creswell's view, the resemblance strongly suggests that the ten panels were carved there. E. Kühnel has pointed out that their ornamentation resembles that of the Umayyad palace at Mughāṭṭa [q.v.] (Die Islamsische Kunst, in A. Springer, Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte, Leipzig 1929, vi, 385). E. Lévy, with the use of mosques in the ʿAbbāsīd period, states that the predilection for the naturalistic panels to the more abstract style of the early ʿAbbāsīd period typified in the stucco and wood decoration in Sāmarrā, and believed that some of the carved strips and panels may have belonged to an Umayyad minbar before being assembled in the present structure (LEF, MINBAR, at iii, 590). The minbar has been subjected to damage and restoration and, particularly, it must have been restored after Kayrūwān was sacked by the Fāṭimid caliph al-Mustānṣir in 441/1049-50 (H. Saladīn, La Mosquée de Sidi ᪩aḳa Ḧa Ễatroun, Paris 1899, 8, 104). According to Creswell, in the repairs of 1907 the panels were replaced in a new order. The rectangular panels with geometric designs, which are of varying quality, are difficult to date, and whilst some are more recent, others may have been in use at an early period (L. Gölvin, Essai sur l'architecture religieuse musulmane, Paris 1970, 228).

In early Islamic times, some minbars were moveable, which would at once indicate that they were made of very light material, probably wood. Judging from the form and size of the kibla wall in the Great Mosque of Sāmarrā, it must have had a moveable minbar which was kept in a special room close to the mīhrāb (Schacht, op. cit., 156). The minbar of the Kaʿbah in Mecca was on wheels and was normally kept in the mākām ʿĪbraḥīm [q.v.], but was pushed out to stand beside the Kaʿbah for the Friday sermon (Ibn Ǧubayr, Ribḥa, ed. M. J. de Goeje, Leiden and London 1907, 95, 97). This was presumably the minbar donated by the ʿAbbāsīd caliph al-Walīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik b. Marwān (Schacht, op. cit., 157). The practice of moving minbars in and out of the assembly area has actually survived in certain parts of the Islamic world, mainly in North Africa. Few early ones remain, but the existence of a recess to the right of the kibla wall of some Friday Mosques proves that the original minbars of these mosques were moveable. The series of moveable minbars of the Abbasid period found at Sīsā built in 235/849, which has a recess for the minbar (see Schacht, op. cit., 149 ff., for this and further examples).

Since the minbar was a symbol of authority, where the governor sat as representative of the ruling power, it was therefore an important feature of the Masjd-i Ǧamʿī when the community gathered to be officially addressed. Al-Muṣṭakkiḍī refers to the minbar as an object of high regard in Muslim communities. A township, for instance, could only be called a city if it enjoyed the right to possess a minbar and held public assemblies. He frequently categorizes towns according to whether they had a minbar or not. The significance of a minbar was such that in Iran townships fought hard for the right to have one. Several references from al-Muṣṭakkiḍī indicate that the number of minbars in a city was a sign of its prosperity (193, 261-2, 267, 273, 282, 306, 309).

No minbar survives from the early period in Iran, but Ibn Funduq mentions that he saw a minbar in the Adina Mosque in Sabzawār dated 266/879 (Tārīḵl-i Bayhaḵ, ed. K. S. K. Husayn, Hyderabad 1966, 86). He also adds that the name of the ruler of Khurāsān, Ahmad al-Khūḍjīstānī, who held power there during the reign of the caliph al-Muʿtamīd [see KHUDJISTAN], was written on it. The earliest surviving minbar in Iran is in the Ǧamʿī Mosque of Shūhtar and is dated Safar 445/June-May 1053 (N. Meshkati, A list of the historical sites and ancient monuments of Iran, tr. H. A. Pes- sāyan, Tehran 1974, 109). It is an early example of a minbar decorated with star- and polygon-shaped panels, filled with arabesque interlace pattern, fitted by the tongue-and-groove technique covering the sides, a type of decoration which became popular in Egypt, Syria, Turkey and other parts of the Islamic world from the 5th/11th century onwards. No other minbar with this type of decoration is known in Iran.
from the Saljiq period. In central Iran, five minbars survive from the period of Saljuk rule. All of these reveal the same structure as that at Kayrawan, namely, a flight of steps with posts at their entrance leading up to the speaker's seat, which consists of a platform supported on four posts. The minbars are on a smaller scale than that of Kayrawan, but the sides, consisting of carved rectangular panels, are similar for a detailed description and analysis of these Iranian minbers, see J. Golmohammadi, Woodcarvings, buildings and carved woodwork in central Iran, Ph. D. diss., Univ. of London 1988, unpubl.). One of the earliest of these five is the minbar in the Masjidi-i Djami in Abyana, dated 466/1077. The second, dated 543/1148, is in the Imamzada Ismai'ul in Barz, and the third, dated 583/1187, is in the Masjidi-i P'ain in Farghazand. All these three minbars are in the Natanzi region. The minbar in the Masjidi-i Djami in Muhammadiyai near N'din, and that called the Sahl-bi Minbar in a building attached to the Husaynayai in Farghazand, have no dates, but they may be attributed to the 5th/6th-11th-12th centuries on account of the use of the bevelled technique of carving in the arabesque decoration, and in the case of the Sahl-bi Minbar, the style of the Kufic inscription. A new style of decoration and form on these five Iranian minbars is the application of a so-called "bevelled" style of carving. This particular decorative technique was identified by E. Herzfeld as found on the stucco decoration of Samarrã (Die Ausgrabungen von Samarrã, i, Berlin 1923, 5-8, 10-14). It consists of patterns cut at a deep slant giving contrast of light and shade. The patterns, often repeated and separated by carving lines, were covered with dots, notches and slits and rows of beads or pearls were frequently used as a decorative border. While this style and technique was first used in Samarrã during the 3rd/9th century, it survived in Iran, as R. Ettinhausen has pointed out, in a somewhat modified form, losing its repetitive arrangements, during the 5th/6th-11th-12th centuries (The "Bevelled Style" in the post-Samarrã period, in Archaeologia orientalis in memoriam Ernst Herzfeld, New York 1952, 76-81). This style of carving was outmoded in Egypt by the 5th/11th century, but we can still observe it in other parts of the Islamic world right up to the end of the 6th-12th century, although the beveling tended to be considerably shallower. The minbar of the Masjidi-i Djami in Abyana is perhaps one of the most outstanding works of the bevelled style still surviving in Iran. Its panels are carved with deeply bevelled patterns, including abstract leaves with spiral tips, which can be traced back to the stucco decoration of Samarrã. Also noticeable on it is the use of the tongue-and-groove technique, which existed in the early days of Islam (see E. Pauty, Les bois sculptés jusqu'à l' époque Apparatch, in Catalogue général du Musée Arabe du Caire, 1931, pl. II, nos. 4627, 4630, and pl. IV, no. 4779). Although the Barz minbar has bevelled panels, the decoration is mainly arabesque interlace, showing the influence of new decorative trends. This minbar is also notable for its balustrade, which is composed of a lattice grille made up of geometric patterns formed by small pieces of turned wood fixed to each other by the technique that is well-known in the magrâbiyya [g.v.] work of Egypt; this is the earliest known dated example of such work in Iran. The existence of these minbars is significant, since they pre-date the Mongol invasion; it was previously thought that all Saljuk minbars were destroyed by the Mongols. The bevelled style of carving can further be observed on the minbar in the Great Mosque of 'Amâdiyai in 'Iraq, dated 548/1153 (Ettinhausen, op. cit., 74, Pl. X). Here polygonal panels set in a plain frame are decorated with semi-palmettes with spiral tips within carving scrolls. In Turkey there is a minbar from Malatya, which is now preserved in the Ethnographic Museum in Ankara (G. Oney, Anadolu Seljuklu mimarisiinde sistem ve el sanatlari, Ankara 1978, 115). It has small polygonal pieces set in a plain framework carved in the bevelled style. The field of the panels is made up of deeply incised small scale arabesques with bevelled surfaces. It has been attributed to the 7th/13th century, but Ettinhausen has correctly pointed out that it must be earlier, namely dating from the 6th/12th century (op. cit., 82). So far no other dated piece of woodwork carved with the bevelled style is known from the 7th/13th century; Ettinhausen's dating appears therefore justified. The structure and decoration of the sides of minbars began to change towards the end of the 5th/11th century, when there appeared a new method of construction and design. This was to cover the sides with small pieces of wood in the shape of stars and polygons. The earliest known example of this type is the minbar of the Masjidi-i Djami in Shushgar already mentioned. The new composition appears in its fully developed form on the Fatimid minbar of the Shrine of al-Husayn in Askelon, now preserved in the Museum of Hebron (L. H. Vincent and E. J. H. Mackay, Le Haram el Khalil, sépultures des patriarches, Paris 1923, 219-25, pls. XXV-XXVII). It is dated 484/1091-2. The entire surface of the sides is covered with elaborate geometrical patterns composed of small polygonal pieces of wood fitted into incised stripwork by the tongue and groove technique. The main elements of the pattern consist of hexagons, polygons and six-pointed stars. Each of the polygonal pieces is filled with interlaced arabesque designs. The carving, however, is no longer in the bevelled style, but executed in deep straight cuts. Another interesting feature of this minbar is its balustrade grille composed as a magrâbiyya, making it a very early dated example of such work. The present canopy and door of the minbar are later, probably of the Mamluk period. During the Fâtimid period in Egypt, the system of decoration was to continue appearing in two early minbars, that in St. Catherine's Monastery on Mt. Sinai dated 500/1106, and that in the Mosque of Amr in K'is dated 550/1153 (C. J. Lamm, Fatimid woodwork, its style and chronology, in Bull. de l'Inst. d'Egypte, xxviii [1933-6], 78). The latter example has a pavilion over the speaker's seat, and the decoration at the back of the seat recalls a minbar. From the Fâtimid period onwards, the minbar developed its standard form, having a domed canopy over the speaker's seat, a doorway and decorative elements consisting of stars and polygons made up of small carved pieces of wood. This form was to become standard in Syria and Turkey as well as Egypt. A good example of this type is the minbar of the Aksa Mosque in Jerusalem, which was donated in 564/1168 by Nîr al-Dîn to Aleppo and later taken by Salâh al-Dîn to Jerusalem (ibid., 88). A popular decorative feature of the 6th/12th century onwards, inlay work of ivory and mother of pearl, appears on this same minbar (M.S. Briggs, Muhâmadiyai architecture in Egypt and Palistine, New York 1934, 216). Later on, Mamluk minbars were noted for their elaborate inlay work, which included not only ivory and mother-of-pearls, but also ebony and bone. Such minbars are to be found in the mosques of Ibn Tûlûn and Sâlih Tâlâtî in Cairo (L. Hautecoeur and G. Wiet, Les Mosquées du Caire, Paris 1932, pls. 82, 85). Towards the end of the Mamluk
period, we witness the decline of both carved and inlay decoration. The minbar from the Mosque of Kābīt-Bay, now in the Victoria and Albert Museum in London, dated 872/1468-9, is a good example of these late Mamlūk works (V. and A., no. 1050-1869).

In Iran, star and polygon decoration was slow to become popular. Thus the minbar of the Masjīd-i Dājmā in Na'īn dated 711/1311-12 has sides still constructed with rectangular panels rather than stars and polygons (M. B. Smith, The wood and marble in the Masjīd-i Dājmā, Na'īn, in Art Islamī, v [1938], 21-2, figs. 1-7). Part of its carved decoration consists of chains of lozenges or leaves, filled with comma-like volutes, which reflect a style that became popular in Iran during the 8th/14th century. It also has a lattice-work balustrade with a geometrical design made up of slats. This is an early example of this type of lattice-work in Iran, which was used for screens, windows, gateways and balcony balustrades. Another outstanding minbar from this post-Mongol period in Iran is that of the Masjīd-i Dājmā in Fārs, now preserved in the Irān-Bāštān Museum in Tehran (S. M. T. Mustafāzādi, Iklīm-i Pārs, Tehran 1343 g/1964, tr. R. N. Sharp, The land of Pers, Chippenham 1978, 5). According to its inscription, it was made in 771/1369. It is distinguished by the use on its sides of the star and polygon pattern, with tendrils carved in relief in the polygon style, which was by that time applied in Iran.

Another feature of this minbar is the distinctly floral element of its carved decoration, which was to be later characteristic of the Timūrid period. The minbar of the Mosque of Gāwhār Shāh in the sanctuary of the Imām Rīdā in Mashhad made in 840-50/1436-46 is a fine Timūrid piece. It is distinguished by profuse ornamentation of star and polygon decoration; it has a balustrade grille constructed with rectangular panels rather than stars and polygons (Diez, op. cit., 500). This minbar is unusual in Iran in having a canopy, in this case surrounded by a crown of stalactites (EP, Mirmāb, fig. 8, which shows the minbar). Wooden minbars carved to a very high standard were also produced in Anatolia. Wood was plentiful there, so its use for mosque furniture is easily understood. One of the earliest wooden minbars in Anatolia is the in the Alaeddin Mosque, Konya, and is dated 550/1155 (J. H. Loytved, Konia. Inschriften der Seldschukidischen Bauten, Berlin 1907, 22-4). It is made of walnut wood, and apart from its intricately carved star and polygon decoration it has a balustrade grille with a Qur'anic inscription on the rails and a cusped canopy surmounted by an onion-shaped dome. This minbar is in the mosque of Sultan Hasan dated 757-64/1356-63 (Hautecoeur and Wiet, 103, 300, pis. XXXVI-XLIII). All are decorated with variations on a design of eight and twelve pointed stars, which include patterns of light blue stems with amber and white flowers, and floral patterns with light blue on a dark blue ground. Some have inscriptions giving the name of the donor, or of holy figures or religious texts. The finest is in the Masjīd-i Maydān in Kāshān and is decorated with mosaic faience of a standard far above average. One inscription on the left-hand side gives the name of the craftsman as Haydār, the tile-cutter, and another inscription states the time of construction as being in the reign of Sultan Abū Saʿīd Gūrgān, which has led O'Kane to date the minbar to the year before Sultan Abū Saʿīd's death in 874/1469, when he was briefly ruler of the area. The minbar of the mosque of the khānagāh of Būndirābād is the largest of the five, and is dated by O'Kane to about the time of the repair works to the mosque itself, carried out in 948/1443. These tiled minbars belong to a period of growing use of tiles and mosaic faience in Iranian architecture. The taste for them did not last for long, probably because there was a need to retain nobility in certain circumstances. There are two late examples of tiled minbars from Kīšwā, one in the summer mosque of the Old Arg, which is datable to the 1820s and the other in an unidentified building also probably 19th century. Both are low with four steps (O'Kane, op. cit., 153).

There are a number of stone minbars in the Islamic world, such as those of the Shāykū, Aksunkur and Kāhtīrī Mosques in Egypt. Perhaps the most famous is in the mosque of Sulṭān Ḥasan dated 757-64/1356-63 (Hautecoeur and Wiet, op. cit., 103, 300, pls. 119, 132). The Mosque of Barkūk in the Cemetery of the Caliphs, dated 806-13/1410-12, has a fine stone minbar carved with intricate geometric patterns, the sides in particular having star and polygon designs similar to those on woodwork. It resembles the carved stone minbar in the Mosque of Shāykū dated 750/1349 in having a door with a stalactite portal and canopy surmounted by an onion-shaped dome (ibid., 261, 300, 314, 334, pls. 119, 157).

The Friday mosque of Hārār had a marble minbar of great beauty, which now no longer exists, carved for it at the end of the 9th/15th century by the stonemason Shams al-Dīn (Khulāsát al-akbhar, part of Khānānādāmī'ī's general history describing Hārāt, ed. G. Pītimādī, Kābul 1345 g/1966, 12). A.D.H. Bivar
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has drawn attention to the stone minbar of the Muzaf- farid Ahmad dated 789/1387-8 in STrdjan (see KITABAT, pl. XXIII, 29).

The earliest stone minbar in Anatolia is in the Alaeddin Mosque in Niğde dated 620/1225. The minbar is simple with no decoration except arabesques carved on the stone balustrade (A. Gabriel, *Monuments luris d'Anatolie, Kayseri-Niğde*, Paris 1931, i, 120, 122, pl. XXXVI). Marble and stone minbars were mainly popular in the Ottoman period. The Mosques of Bâyazîd and Mehmed Pasha in Amasya, both dated 891/1486, have fine marble minbars of high-quality workmanship. The minbar of the latter is particularly notable for its rich floriated decoration (Gabriel, op. cit., ii, 37-8, 43, pls. VI-2, VII-2).

The most interesting minbar is in the Seâlimyê Mosque in Edirne dated 961/1574, and is superior in its size, beauty and the quality of its workmanship. It is carved from a single block of stone, and the side is dominated by an equilateral triangle containing a sun disc. The fretted border and balustrade are composed of traditional polygonal designs and the conical canopy decorated with ceramic tiles. The stone minbar in the Sokollu Mosque in Istanbul dated 980/1572 also has a tiled canopy, as well as a lattice balustrade in stone imitating those in woodwork (G. Goodwin, *A history of Ottoman architecture*, London 1971, 264-5, 274, pl. 253, 261; O. Aslanapa, *Turkish art and architecture*, London 1971, 223, 225, pls. 174, 178).

The earliest, in carved basalt, in the Banî�âdîn mosque of Iric, 815/1412, is a massive stone minbar; lowest step of the mihrâb; there is again a square low platform at the foot of the minbar; its original purpose is not clear, but it is not uncommon now to see it covered with mats and used to seat young students when the mosque is in use as a Kurânic school.

Dihli sultanate. In none of the earliest mosques is there an original minbar (that in the Djâmâ'-at-Khâna at Nizamuddin, the oldest mosque still in worship, is a modern replacement; old photographs, however, show a simple minbar of three stone slabs). This pattern is maintained up to the Lodî period, to judge by very few extant examples in Dihli (e.g. mosque at Baťâ gumbad; mosque at the bââli known as Râqi'on kî bâtnî); only in the special case of the ʿidâh attributed to Mollâ Ikbâl Kîhan is there a more elaborate structure, a tall stone platform level with the top of the mihrâb arch whence the voice of the Khâlit might reach the great concourse gathered for the ʿid assembly. Outside Dihli itself, the minbar of the Djâmî mosque of Irî, 815/1412, is a massive stone structure of seven steps, the last extended to a square platform supported on pillars.

Among the regional styles, no early mosques remain in the Pandâb.

Bengal shows excellent early examples of canopied minbars; the earliest, in carved basalt; in the Bâfî masdjid in Chotâ Pandu`a [see pandûj', Chotâ] of the early 8th/14th century, has nine steps leading to a domed upper chamber, with arched openings on three sides and what appears to be a mihrâb representation against the western wall of the prayer-chamber. This design was followed in the great Adina masdjid of HâdadＲand Pund`u [see pandûj'] of 776/1374-5, where as Ravenshaw's photograph shows (J. H. Ravenshaw, *Gaur: its ruins and inscriptions, London 1870*) the mihrâb-like decor of the western wall is carved with the representation of a hanging lamp, and the outer surface carved with geometrical diaper patterns. Similar but plainer is the minbar of the nearby Kuṭb Shâhî (Ravenshaw's "Golden") mosque, 993/1585. Further instances of this type occur; but there are also many simple minbars of three simple stone slabs. One late aberrant minbar, in the mosque of Muhammad b. Tipû Sultan, 1258/1842, consists of three polygonal stone steps occupying half of the central mihrâb, space having been severely limited by the neo-Palladian design of this building.

In the very few remaining buildings of the Djawnpur sultanate, in Dihljpurpuru itself, in the Djâmî mosque at İtâwa, and in the Äfha` kângûra mosque at Kâshî, Bânaras, the minbar takes the form of a massive stone structure of nine steps up to a square stone platform, with no trace of there ever having been a canopy. The typological similarity to the Irî example mentioned above points to a geographical rather than a dynastic determinant of style.

The favourite style of minbar in the Gudjarât sultanate is again the massive stone nine-stepped structure, although as Ahmad Shâh's mosque, the earliest in Ahmadshâb (816/1414), shows, the upper platform was covered by a canopy; the canopy may be taken entirely from a Hindu temple mandapa, supported by pillaged pillars, although even when purpose-quarried stones are used they are often elaborately carved in accordance with the characteristic richness of the Gudjarât style. The steps may further be enclosed by stone sides to form handrails, again with carved surfaces. In many mosques the canopies have been removed, probably when many fine stone buildings were plundered during the early years of Marâṯâ rule in the early 12th/18th century. A feature found in many Gudjarât mosques is the presence of a low square platform in front of the lowest step of the minbar; its original purpose is not clear, but it is not uncommon now to see it covered with mats and used to seat young students when the mosque is in use as a Kurânic school.

In Mâlîwâ the canopied minbar is again the preferred style, as exemplified in that of the early mosque of Malik Mughîth at Mûndû, 835/1432, where the upper platform is surmounted by a square roof resting on pillars which appears to be temple spoil, with projecting eaves and a parapet surmounted by a row of shield-shaped merlons; to the west the wall takes the form of a mihrâb of black polished basalt, with the characteristic Mâlîwâ row of merlons in low relief. This is surpassed by the magnificent minbar of the Djâmî mosque (completed 858/1454), perhaps the finest in the sub-continent: eleven steps lead to the upper platform, originally railed on north and south; the three open sides are of the same shape as the arches of the mihrâbs, slightly ogival; the canopy itself has its eaves supported by sinuous brackets, of the same shape as those in the Djâmî mosque of Dhâr and of Hüḥâng's tomb in Mûndû; above the row of merlons there is a marble dome of the characteristic Mâlîwâ shape, i.e. stilted below the haunch by being raised on a cylindrical drum. Here, as in the Gudjarât mosques, there is again a square low platform at the foot of the minbar steps. At Cânderi [q.v.] the minbar of the Djâmî mosque is typologically similar, but without the sinuous brackets and more solidly built (now whitewashed); that of the great ʿidâh similar but plainer, and of only eight massive steps (the even number is unusual).

In the Deccan, however, the minbar is usually of
the plain pattern of three modest stone steps; so at the first BahmanT mosque, the Djami mosque of Gulbag (769/1367), and others in Bidar. In the massive 2^i^z^i^d^i^q at Bidjapur [q. e.], certainly of Bahmani date, the minbar has nine stone steps leading to an open platform; in the arched opening of the west wall behind it is a flight of smaller steps leading to the top of the wall. In the buildings at Bidjapur (and Gog) of the 2^A^d^l^ Sh^a^h^is, the most ornate of the Deccan styles, the minbar remains of the simple pattern of three (occasionally five) stone steps, and the same is true of the K^u^t^h Sh^a^hi mosques of Haydarabad.

Throughout the Mughal period, the minbar is of the stepped uncovered type. Sometimes, as at the Djami mosque in Fathpur Sikri, the massive red sandstone steps have small pierced screens at their sides; in the time of Shahjahan, when many modifications were also made to earlier buildings, the minbar is often a simple structure of three steps but built of polished, sometimes also inlaid, marble, and have a few a chair-like back slab which may carry a brief inscription. The Djami mosques of Dihli (Shahjahanabad) and Agrâ each have a central platform, approached by steps, in the s^a^h^n, outside the prayer-chamber, which may fulfil the functional purpose of the minbar when there is a vast concourse of worshipers to be addressed, even though there is no mihrâb. The minbar is in its normal position within the prayer-chamber.

Bibliography: For general stylistic discussion, and for many illustrations, see Bibl. to MIND, viii, above. To this should now be added T. Yamamoto, M. Ara and T. Tsukinowa, Delhi: architectural remains of the Delhi sultanate period, i, Tokyo 1967 (in Japanese); Catherine B. Asher, Inventory of key monuments, in G. Michell (ed.), The Islamic heritage of Bengal, UNESCO, Paris 1984; J. Burton-Page, Mosques and tombs, in Medieval Ahmadabad = Marg, xxxix/3, 30-119. For Iriâ, see J.F. Blakison, The Jamâ Majûd at Budvaunn and other buildings in the United Provinces = MASI, xix, Calcutta 1926. Information on Íwàwâ and Báñârâs from personal photographic collection. (J. Burton-Page)

4. In East Africa.

Several different types of minbar are to be found on the East African coast. One type is apparently peculiar to it. In the Middle Ages and up to the 19th century the greatest number of Friday mosques had a stone minbar consisting of two steps and a seat. It is a Kisimkazi, Zanzibar, there is only one step and a seat, while at Kua, Juani Island, Mâfia, and at Mgao Mwanya, on the Tanzanian mainland, there are three steps and a seat. In all these cases the lowest step is very shallow, and is known in Swahili as kâpa, or place for taking solemn oaths. The person taking the oath stands on the lowest step, and touches the minbar. A brief account of Swahili oaths is given by Mtorö bin Mwanya Bakari of Bagamoyo, Tanzania, in C. Velten, Desturi za Wawuhili, Göttingen 1903, 273-7, but without explanation of the ritual.

The later Friday mosque at Ungwana, Kenya, built ca. 1500-50, is alone in its period in having seven stone steps and a seat at the top, with masonry sides formerly surmounted by a wooden handrail. In recent times similar stone minbars have been constructed in mosques in the Lamu and Sharchago archipelago.

Only two wooden minbars are known. This does not arise from any distaste for wood, but because it is vulnerable to the white ant, ubiquitous in eastern Africa. The wooden minbar in the Friday mosque at Lamu is dated by an inscription 917/1511, and that at Shiû 950/1523, both of these being in Kenya. At Magogoni, a small village near Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, a portable minbar is to be found today. It consists of a simple wooden upright chair constructed on a flat pedestal, the latter projecting to form a step in front, and the space between the legs being enclosed to form a cupboard. It is of recent and rough construction.

In a number of Friday mosques, however, the minbar takes the form of a recess, or of a raised platform within a recess built out behind the kibla wall. It may be reached by a staircase within its recess, or by a staircase from inside the mihrâb. The minbar thus resembles a window on the right-hand side of the mihrâb. It is sometimes provided with a balustrade for the preacher to lean on. Where the staircase leads out of the mihrâb, it is sometimes connected with a room or office for the use of the imâm, for whom often an external door is also provided. The dating of minbars of this type is uncertain, but local tradition, which is probably correct, assigns their construction to the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century.


MINAEANS [see MAÉIN].

MINHÃ NAO [see PHILIPPINE].

MINE, MINERAL, MINERALOGY [see MAĐIN].

MINNA [see MA'IN].

MINGLÍ GİRÁY KÁHÁN [see MINGLÍ GİRÁY].

MINIATURE [see TAŠAWĪR].

MINICOY, an isolated coral atoll, the southernmost of the Indian Lakshdweep group [see LACCADIVES], situated in the south-eastern Arabian Sea, off the coast of Malabar [q. e.], in lat. 8°7'N, long. 73°19'E. The atoll comprises two islands—the main, inhabited island of Minicoy (known to its European, Divehi-speaking Maldivian people, probably in its former use by the islanders as a quarantine station)—as well as extensive coral reefs enclosing a broad lagoon. Malik Island, an elongated crescent forming the southern and eastern rim of the atoll, is just over 6 miles/9.6 km long, but only half-a-mile/0.8 km across at its widest point; the total land area is about 1,120 acres/300 hectares, whilst according to the 1971 Census of India, the population totalled 5,342 persons (2,433 male and 2,909 female).

Little is known of the early history of Minicoy, which—in contrast to the more northerly, Malayalam-speaking, Dravidian-populated islands of the Lakshadweep group—was settled by Indo-European, Divehi-speaking Maldivian people, probably in the first centuries A.D., though whether these early settlers migrated directly from Malabar, or via Sri Lanka and the neighbouring Maldives Island (q.n.), remains uncertain. It is clear, however, that until the mid-10th/16th century the people of Minicoy remained culturally and politically attached to the Maldives, sharing a common ethnic origin, language, script, and religion; thus archaeological evidence indicates the former presence of Hinduism and Bud-
1. Minbar of the Masjid-i Djami, Abyana (Photo.: J. Golmohammadi)

2. Ceramic minbar of the Masjid-i Maydan, Kashan (Photo.: B. O’Kane)
3. Minbar of the Shrine of al-Husayn at 'Askalan (Photo.: B. O'Kane)
4. Minbar of the Sultan Hasan Mosque, Cairo (Photo.: B. O’Kane)
5. Minbar of the Sidi 'Ukba Mosque, Kayrawān (Photo.: J. Golmohammadi)

6. Minbar of the 'Allī al-Dīn Mosque, Konya (Photo.: Mevlana Museum, Konya)
dhism in the atoll, faiths which were fairly rapidly eclipsed by the introduction of Islam in the late 6th/12th century, probably some years after the conversion of the Maldivian Sultan Muhammad al-Adil in 548/1153.

Minicoy's political link with the Maldives became increasingly tenuous from the 8th-9th/14th-15th centuries onwards when certain of the northern Maldivian atolls (including, most certainly, Minicoy, the most isolated area from Male and closest to India of the various Maldivian atolls) came under the influence of the Malabar principality of Kannanur [q.v.]. The process of Minicoy's detachment from the Maldives was completed by ca. 973/1565, at which time (according to the Maldivian Tāḥākk, corroborated by Pyrard and Zayn al-Din) the atoll had passed under the rule of the Āli Rāдж (or "Āzhi-Rāдж"); Malayalam: "Sea King") of Kannanur. For the next three-and-a-half centuries, Minicoy remained attached to the Arakkal rulers of Kannanur. By the mid-19th century, however, Arakkal rule had become increasingly a legal fiction, with the British authorities sequestrating the atoll in 1861 for a period of five years, and again in 1875, on this occasion permanently. In 1908, together with the more southerly islands of the Laccadives group, Minicoy was formally ceded by the Bibi of Kannanur to the British Indian Empire. British rule was maintained until Indian independence in 1947. Most recently, in 1956, the atoll was incorporated within the Indian Union Territory of Lakshadweep (Lakshadvīp).

The indigenous inhabitants of Minicoy (excluding only members of the expatriate mainland, predominantly Malayali, administration) are, like the inhabitants of the Maldives, uniformly Sunni Muslims of the Shāhī/Sīdāhi madhhab. Religious observances and customs—including widespread belief in spirits and black and white magic, as well as the institution of namāz-ge or prayer houses for women—are similar to those in the Maldives. Literacy is high (practically universal), and most islanders are conversant with Arabic script, as well as with their own Maldivian language (Divēhi, known on Minicoy as "Mabh") and Tānī script. As in traditional Maldivian society, the people of Minicoy are divided into four caste-like groups, or classes, viz. Mālikkan (the highest group, predominantly landowners); Mālīmī (the second highest group, expert sailors and navigators, cf. Ar. mu’sālim); Tākkru (the third group, less specialised fishermen); and finally Rāvī (the lowest group, specialising in tending coconut plantations). In isolated Minicoy, caste-like differentiation has persisted longer than in the Maldives; thus in Minicoy, the first two classes may intermarry, as may the last two, the child of such a marriage belonging to the class of whichever parent is higher. Similarly, the first two classes may eat together, as may the last two. Inheritance, similar restrictions on the ownership of the Maldives, but these have long since disappeared.

The economy of the island rests on fishing and agriculture (predominantly coconut farming), whilst a substantial supplementary income is remitted to the island by sailors working for the Indian merchant navy; the men of Minicoy have long enjoyed a well-founded reputation for their seafaring expertise, and the widespread and long-standing practice of leaving the island to find work and food has frequently led to the suggestion that Minicoy, bereft of many of its sons at work on the high seas, whilst the women traditionally till the land, might be identified with Marco Polo's "Female Island".

The people of Minicoy live in one large settlement spanning the centre of the island at its broadest point. This village, with its Lāmīna Masdjid (Ml. Ḥabībi Masjīd) and a number of lesser mosques and namāz-ge, is divided into nine wards (Ml. a/in), each under its own headman (Ml. māppan), the whole island being traditionally administered by an ʾāmīn. Maliku Village is remarkable for its cleanliness and order, each ʾātīr having its own mosque, bathing tank and cemetery. To the north of the village lies the Central and North Pandāran lands (formerly the homeground of the Arakkal Rāджs, but now common land) as well as a former leper colony. To the south and west lies the "Big South Pandāran" as well as, near the westernmost point of the island, Minicoy lighthouse (constructed in 1882-4), a major navigation point for shipping using the Eight Degree and Nine Degree Channels.


MINICOY — MINTAKAT AL-BURUDJ

MINICOY — MINTAKAT AL-BURUDJ, also minjakat falak al-burudj, are all used in Arabic to designate both the zodiac and the ecliptic. Strictly speaking, the zodiac is a "belt", or "zone", of the sky extending up to 6° (more correctly, 7°) north and south of the ecliptic due to the inclination of the orbits of the planets from the latter, while the ecliptic is a great circle in the sky running through the middle of the zodiacal belt and representing the path of the sun (arkh/tarkat al-ṣamī) in her apparent annual revolution. The knowledge of both the zodiac and the ecliptic was received by the Arabic-Islamic culture, through translations of scientific writings, from classical antiquity.

The ambiguity in the term—it being used for the zodiacal belt as well as for the ecliptic circle—existed already in antiquity; for greater exactness, therefore, the ecliptic specifically was sometimes called "the circle running through the middle of the zodiac" (cf. RE, art. Zodiacos, ii; iii; i, 1), a formula which is also reflected in some Arabic texts (see, e.g., the Arabic translation of Prolemy's Planisphaerium, ms. Istanbul, Ay A sofya 2671, fol. 81b, 82a, 83b, etc.: al-dārān al-wustat 'alā kitāb al-ṣamī, the expression of whichever parent is higher. Similarly, the first two classes may eat together, as may the last two. Inheritance, similar restrictions on the ownership of the Maldives, but these have long since disappeared.

The economy of the island rests on fishing and agriculture (predominantly coconut farming), whilst a substantial supplementary income is remitted to the island by sailors working for the Indian merchant navy; the men of Minicoy have long enjoyed a well-founded reputation for their seafaring expertise, and the widespread and long-standing practice of leaving the island to find work and food has frequently led to the suggestion that Minicoy, bereft of many of its sons at work on the high seas, whilst the women traditionally till the land, might be identified with Marco Polo's "Female Island".

The people of Minicoy live in one large settlement
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The old Arabs, before their acquaintance with Greek astronomy, did not know the zodiac as a complete system. But, as it seems, some of the twelve zodiacal constellations had become known to them, most probably, through channels as yet unknown, from Mesopotamia. These few constellation names were assigned new names formed after their Greek models. Also, it became apparent that the astronomical location of several of the older Arabic constellations had shifted from those places in the sky which they occupied in Greek tradition. So it would seem that here we have a testimony of two branches of development in the transmission of the zodiacal constellations: a northern branch reaching from Mesopotamia to the Greeks (and hence into modern astronomy), and a southern branch reaching into the
After the introduction of Greek astronomy, the Arabian-Islamic culture adopted and continuously applied the Greek distribution of constellations and the fixed stars, and it came to know and use the zodiac and the ecliptic as a system of astronomical and astrological reference (cf. the ed. of the star catalogue from Ptolemy's Almagest, in the two surviving Arabic versions of al-Hadjadj b. Yûsuf b. Matar and of Ishâq b. Hunayn, with amendments by Thabit b. Qurra, where the descriptions of the twelve zodiacal constellations and all their individual stars are given and which have served as the basic source for all the astronomers and astrologers of the Islamic period).

Most of the Arabic philologists, in their Kuttab al-aswâq (see ANWÁ; AL-MANÁZÂ), give a description of the burudi. But since all of them lived in the time after the introduction of Greek science, it came about that they usually give the complete list of twelve burudi (which, as stated before, were not completely known to the old Arabs), thus mixing up foreign knowledge and indigenous Arabic traditions.

Now follows a list of the twelve burudi:

1. Aries, al-hamal (lit. "the lamb"). The name seems to be of indigenous Arabic tradition, since the three first lunar mansions (nos. 1, 2 and 3) were a name for the constellation of a major Scorpius. The early Arabs, Arabic-Islamic culture adopted and continuously from the Babylonians both to the Greeks (and hence into modern astronomy) and to the old Arabs. Arabic al-aswâq (of unknown origin, since this section of the zodiac was already related to Scorpius. It should be kept in mind that the location of this Arabic hamal extends into the Greek Tauou (the Pleiades) 1). In the translations from the Greek, the same name al-hamal was retained for Greek δ Κράς, while the constellation as such was developed into a maiden (Παιδίον) carrying the ear in her hand. With the Arabs, on the other hand, the 16th lunar mansion of the zodiac is understood as the claws of the scorpion. As it seems, there exists a relation between the Babylon, zîhûnâ and Ar. al-zubûn (although the meaning, for the Arabs, has become obscured and they now understood what formerly meant "balance" as the "claws" of Scorpion). In translating Ptolemy's Χαρα, both Arab translators supplied the indigenous Arabic name al-zubûnâ, whereas the Scrópys used elsewhere in the Almagest, and also in the latitude column in the star catalogue, was rendered into al-mizân.

2. Taurus, al-qātār. This name seems to be of scientific origin, translated from Greek δ Τάρος, since no indigenous asterism (from among the lunar mansions) has ever been related to it.

3. Gemini, al-ajawzdâ ("the twins"). After the introduction of Greek astronomy, the corresponding constellation of γ Sextantis, while the constellation as such was developed into a maiden (IlpGeocx;) carrying the ear in her hand. With the Arabs, on the other hand, the 16th lunar mansion of the zodiac is understood as the claws of the scorpion. As it seems, there exists a relation between the Babylon, zîhûnâ and Ar. al-zubûn (although the meaning, for the Arabs, has become obscured and they now understood what formerly meant "balance" as the "claws" of Scorpion). In translating Ptolemy's Χαρα, both Arab translators supplied the indigenous Arabic name al-zubûnâ, whereas the Scrópys used elsewhere in the Almagest, and also in the latitude column in the star catalogue, was rendered into al-mizân.

4. Cancer, Arabic al-sarâd. Like no. 4, it seems to be of scientific origin, translation from Greek Καρκίνος. No indigenous Arabic asterisms have been related to it.

5. Leo, al-aswâq. The name belongs to the indigenous Arabic tradition. Not less than eight (or even nine) lunar mansions (nos. 7 to 14, or 15) have been related to al-aswâq which, therefore, in modern research literature, became famous as "the huge Arabic Lion". It is to be noted that the indigenous Arabic Lion figure, in location, is again different from the Greek tradition in that it stretches from ασ Γeminorum to α or even υλ Virginis. In the translations from the Greek, the traditional name al-aswâq was retained.

6. Virgo, Indigenous Arabic al-sunbulâ ("the ear of corn"). It is to be noted that the indigenous Arabic Lion constellation, in location, is again different from the Greek tradition in that it stretches from ασ Γeminorum to α or even υλ Virginis. In the translations from the Greek, the traditional name al-aswâq was retained.

7. Libra, al-mizân, translated from Greek δ Ζώρης. As constellation title, Ptolemy in the Almagest had retained an older designation, al-Χάρα ("the claws", i.e. of Scorpion). Already in Babylonian texts this section of the zodiac was called zîhûnâ ("balance") and was equally understood as the "horns" of Scorpion. On the other hand, the 16th lunar mansion of the Arabs, al-zubûnâ, is understood as the claws of the scorpion. As it seems, there exists a relation between the Babylon, zîhûnâ and Ar. al-zubûn (although the meaning, for the Arabs, has become obscured and they now understood what formerly meant "balance" as the "claws" of Scorpion). In translating Ptolemy's Χαρα, both Arab translators supplied the indigenous Arabic name al-zubûnâ, whereas the Scrópys used elsewhere in the Almagest, and also in the latitude column in the star catalogue, was rendered into al-mizân.

8. Scorpio, Here we have a case among the (zodiacal) constellations where a constellation is transmitted with the same name, and in the same location, continuously from the Babylonians both to the Greeks (and hence into modern astronomy) and to the old Arabs. Arabic al-akrab was already known in pre-scientific times, and four lunar mansions (nos. 16 to 19; by one author also no. 15, as a fifth) have been related to it. It should be kept in mind that originally Libra, before made into an independent constellation of its own, was included, as the "claws", into the constellation of a major Scorpion. The translators from the Greek afterwards retained the older name al-akrab for δ Σκορπίως.

9. Sagittarius. In old Arabic tradition, al-kaus ("the bow"). In indigenous Arabic stellar lore there existed an asterism called al-kaus, consisting of six stars, of which the position of the "bow" (in modern astronomy) was contained in this asterism. In the translations from the Greek, the traditional name al-kaus was retained.
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constellation received its (old Arabic) name al-kaws from this asterism. The translators later introduced al-rāmī ("the he-goat") for al-djady (no. 5); al-tays ("the figure"); latter commonly used for "constellation") for al-šabr (no. 8), al-rīfū for al-būrū (no. 12) seems merely to be a confusion with one of the names of the 28th lunar mansion. A special case is al-djady (no. 3) for which Ibn Sīdā (d. 458/1066; K. al-Muhrajān, ix, 12, 16—on the authority of Abū Ḥanīfa al-Dinawari) cites the alternative name al-sāra ("the figure"), while Abīd Allāh b. Ḍū Āṣim (K. al-Šawā, fol. 3, 5) reports that the Arabs called al-taw'amān [σι, as the basic name!] also al-djaza'aw and al-sāra and al-djābāb. Both these statements are utterly mutilated; the fuller and correct wording is found in al-Tūḥāf (Surīr, 198, last two lines = Ibn Ma‘ṣūr, Niṣrār, 174, 6-7): ... al-djaza'aw wa-tusammiha l-munajāmīn al-taw'amān fa-amān l-sāra fa-yusamminah al-djābāb wa-l-bū'rābir wa-layn hamā 'l-šabr (‘al... al-djaza'aw), and the astronomers of Greek-based scientific profession call her 'the Twins'; however, the figure [i.e. the asterism, or constellation figure, obtained by al-djaza'aw in the sky, i.e. Orion] they call al-djābāb [ = Orion] and al-būrū [the human figure]—not found elsewhere in the texts, but these two are not found among the Arabs’.

In Persian, the common names of the zodiacal constellations are: 1- barra ("lamb"); 2- gāw; 3- du paykār; 4- ḍabār; 5- gālī; 6- ḍabā ṭām(wor "ear of corn"); 7- tawāt; 8- kādhūm; 9- kāmān ("bow"); 10- bużghālā ("kid"); 11- dūl ("bucket"); and 12- mālī ("fish, sing."). It may be added that, through Latin translations of Arabic works on astronomy and astrology, the Arabic names of the twelve zodiacal constellations and signs also became known in mediæval Europe. But these names did not gain the same popularity as the individual star names and never came into actual use in Europe.

Mintaka in Astrology. The zodiacal figures no. 1, al-Hamal, no. 4, al-Sarqān, no. 7, al-Mizān and no. 10, al-Djady are known together as burūdī munkalī Khawāṣṣ, Greek ζώδια τρίγωνα, no. 2, al-Thawr, no. 5, al-Asād, no. 8, al-Šibr and no. 11, al-Dalw under burūdī gābhāt, ζώδια τρίγωνα, no. 3, al-Dunā, no. 6, al-Adhā'ī, no. 9, al-Rūm and no. 12, al-Samakatūn under burūdī hūmūdī dūrba (i.e. "Signa bicorpora", "Double figures": Twins. Virgin and Ear of corn, Archer with Horse’s body and the two Fishes).

Muğallathāt. Muğallathāt (sing. muğallathath) are meant in Arab astrology the Greek τετράων, Lat. trigona or triqueta, which in the Middle Ages were usually translated through trigonitae.

The twelve signs of the zodiac are here arranged in threes at the angles of four intersecting equilateral triangles of which one is allotted to each of the four elements. Each triangle is given two of the seven planets as its rulers (σαμ, pl. ἄρβαρ, Greek αἰκονοτότων or τριγωνοτοτέως), one for the day and another for the night; a third is associated with the two others as "companions".

The arrangement is as follows:

The only inaccuracy in the list of exaltations, already fixed in ancient times, is giving 20° instead of 21° to Libra for Saturn, which however goes back to Ptolemy.

Various Arab writers since Abū Maṣḥar also ascribe exaltations and dejections to the nodes of the moon (šād duʿādūn or ʿudūdat, sc. al-καυκάβ) as sharaf Gemini 3°, as hubat, Sagittarius 3°; vice versa to the descending node (gharāb) as sharaf Sagittarius 3°; as hubat Gemini 3°. This allocation is not known to the Greek astrologers.

Hūlid. Each of the five planets (excluding the sun and moon) possesses in each of the 12 burūd a field of influence covering several degrees (Arab. hadḍ, pl. ḥadīd, Greek ὅπων, Lat. fines, med. Latin terminus) which has the same astrological significance as the planet itself and can represent it at any time in horoscopes. On the distribution of these fields of influence within the zodiacal circle, opinions differed widely and unanimity could never be attained. Ptolemy added one more to the Egyptian and Chaldaean provisions already in existence (The various systems are fully expounded in the ʿarṭ al-kawakib, i. 20, fol. 43: Boll has studied this question very fully in Neues zur babylonischen Planetenordnung, in ZA, xxviii [1913], 340 ff.) The Arab astrologers used almost exclusively the Egyptian system, which makes the different fields of very unequal sizes. (For the classical doctrines, cf. Bouchè-Lecerf.)
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Zodiacal sign: al-Thawr, al-ʿAdhraʿ, and al-Djady (nos. 2, 6 and 10).
Ruler: by day al-Zuhara (Venus), by night al-Kamar (Moon).
Companion: al-Mirnkh (Jupiter).
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The distribution of the ʿarṭ al-kawakib has been settled since the time of Ptolemy.
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The only inaccuracy in the list of exaltations, already fixed in ancient times, is giving 20° instead of 21° to Libra for Saturn, which however goes back to a very old error; it is also found in Pliny, Firmicus and the Hindu astronomer Varāha-Mihira.

Al-Balʿami assumed that at the time of the creation of the world the planets were in their aṣḥāf.

The points of intersection of the ecliptic with the equator (dāʿtrat or faʿal maʿṣaddi al-nahhār) define the two equinoxes (al-ʿīsādān), the points of the greatest northerly and southerly declination the two solstices (al-rāʾisādān). The position of a fixed star or planet with respect to the minṭaka is defined by giving its longitude (šīl, pl. ṣaʿlān, or in al-Battānī al-ṣaʿlān ʿallāḥī fīhī al-kawakib) and altitude (ʿarḍ, pl. ʿarḍān). The longitude, which is inturned from the galactic point (al-nukta al--hashāʾiyya) is defined as the arc of the celestial sphere corresponding to the fixed star in the poles of the ecliptic (kutāba dāʿtrat or faʿalat al-nahūd).

On Arab star-maps and star-globes, we frequently find a mixed ecliptical and equatorial system of coordinates used (cf. the remarks above on the fresco on the dome of the Amra), which consists of ecliptical circles at longitude through the poles of the ecliptic and equatorial parallel circles.

Precession (in al-Battānī, ḥaraskat al-kawakib al-ḥibība, in later authors more precisely mubīdatat nukhat al-rīḍādī), from the old sources, according to which the process of the precession consisted of an oscillation to and from around the “nodes of the path of the sun” (the so-called trepidation). The greatest amount of the precession according to this theory is 8° west or east of the nodes; the retrogression amounts to 1° in 80
years so that the whole phenomenon repeats itself after 2,560 years. The latter theory found particular approval in India and was further developed there. Thabit b. Kurra gave an explanation for it which at the same time took into account the (more suspected than observed) diminution in the obliquity of the ecliptic and calculated the length of the period at 2,376 years. The latter theory found approval in India and was further developed there. Thabit cannot really have been involved in the transmission of the theory of trepidation.) Al-Battani attacked and refuted this oscillation hypothesis of Theon and of the Ashab al-ilsamāt (among the astronomers, see above), ed. I. Nallino, al-Khams (in the first, astronomical part identical to its edited version by Ibn Manzur, Nithdr, see above), ed. I.

Obliquity (Mayal falak al-burudj, very frequently al-mayl kullulu or al-kulli in contrast to al-mayl al-djuz, ‘“declination of the separate points in the minfalu”), cf. al-Aghzawi, 21). The problem of estimating the obliquity of the ecliptic was during the classical period a centre of interest for the Muslim astronomers. As a first attempt at an exact estimate in the Muslim period, Ibn Yunus (ch. ix, p. 222, of the Leiden Codex or of the Paris Codex, no. 2475) mentions an observation of the period between 778 and 786 which gave the value $\varepsilon = 23^\circ 31^\prime$. We have an unusually large number of observations of later dates. (For details, see Nallino’s notes on al-Battani’s Opus astronomicum, i, 137 ff.).

Al-Battani in his observations used a parallactic ruler (triqarum, ‘tidah tawil’ as well as a finely-divided wall quadrant (libna). He ascertained with these instruments in al-Rakka the smallest zenith distance of the sun at 12°26’, the greatest at 59°36’; this gave $\varepsilon = 47^\circ 10^\prime - 23^\circ 35^\prime$. This value is at the basis of all al-Battani’s calculations and tables and has been adopted by many other Arab astronomers.

The question whether the amount of obliquity remains constant at all times or is subject to a secular diminution was answered in different ways by different students. As a matter of fact, the degree of accuracy of observation was not sufficient to settle this point and the old Hindu value of $\varepsilon = 24^\circ$, on which these investigations were often based, was based not on observations but only on a statement of Euclid’s according to which astrologers of his time used to estimate the obliquity as a fifteenth part of the circumference of the circle.

The following table gives a survey of the Arab values for the obliquity of the ecliptic (cf. Nallino, al-Battani, Opus astronomicum, loc. cit.). The column ‘average obliquity’ gives by Bessel’s formula

$$\varepsilon = 23^\circ 28^\prime 18^\prime 0^\prime - 0^\prime 48^\prime 36^\prime \times 10^{-3} \times 100000222.95.\, t (t = \text{years after 1750})$$

the true values calculated for the periods in question. The years given in brackets are only approximate, i.e. not given by the authors themselves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observer</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Obliquity observed</th>
<th>Average obliquity</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eratosthenes</td>
<td>Alexandria (230 B.C.)</td>
<td>23°43’45”</td>
<td>+ 7°35’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hipparchus</td>
<td>Rhodes</td>
<td>(130 B.C.)</td>
<td>23°51’20”</td>
<td>42°57’</td>
<td>+ 8°23’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy</td>
<td>Alexandria (140 A.D.)</td>
<td>41°10’</td>
<td>+10°10’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabulae probatae</td>
<td>(al-ZFD al-muntha)</td>
<td>Baghdad 829</td>
<td>33°</td>
<td>35°41’</td>
<td>- 2°41’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other observers under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ma’mun</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>33°32’</td>
<td>35°40’</td>
<td>- 1°48’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banu Māsā</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>(860)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35°26’</td>
<td>- 0°26’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banu Amādūr</td>
<td>al-Raḳkā</td>
<td>(880)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35°17’</td>
<td>- 0°17’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ṣūfi</td>
<td>(918)</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>35°</td>
<td>35°</td>
<td>+ 0°50’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu ’l-Wafā’</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>(965)</td>
<td>34°35’</td>
<td>34°25’</td>
<td>+ 0°35’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wīḏān b. Rustom al-Kūḥī</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>51°1’</td>
<td>34°25’</td>
<td>+16°36’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Yūnūs</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>34°52’</td>
<td>34°19’</td>
<td>+ 0°33’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Būrūnī</td>
<td>Ghaznī</td>
<td>(1019)</td>
<td>34°10’</td>
<td>34°10’</td>
<td>+ 0°50’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphonsine Tables</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>(1250)</td>
<td>32°29’</td>
<td>32°19’</td>
<td>+ 0°10’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn al-Shāṭir</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>(1363)</td>
<td>31’</td>
<td>31°25’</td>
<td>- 0°25’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulugh Beg</td>
<td>Samarkand</td>
<td>(1437)</td>
<td>30°17’</td>
<td>30°49’</td>
<td>- 0°32’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison table of the Arab values for the Obliquity of the Ecliptic

MINTAKAT AL-BURUDJ — MIR

Abbas, Beirut, 1400/1980. 2. Modern studies:

MINUF, MINUF [see MANUF, MANUFI].

MINURKA, Minorca, name of the easternmost of the Balearic islands; it lies about 40 km east-north-east of Majorca [see MAYURKA]. Its area of 669 km² is dwarfed by that of the centrally located island of Mallorca (3,640 km²), but it slightly surpasses that of Ibiza (572 km²) [see YBASLA]. Minorca’s elongated latitudinal shape is marked by two excellent harbours, at its western and south-eastern extremities, Ciutadella and Mahon, both of Carthaginian date. For the greater part of the four centuries or more of Islamic rule on the islands, Minorca was politically and culturally eclipsed by Majorca. Like the other islands, it benefited from one of two great cultural innovations such as irrigation and windmills characteristic of Muslim Spain. It also participated in Majorca’s corsair activities and shared its fate when in 1116 a combined Pisan-Catalan punitive expedition attacked the two islands and freed a great number of Christian prisoners. On the other hand, its easternmost position may have contributed to growing contacts with Christian maritime powers such as Genoa and Pisa, as reflected in the commercial treaties of 1177, 1181, 1184 and 1188. The island’s special place in Islamic history, however, is due to the virtual independence its rulers enjoyed under the suzerainty of the kings of Catalonia-Aragon between 1231 and 1297. This happened when James I annexed the rest of the archipelago, but concluded two consecutive agricultural treaties with Abū ʿUthmān b. Saʿīd b. al-Hakam by which the latter preserved autonomy in return for the presentation of an annual qiyāza and of a few other symbols of vassalage. Saʿīd b. al-Hakam, given in the sources such simple titles as al-Raʾis “Chief” or al-Muṣṭafī, a title that expressed one of his earlier functions as tax collector and that became his Spanish epithet as Almogafri, proved to be an able ruler (although often a harsh one on religious grounds) and a cultivated man. Minorca attained under his half-a-century long rule (1231-82) the reputation of a prosperous island with a strong fleet, but it became especially renowned as a place where refined literary culture flourished and Islamic religious sciences were honoured; it also served as a refuge or point of transit for Muslims fleeing the Reconquista in Spain. After Saʿīd’s death, his successor and a descendant of the previous ruler, al-Hakam b. Saʿīd, who lacked his father’s statesmanship; another would have been the irritation of al-Hakam’s suzerain, Alfonso III of Catalonia-Aragon, by the warning which the Minorcan vassal had sent to Collo when in 1282 a Catalan fleet called at Mahón on its way to raid that North African port. The basic reason, however, should be sought in the historical inevitability of this stage of the Reconquista: the Christian suzerain, for once freed of the usual commitments to wars in the Iberian peninsula, put an end to an anomalous situation. A large fleet left the Catalan port of Salo and, after spending Christmas of 1286 in Majorca, anchored near Mahón in January 1287. Alfonso himself, displaying a Crusader’s paraphernalia and bravura, took part in the ensuing battles. The Muslims put up a brave resistance but eventually had to surrender. The outcome presaged the events of 1492 for Granada. The ruler, his family and retinue were allowed to leave for Muslim-held territory; they embarked in a Genoese ship that took them to Almeria. Eventually they moved to Ceuta, where al-Hakam buried the remains of his father, and whence he and his family sailed to Tunis. They all perished in a storm off the coast of Algiers. As far as the fate of Minorcan Muslims, about one-third chose to emigrate as well.

In subsequent centuries, Minorca, like the rest of the Balearics, was both a participant and a victim in the see-saw contest of Christian and Muslim corsairs. Thus Piri Reis’s (fl. ca. 1526) mentions frequent visits by Arab and Turkish (corsair) boats, and the presence of a great number of Arab and Turkish pirates put to work on the salines of Ibiza. In 1535 Barbarossa [see KHAIR AL-DIN] briefly seized Mahón, and Ciutadella was attacked during the 1558 expedition of the Ottoman fleet under Piyâle Pasha in the Western Mediterranean.

Bibliography: Maria Luisa Belabre, Historia de Menorca, Mas 1977, i, 126-65; Istám St-Salim, Düzüs al-Andalus al-mansiyya, Beirut 1984, 446-60, and its bibl. useful for Arabic sources; E. Lévi-Provençal, La période ibérique d’après Ar-Ra’id al-Miṣfīr [de Himyar], Leiden 1938, 185, 224; F. Codera, review of A. Campaner y Fuertes, Besossíes historico de la dominación islamita en las Islas Baleares, in: Boletín Real Academia Historica, Madrid, xvi (1890), 492-97; D. E. Harms, La vie intellectuelle et spirituelle dans les Baléares Musulmanes, in: al-Andalus, xxxvii (1975), 87-132, esp. 123-6; E. Molina López, El gobierno independentista de Menorca y sus relaciones con al-Andalus e Irligiyen: el “Kittub Lubāb al-Albāb”, una nueva fuente para la historia del Occidente Musulman, in: Revista de Menorca (1982), 5-88; Piri Reis’s, Kittub-i Babriyye, Ankara 1935, 530-3 (see also 534-40 for Majorca); TOEM, s.v. 3, qiyāza 10, sayi 15, p. 966 (Piyâle Pasha’s vassal).

MIR, a Persian title abbreviated from the Arab amīr and approximating in meaning both to it and to the title mirāz [q.v.]. (For the dropping of the initial alj, cf. Bu Sahil for Abū Sulh, etc.) Like amir the title is applied to princes (Manuchirî, ed. A. de Biberstein-
Kazimirsky, Monouchrei, poëte persan du onzieme siecle de notre ère, Paris 1886, 96, speaks of Sultan ... Society, 198; C. White, Three years in Constantinople, iii, 286).

Horse breeding was a matter of prime concern to

It occurs also in official titles in both the Dİhli Sultanate and in Mughal administration: mir āḏīsh "chief of artillery"; mir bōltān "commander"; "chief of police"; mir ʾīmādat "controller of building operations"; mir sāmān "chief of the commissionariat"; etc. Mir-i fargh is the term usually applied to stone weights—often of marble carved and inset with semi-precious stones—used to hold down a pall over a grave.

In Turkish there was derived from it the colloquial adjective miri ("belonging to the government"), which gave rise to al-miri ("the government") in the colloquial Arabic of Tirık.

(R. Levy [J. Burton-Page])

MIR—MIR-ĀKHUR

In the Ottoman empire, the mir-ākhur or Master of the Stables was the official given charge of all aspects relating to the supply and maintenance of the Sultan’s stables, the ṣāḥib-i ʾamame. The wide-ranging services connected with the imperial stables were divided between two chief officials, the kūčük mir-ākhur or Master of the Lesser Stable, and the bāyāk mir-ākhur or Master of the Great Stable, both of whom were high officials in the Palace Outer Service with the rank of Aghas of the Palace. The staff within the Palace included princes who were expected to raise, feed, shoe, and equip two colts for each of land assigned to them (Başbakanlık Arsivi, Maliyeden müdevver, no. 794). Outside the Palace, the mir-ākhur employed Bulgarian Christians called oyunaks numbering about 900-1,000 (Blaise de Vigenère, 347), some of whom were given exemption from certain taxes in return for their services, and others of whom got timar benefices (ʿAli Čalwaš, Kânîn-ı, 155-6). Apart from the breeding and raising of horses on the stud farms (and in the imperial stables which were divided into four sections: the main houses and the lesser houses, the Greater Stable and the Lesser Stable), the duties of the Imperial Stables included all of the animals belonging to the state for use in the sultan’s carriages. The Great Stable (bāyāk ʾākhur) consisted of seventeen separate buildings adjacent to the outer wall of the Palace along the Marmara Sea coast (Baudier, 21, 22). Where one thousand horses were kept, principally for the use of members of the sultan’s household on festive occasions such as state processions (alay-i hāmâyân), or at the reception of a foreign ambassador. Horses from the imperial stables were also distributed to members of the sultan’s household for use during military campaigns. Each spring the horses belonging to the imperial stables in Istanbul were taken to the meadows of Kâğıd-Kâne for pasturing, and the mir-ākhur himself resided there during the summer months (Eyvâli Čelebi, i, 480-2).

The bāyāk mir-ākhur was also responsible for pack animals and camels belonging to the state for use during military campaigns, and had to supervise the stable-related services both within and without the Palace. The staff within the Palace included principally the saddlers’ guild (sarâbîn-i ʾākhur), who numbered 230 men (in addition, 120 men were assigned as saddlers for the draught animals bârgîr sarâbîn-i kâfî, Kanân-nâme, Velîyyidin, no. 1970, f. 107a), the camel-drivers (şuṭurşûn) responsible for the care of the animals during campaign, and the grooms (sâʾiran) and others who cared for the animals in the stables. While some observers estimated the numbers of Palace stable employees as between 10,000 and 12,000 (ʿArāmīn, 44; Blaise de Vigenère, 348), the following table based on official registers gives more precise information as to their actual numbers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No. of employees</th>
<th>Yearly wages in akças</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>933/1527</td>
<td>2,830</td>
<td>5,133,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>975/1567</td>
<td>4,321</td>
<td>7,457,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1018/1609</td>
<td>4,322</td>
<td>8,405,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1038/1629</td>
<td>4,246</td>
<td>9,304,888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sources for table in order given: Barkan, in İktisat Fakültesi Mermesi, xv [1953-4], 300; Barkan, in İFM, xix [1957-8], 305-6; ʿAyn-ʿAllî, Risâle, Istanbul 1280/1683-4, 99; Başbakanlık Arşivi, Maliyeden müdevver, no. 794.)

The oyunak organisation was designed primarily for the purpose of maintaining a good breeding stock for the imperial stables, but purchase and maintenance of the herd of pack animals including camels (dave), geldings (bârgîr) and mules (ester) and others, was also part of the purview of the mir-ākhur. Stables had to be built and forage provided over the winter months for all of the animals belonging to the state (mir-i ʾākhur). Sometimes special collections were taken up under the name of the campaign provisions tax (bedel-i nüzûl) (for an example, see Muhummme, vol. 87 [1046/1636-7], 18, an order providing that each train of five camels (katar) wintering in the environs of Zile should be supplied each day with one kile (25.656 kg) of barley and 50 uşuık (64.14 kg) of straw, but the animals within the imperial stables in Istanbul or Edirne were provided for by a special fund allocated to the baron commissionier (amin-i ḫavw). The amount of cash allocated in the year 1070/1660 for the forage of those animals in the imperial stables alone was 11,816,379 akças (Hüseyen Hazarfen, Tağlîk al-bayân, figures published by Barkan, in İFM, xvii [1955-6], 344-5). Apart from the cash allocation, an additional 302,692 akças (7,766 metric tons of barley and 5,133,000 metric tons) of straw were provided in kind (ibid., 344). For information on prices for both thoroughbreds and common work-horses, the terek defterleri are a most useful source (for two representative examples, see Barkan, in Belgelere, iii, 136, listing sixteen individual animals of varying prices valued at a total of 37,290 akças, and ibid., 404, listing several prize horses, including one valued at 18,000 akças). Most commonly the price for sound draught horses or pack animals was around 1,000-1,200 akças (H. Inalik, in V.J. Parry and M.E. Yapp (eds.), War, technology and Society, 198; C. White, Three years in Constantinople, iii, 286).

Horse breeding was a matter of prime concern to...
For some sultans, the collection of prize horses became almost an obsession, as was the case with Mehemmed IV [q.v.] (reigned 1058-99/1648-87), who came to be known as Audîji Mehemmed or Mehemmed the huntsman. Edward Brown, an English traveller who visited Mehemmed's camp during an imperial residence at Larissa in the summer of 1669, remarked that having seen the stables of the great princes of Christendom in Paris, Naples and Dresden and Prague, he found that none of them could compare in their variety and brilliance to those of the sultan's court (Brown, *Travels*, 40). But apart from their value for sport, sound breeds were a military necessity. According to Marsigli (*Stato militare*, 41-2), the horses bred in Transylvania from Moldavian mares were prized for their stamina during long marches, and the Tatar horses, though somewhat smaller in stature, were equally indefatigable. Besides the Moldovan and Tatar horses, the sultan's stables were supplied with Turkish breeds. Horse breeding and horse trading were established economic activities in central Anatolia from ancient times (F. Taeschner, *Anadolu*, i, 476). An Arab traveller of the 8th/14th century单身 (Stato militare) observed that horses raised by the Turcoman tribes of Germîyan and Kastamonu for especial praise (al-Samans known as the *esb-keshan* tdÎifesi). In exchange for other taxes, the *esb-keshan* of Karaman were expected to provide a number of horses each year (for an example, see Basbakanhk arsivi, nos. 710, 768, 6197; no. 6883 Maliyeden mudevver hazinesi, no. 6147 (1028 A.H.); no. 6883 Maliyeden mudevver no. 6148 (1028 A.H.); no. 4872 (1060 A.H.); no. 18172 (1063 A.H.); Regulations for the sultan's pastures and parks: BaÎbakanlî arsivi, Kanûl Kepei no. 7182 and Maliyeden mudevver no. 210, 768, 61 et al.). The show horses and studs kept in the sultan's privy stable were mostly given to him as gifts from governors in the Ottoman period, the province of Karaman was a centre for the organisation of the stables in other Islamic states, see C.S. Colin and C.E. Bosworth in ISTABL. (R. Murphey)

*The Ottoman* period, the province of Karaman was a centre for the organisation of the stables in other Islamic states, see C.S. Colin and C.E. Bosworth in ISTABL. (R. Murphey)
MIR 'ALI SHIR NAVAI', Nizam al-Din 'Ali Shir, later called Mir 'Ali Shir or 'Ali Shir Beg, with the pen-name (tayyeb) of Nawaii (844/946/1415-1501), outstanding 9th/15th century Caghatay poet and important Central Asian cultural and political figure of the reign of the Timurid sultan Husayn Baykara (873/911/1469-1506 [q.v.]).

He was born in Harat (Herat) on 17 Ramadan 844/February 1441, the scion of a cultured Turkic family of Uyghur bakhshis, hereditary chancellory scribes, who had long been in the service of the Timurid family. 'Ali Shir's father, Ghiyath-al-Din Kichkina, also called Kichkina Bakhshi, was in the service of AbuSa'id, the grandson of Miranshah, as well as of Abu 'l-Kasim Bubur, Shahruck's grandson, and at one time was the governor (bakhsh) of Sabzvar.

'Ali Shir's maternal grandfather, Bu Sa'id Gang, had been an amir of Mirza Baykara's, the son of 'Umar Shaykh and grandfather of Husayn Baykara. Moreover, the family of 'Ali Shir was intimately connected to that of 'Umar Shaykh by ties of foster-brotherhood (kakalik) and 'Ali Shir was himself the foster-brother of Husayn Baykara. Although he never bore the title kikelik, it was always appended to the name of his brother, Darwish 'Ali. Because the families of 'Ali Shir and Husayn Baykara were closely related and sometimes counted themselves as of the same age (two years older), they were educated together as children. The fact that 'Ali Shir received a good education is emphasised by Dawlatghah and would have been in keeping with the value placed on a universal education by the highly literate Central Asian bakhshis.

As a result of the unstable political situation created by the death of Shahrub in 850/1447, 'Ali Shir's family was forced to flee Harat until the restoration of order in the early 1450s enabled it to return to Khurasan. The chronology of 'Ali Shir's life before he joined Husayn Baykara at the time of the latter's accession to power in Harat in 873/1469 is not entirely clear. His first patron appears to have been Abu 'l-Kasim Bubur, whose service he entered in Harat together with Husayn Baykara sometime before 860/1456. But, as Husayn Baykara had earlier been in the service of AbuSa'id (with whom he soon fell out of favour, however, and remained on inimical terms), it is possible that 'Ali Shir, or at least his father, also accompanied Husayn Baykara when he entered the service of this Timurid prince in 858/1454. 'Ali Shir and Husayn Baykara were closely related, as they accompanied Abu 'l-Kasim Bubur to Mashhad in 860/1456, but after the latter's death in 861/1457, they parted ways for twelve years. Husayn Baykara then entered upon a period of kaziiklik during which he struggled to establish himself politically, while 'Ali Shir pursued his studies in Mashhad, Harat and Samarkand. Although the dates of 'Ali Shir's movements between these cities are not stated explicitly in the sources, it is clear that he studied in Samarkand under Khudayd Fa'ad Allah Abu 'l-Layhji, an expert in fiqh and Arabic, for a period of two years. It is however not clear whether he came to Samarkand solely for the purpose of studying or because he was banished from Harat by AbuSa'id, whose service he entered, according to V.V. Bartol'd, sometime after 868/1464. Both Bartol'd and E.E. Bertel's held the view that he was banished, arguing that, in those days, no man left Harat to study in Samarkand, which had become a provincial town in comparison with the capital (for a refutation of this view, see E.R. Rustamov, Stranit's iz biografii Alig'yar Navaii ("Pages from the biography of 'Ali Shir Navaii"), in Kratkie soothcheniya Institutu narodov Azii, Moscow, Ixii [1963], 80-6). It is likely that 'Ali Shir was in Samarkand on two occasions—the first in 862-3/1458-9 to pursue his studies and the second around 871/1467 after he encountered political troubles at the court of AbuSa'id in Harat. He also appears to have been in Mashhad twice during this period of his life. In Samarkand he was aided by two mentors—Darwish Muhammad Tarqkan, the brother-in-law of AbuSa'id, and Ahmad Hadi Beg, the powerful governor of the city, who was also a poet with the pen-name Wafai.

After the death of AbuSa'id in 873/1468 and Husayn Baykara's subsequent seizure of power in Harat on 10 Ramadan 873/24 March 1469, 'Ali Shir left Samarkand, where he had been in the retinue of Ahmad Hadi Beg, in order to enter Husayn Baykara's service and, on Bayram 873/14 April 1469, presented him with his famous kasida entitled Hilaityya. He remained in the service of Husayn Baykara, who ruled Khurasan from Harat uninterruptedly for almost forty years (with the exception of the brief interregnum of Shahruck's great-grandson, Muhammad Ydagir, in 875/1470), until his death on 12 Dzumadai 1406/6 January 1501. He was buried in Harat.

Although he held several offices, such as that of kaziiklik (the sultan's intimate). As a result of his unique position at court compared with that of the hereditary beg on the service of Husayn Baykara's grandfather, it was always appended to the name (hakim) of 'Ali Shir (kukdshki) by ties of foster-brotherhood

Husayn Baykara's service and, on Bayram 873/14 April 1469, appointed by Husayn Baykara in 873/1469 and from which he soon resigned, 'Ali Shir tried as a rule to avoid political office. Since he was not a member of one of the paramount Caghatay clans that constituted the Timurids' Turkic subjects and matters of a military nature) by Husayn Baykara in 876/1472. In connection with this appointment, he was granted precedence in affixing his seal over that of all other amirs with the sole exception of Muzaffar Barlas, one of Husayn Baykara's companions from his kaziiklik days. In late 894/1488 he asked to be relieved of his position as governor (bakhsh) of Astarabad, to which he had been appointed the previous year (for a refutation of Bartol'd's idea that 'Ali Shir was banished here by Husayn Baykara, see A.A. Semenov, Vzaimotnosheniy Alig'yar Navaii i Sultani Khuseyn-Miži ("Relations between 'Ali Shir Navaii and Sultan Husayn Baykara"), in Izlemevanie po istorii kul'tur narodov sostoka (Sbornik o te'st akad. I.A. Orbeli, Moscow-Leningrad 1960, 237-49). At the same time, he resigned from the office of amir (amir-i imrat) or, as Bubur put it, gave up "military duties" altogether, that is, the duties associated with the title, although he continued to retain the title itself.

The strength of 'Ali Shir's position at the court of Husayn Baykara derived from his personal service to him based on their relationship as foster-brothers, rather than from any official positions held by him. 'Ali Shir belonged to the inner circle of Husayn Baykara's courtiers (ikshkan) and, in his own words, stood closer to the throne than any of the great amirs. The honorific title that was bestowed upon him by Husayn Baykara and by which he is referred to in the contemporary sources was mawudd-i haddari-i sultani ("the sultan's intimate"). As a result of his unique position at court, 'Ali Shir was often entrusted with important matters of state, such as acting as intermediary in the frequent conflicts between Husayn Baykara and his sons or governing Harat in
the sultan’s absence. It ought to be noted that cAh Shir was never Husayn Baykara’s wazir (an error persisted in the secondary literature) nor could he have possessed this title, since, in the dual administrative structure of the Timurid government, it was reserved exclusively for officials of the Sâr dîwânî which dealt with non-Turkic, that is, sedentary Iranian matters, such as finance, and its holders were as a rule non-Turkic.

Ali Shir’s primary historical importance lies in his literary activity. He is universally considered as the greatest representative of Çağhatây Turkish literature which, thanks to him, reached its apogee in the second half of the 9th/15th century at the court of Husâyn Bâykarâ in Harât. He was already regarded by his contemporaries as the greatest poet ever to have written in the Turkish language. Indeed, his family background seemed to predispose him to the poetic art as two of his maternal uncles were poets with the pen-names Kabûli and Gharîbi, as was his cousin, Amir Haydar, who wrote under the name of Şâbûhi.

Despite the fact that Persian had traditionally been regarded as the language par excellence in Central Asia since the 4th/10th century, Ali Shir championed the cause of the Çağhatây, or Eastern Turkic, literary language (usually referred to by contemporaries using the term Câghâtay) which was seen as a continuation of such Middle Turkic language as Karâkânîd (5th-7th/11th-13th centuries) and Kârâzîmanî (8th/14th century). He argued that not only could it vie with Persian but that it was also superior to it as a language for poetry. Following the lead of earlier Çağhatây poets of the Timurid period, such as Lûtî [q.v.], Sâkki and Gâdâ’î, Ali Shir founded Çağhatay as a new literary language, modelled on Nizâmi’s 889/1483), a romantic mathnawi modelled on Nizâmi’s Old Age”), corresponding to the four ages of his life, and a translation and expansion of Djâmî’s collected biographies of Şûfî saints, entitled Nafâtût-âl-âns.

Nawa’î also wrote several works in Persian: a Dîwân (completed 902/1496) in imitation mainly of Háfez, in which he used the pen-name Fâni; Risâsî-ye mu’âammâ (completed some time before 889/1482), a treatise on the enigma; and a collection of model letters. Other works in Çağhatây of secondary significance are the biographies of two of Nawa’î’s close companions, Hâlâtî-ye Pahlavân Muhammad; two short histories, Türkî-i mulûki ‘Ada’âm and Türkî-i anbîya’ wa haštâmâ; Nazm al-djawdhir, a translation of aphorisms ascribed to ‘Ali, entitled Naqî-âl-âsâfî; a verse translation of Djâmî’s work, Çıhîl hadîthî, a collection of model letters; and a Wâkîfyya (completed 886/1481-2).

The impact of Nawa’î’s works on all Turkic peoples and languages cannot be underestimated. He exerted a profound influence not only on later Central Asian authors who wrote in Çağhatây up until the beginning of the 20th century, but also on the development of Azeri (especially on the poetry of Fudûl [q.v.]) until the 19th century (see E. Birnbaum, The Ottomans and Chaghatay literature, in CâF, xx/3 [1976], 157-90). Soviet scholarship, which has termed Câghâtay “Old Uzbek”, considers him the founder of the literary Uzbek (A. K. Borovkov, Alişer Navi kaş osnovopoloznik uzbekskogo literaturnogo yazyka (“Ali Shir Nawa’î” as the founder of the literary Uzbek language”), in Alişer Navi. Shornik stastey, ed. Borovkov, Moscow-Leningrad 1946, 92-174). Proof of the tremendous interest in the works of Nawa’î among not only the Turkish but also the Iranian-speaking peoples are the many specialised dictionaries that were written on the basis of his works, such as Tâlî Imâmî’s Çağhatây-Persian dictionary, Bâdâ’î-î-lughât, composed during the reign of Huseyn Bâykarâ (see Borovkov, “Bâdâ’î-î-lughât”: slovar Tâlî Imâmî geratskogo k soleniyam
Ali Shīr's patronage activities included the donation and endowment of about 370 buildings, architectural ensembles and public works in Khurasan and Harat, especially in and around Harat. Among these was the huge Hālilīyā complex to the north of the city, which contained a mosque, madrasa, khānas, hospital, bath and Ali Shīr's principal residence. Khānāmīr enumerates about 50 ribāts which he donated throughout Khūrāsān, about 20 reservoirs (ba'ad) in Harat, 15 bridges, nine public baths, and 14 mosques in Harat and other cities, such as Iṣfīzār, Sarākh and Astarābād. In many cases, pious endowments which he made provided for the maintenance of scholars, students and the poor. He was also involved in restoration work and was responsible for the reconstruction of, among other monuments, the Friday mosque of Harat which dated back to Ghurid times (early 7th/13th century) (see L. Golombek, The residue of the Friday mosque: the case of Harat, in Muqarnas, i [1983], 95-102).

Ali Shīr's patronage activities were financed from personal sources of revenue derived from landholdings throughout Khūrāsān (but particularly in the region of Western Khurasan) and from Harat, his residence, in the form of the amīr, such as the royal mint and royal workshops. Various estimates of his daily income indicate that he was one of the wealthiest men of his time.

Despite a certain idealisation of Ali Shīr in the writings of his contemporaries (such as Khānāmīr's Makārim al-ʿ.svg, and Dawlatshāh's Taṣḥīḥ al-ʿ.svg, which stress such positive aspects of his character as his integrity, refinement, charitable works, patronage, etc., it is possible from other sources to form a more rounded opinion of him. The single negative character trait is the early seconded by later authors such as Muhammad Haydar and Bābur is his hypersensitivity, which, coupled with the high moral and artistic standards which he set both for himself and for others, made him a demanding and difficult person. In describing his exclusive literary audiences, Wāsīf offers a glimpse of this less attractive side of his character, which often manifested itself as impatience or even sarcasm (see A. N. Boldrev, Ali Shīr navoi v tsaksadakh soveremenikhos ("Ali Shīr Navawī according to his contemporaries"), in Ali Shīr navoi, ed. Borovkov, 121-52).

In his personal life, Ali Shīr maintained an ascetic lifestyle, never marrying or having concubines or children. Although initiated into the Nakshbandiyya order by his spiritual master and lifelong friend, the great Persian poet and mystic, Dāmī, in 881/1476-7, his brand of mysticism was not of the "intoxicating", but rather of the more worldly variety practised by the order as a whole. Much has been made of his purported inclination toward Shī‘ism, but there is no evidence that this went beyond reverence for the person of Ali, a feature of Central Asian Islam in general.

The complex figure of Ali Shīr sparked the popular imagination of many Turkic peoples. Turkmen folktales, for example, depict him as the clever waṣīf, the defence of the poor, who before his extravagant and misguided sultan, while Uzbek legends revolve around the mysterious reasons for his celibacy. Many of his ghazals have become popular Uzbek folk songs and some of his works have been staged as dramatic plays by modern Uzbek playwrights.

MIR ALI SHIR NAWAWI — MIR KASIM ALI

thousand manuscripts (based mainly on the count made by Kh. Sulaymonov), the great majority of which are of the Dinan and Khasan. For a description of the manuscript collections held by Eckmann, see Alisher Navoiy asrar-i-nasrin. Uzbek fanar akademiyasii i khorazhmoni-khoxmati instituti tizimlamlari kilemlarini ("Manuscripts of the works of 'Ali Shir Nawawi' in the collection of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the Uzbek S.S.R.").

MIR KASIM ALI, Indo-Muslim commander and Nawawebq.v. of Bengal 1760-4, died in 1777. He was the Shah Bahadur ruler of Golkonda 'Abd Allah b. Muhammad Shihab al-Din and Awrangzib [see KUTB-SHAHIS] and then in that of the Mughals Shsh Dujhan and Awrangzib [q.v.], died in 1073/1663. Stemming originally from Persia, he was at the outset a diamond merchant and accumulated a vast private fortune in the city of Madras, from these dealings and from Hindu temple treasures, having his own private army of 5,000 cavalrymen and using European help and expertise for his artillery. But after the defeat of the Kutb-Shahis at Golkonda in Rabii II 1066/February 1656 at the hands of the prince Awrangzib, viceroy of the Deccan, Mir Dujuma went over to the Mughals, who honoured him and gave him the title of Muazzam Khan. He commanded the Mughal troops against the Adil-Shahis [q.v.] of Bijapur in Muharram 1076/November 1656, and then in Shawwal 1070/June 1660 became governor of Bengal, campaigning against the raiqis of Kacch Bihm (Coch Behar) and Assam [q.v.] immediately on appointment and in the period Dujumadi I-Radjab 1072/January-March 1662, the latter campaign culminating in the capture of the Ajom raiq of Assam's capital of Garhagun. But the rainy season and outbreaks of disease in his army compelled him to return to Bengal, and he himself died of dysentery in spring 1073/1663 at Khidrapur just before reaching Dacca, leaving behind him a reputation of having been the greatest general of his age.


[M. Hidayat Hosain — C.E. Bosworth]
Mir Kasim’s rise to power was an episode in the British East Indian Company’s extension of power in eastern India in the latter decades of the 18th century. Since the Nawab of Bengal Mir Da’far [see ga’far, mir] was unable to fulfill financial obligations contracted to the Company, he was in October 1760 deposed in favour of his son-in-law Mir Kasim, who now became Nawab but had to cede the districts of Burdwan, Midnapur and Chittagong to the British. However, he now attempted to build up for himself an independent state in Upper Bengal and Bihar, abandoning Lower Bengal to the British, moving his capital to the less accessible Mungir [q. v.] in Bihar and forming an army on European lines trained by an Armenian, Gurgin (Gregorios) Khan. Relations with Britain became strained over the question of private trading within India, for Europeans trading inland claimed exemption from duties, thus diminishing the Nawab’s revenues. War broke out in Bihar in July 1763. Mir Kasim’s new army proved ineffective; Mungir and Patna were captured; and Mir Kasim fled to Awadh (Oudh) [q. v.] and sought the alliance of the Nawab-wozir of Awadh Shuja’d al-Dawla and the Mughal Emperor in Delhi, Shah ʿAlam II. The allies were nevertheless defeated at Baksar (Buxar [q. v.]) on 23 October 1764 by Major Hector Munro, but Mir Kasim had already been stripped of his possessions and imprisoned by Shuja’d al-Dawla. He now escaped, led a wandering life and died near Delhi in 1777. Mir Da’far had been briefly restored in Bengal till his death in 1765, with British control there firmly established.


MIR LAWHĪ, SAYYID MUHAMMAD B. MUHAMMAD AL-HUSAYNĪ, referred to also by his nickname as ‘mutahhar’ and nom-de-plume as ‘ sniff’, a noted Shi’ī religious scholar of Sabzawār origin, but resident in Isfahan during the Safavid period, flour. during the 11th/17th century. He has not received any well-known Shi’ī authorities as Shaykh Bahā’ al-Din Muhammad al-ʿAmālī, the father of Sharḥ al-Qadīr ‘imām, al-ʿĀmilī, the father of ʿAbd al-Ḥasīb (Muhammad Muḥsin Aḥa Būrzīr Tīhrānī, al-Qaṣīrūn al-ṣaṣīn al-ṣaṣīn al-ṣaṣīn, 9; our references here are only to the abridged copy.) The fact that Mir Lawhi was an advanced student in or before 1031/1621 suggests that he could not have been less than 20 years at age at that time and consequently his date of birth must have been ca. 1010/1601. The book also shows that Mir Lawhi’s areas of intellectual interests were Shi’ī theology, the Imāmāte, especially the questions relative to the Twelth Imām, and the refutation of all forms of Sufism. The other books he ascribed to himself, such as ʿAlām al-muhābbin, Ibrā’ al-Qulūb wa-khassat al-majdīn, ʿĀdī al-ukbā fi mānākīh al-sa‘īda wa l-a‘ayyīs, and even his Riḍā al-muḥmin wa-hādī al-muttakīn, which he wrote during his youth, were written on those subjects; the latter books, however, do not seem to have been available to the authors in the field.

Mir Lawhi was also interested in Islamic history and wrote a controversial book, in or sometime before 1043/1633, on the problem of ʿAbū ʿAbdūrāsān’s rising against the Umayyads. According to a note written by Muhammad ʿAbd al-Ḥasīb al-Husaynī in 1063/1654, Mir Lawhi argues in his book that ʿAbū ʿAbdūrāsān (d. 157/774) [q. v.] whose origin from Khurasan, ʿAbd al-Ḥasīb, or Isfahan has not been determined, did actually win the caliphate for the tyrannical ʿAbbāsids, but was never a friend of the Shīʿī Imāms, and was murdered for his evil deeds by the then Ṭabīb al-salīr, al-Maʻṣūrī (d. 157/774), who was more wicked than himself. Some people did not tolerate Mir Lawhi’s condemnation of ʿAbū ʿAbdūrāsān, and troubled him with all their effort and power (bi kull gikkīn wa-gūra). A number of Mir Lawhi’s contemporaries, ʿAlāmī, however, defended his argumentation by writing numerous books and treatises on the subject, and one of them was the Iḥrār al-hakk wa-miʿyār al-sidīr written in 1043/1633 by Sayyid Ahmad al-ʿĀlāwī al-ʿĀmilī, the father of ʿAbd al-Ḥasīb (Muhammad Muḥsin Aḥa Būrzīr Tīhrānī, al-Qaṣīrūn al-ṣaṣīn al-ṣaṣīn al-ṣaṣīn, iv, Tehran 1941, 150-1, where there can also be found a list of seventeen books written in support of Mir Lawhi’s position on the problem.) The reasons behind this confusion and controversy, which involved the common people as well as a number of religious authorities, seem to be found mainly in Mir Lawhi’s ideological difference with the Shīʿīs, whom Mir Lawhi himself scorns, but which was probably due to the fact that ʿAbū ʿAbdūrāsān had been a famous Sufi of the Sufis, the helpless Sayyid [Mir Lawhi], who provoked the common people from loving Abu Muslim,
had no peace even for a moment, and the Sufis, both their elite and the common followers, hurt him a great deal through their accusations and personal attacks. Mir Lawhi was reluctant to oppose the popular Madjlisi, who had no peace even for a moment, and the Sufis, both their elite and the common followers, hurt him a great deal through their accusations and personal attacks. Mir Lawhi was reluctant to oppose the popular Madjlisi, who

Owing to this unhappy experience, Mir Lawhi had no peace even for a moment, and the Sufis, both their elite and the common followers, ... mirdn.

Holders of the rank of mir-i mirdn enjoyed the designation of Pasha, and were entitled to be addressed as

ordinary human beings can earn limited knowledge through supernatural means, which is simply a form of boasting (jazgaz) which is sung by singers such as Shâh Mûhsûni. Owing to this unhappy experience, Mir Lawhi had no peace even for a moment, and the Sufis, both their elite and the common followers, hurt him a great deal through their accusations and personal attacks. Mir Lawhi was reluctant to oppose the popular Madjlisi, who had no peace even for a moment, and the Sufis, both their elite and the common followers, hurt him a great deal through their accusations and personal attacks. Mir Lawhi was reluctant to oppose the popular Madjlisi, who...
In the 19th century, it also became a civil service rank. Before the administrative reforms of 1259/1843, civil officials held military ranks, such as ferk “divisional commander” and mir-i liwā “brigadier”. The award of military ranks for them now ceased, and the equivalent ranks of mir-i mīrān and emir ʿl-ʾumrān were given to them.

Bibliography:
M.Z. Pākānī, Osmani tārīkh deśimerī ve terimerī siṭlūqā, ii, Istanbul 1953, on whose material this article is based.

F.A.K. Yassakī
MĪR MUḤAMMAD MAṢŪM, known as Nāmī, historian of Sind in the Mughal period. He was the son of a shaykh ʿl-ʾIslam from the island in the Indus river in Sind of Bhakkar [see BAKKAR], born in the middle years of the 10th/16th century. After a stay in Gujārāt, he entered the service of the Mughal emir Akbar [q.v.] in 1503-4/1595-6 and received a mansab [q.v.] or land-grant of 250, being employed on a diplomatic mission to the court of the Safavid ʿShāh ʿAbbās I of Persia. He returned to Bhakkar in 1515/1606-7 and died there soon afterwards.

His Persian Taʾrīk̄h-i Sind, often referred to as the Taʾrīk̄h-i Maṣūmī, deals with the Islamic history of his home province, and was edited by U.M. Daudpota, Poona 1930, see on it Storey, 651-3, 1324.

The majority of his poems in the ghazal. Excerpts from the Taʾrīk̄h-i Sind were tr. in Eliot and Dowson, History of India, i, 215-52. (Ed.)

MĪR MUḤAMMAD TAKĪ (1125-1223/1713-1810), leading Urdu ghazal poet.

He was born in Akbarābād (Agra), the son of a Sufī darāwil who impressed on him the importance of divine love and the unreliability of this world, ideas which he was later to stress in his poetry. Biographical details are difficult to date, but he must have been about 15 years old when, following his father’s early death, he went to Dihlī to seek a livelihood. There he found a patron who, however, soon died, and he returned to Akbarābād. Little is known of his activities there, but it appears that he caused a family scandal by an affair with the wife of a relative. He returned to Dihlī ca. 1152/1739, and stayed with an uncle of his stepbrother, the well-known Urdu poet Khān Arzū. He studied Arabic and Persian and the poetic art, and commenced a career as an Urdu poet. Despite the unsettled situation in Dihlī and the poet’s own pride and independence, he was supported by various patrons, and became well-known as both a poet and an eccentric. There was, however, some instability in his make-up; indeed, he had a severe mental breakdown, which was exacerbated, and perhaps partially caused, by his stepbrother’s insanity. At times his statement about love reminds one of the Sufi concept of love, e.g. since it ends in disappointment. Yet throughout his poetry are remarks clearly referring to the Sufi concept of love, e.g.

How shall I say in truth what is love!
To the righteous people (hakk-šinās)
God is love.

At times his statement about love reminds one of Muhammad Ikbaīl [q.v.]. Much has been written about Mir’s language and style, and the word sādāq (“simplicity”) recurs. And indeed, there are many verses which are almost conversational in language. To him, meaning was all-important. His simplicity is most effective in short metres. Sadiq, a less than enthusiastic critic, describes his style (op. cit., in Bibl., 99) as “bare even to nakedness”. But though Mir avoids gaudy description, his diction is rich, with many Persian words. His similes and metaphors are telling, but, like other jānāt-i-badd, they are employed as means rather than ends. The final section of his taḥkına should be read to appreciate his attitude to the use of foreign (i.e. Persian) vocabulary and idioms. He objected to them only where the grammar was foreign and not rīk̄hī (=Urdu). Another feature of his ghazals is their musical effect. L.C. Randhir (op. cit. in Bibl., 177-178) has written about music and ghazal; but the influence in Mir’s poetry does not need singing or instrumental accompaniment—it is achieved by felicitous choice of metre and language. The harmonious use of consonants and vowels, tadhāl and word repetition are further 30 or so years, but his last years were gloomy even by his own sorrowful standards, and he looked forward to death with equanimity.

Mir’s literary output is considerable. The core of his Urdu poetry, roughly two-thirds of it, consists of ghazals collected in six diwāns, and these constitute his main contribution to Urdu poetry. Next in importance comes his twelve erotic mathnawīs. Many other mathnawīs are devoted to satire and eulogy, and there are a few ḥālās [see Mahīb, 4. In Urdu]. To these should be added over 30 marthiyas, some stanza poetry and other miscellaneous verse. In Persian, his diwān has attracted little interest. But his taḥkına of Urdu poets, Nikāl al-šuʿarā’ (1165/1752) is a pioneer work. Again in Persian, his autobiography Dīhik̄-i-Mīr (1169/1756) is important, not only as an account of his life before leaving Dihlī and a key to his personality, but also for the light it sheds on Dihlī life in those years.

Since his Dihlī years, Mir has been widely acclaimed as a great—possibly the greatest—Urdu ghazal poet. As Brēwī puts it (Kulliyāt, Introd., 48), “he made ghazal what it is” (lit. “he made ghazal ghazal”). Even the poetry he wrote in other forms is largely ghazal in spirit. At the same time, excessive praise, due perhaps to oriental exaggeration, has not been helpful. Even a reliable critic like Siddīkī (op. cit., 140) begins a short account of him: “Mīr Tākī Mīr is not merely the Emperor, but the God of poetry.” Elsewhere, Brēwī aptly describes an important facet of the ghazals when he says that “the secret of Mir’s renown and popularity is that he turned poetry into pain and pain into poetry.” The pessimism in his ghazals might perhaps become boring, but for the fact that he invests it with a sort of universality, so that the reader or listener can identify himself with it. Mir expects nothing of this life, which is deception and dream, with death just around the corner. Naturally, love and beauty are the main themes of the ghazals. The love is largely earthly, though there are Sufi overtones; but to him love is not infidelity. The love is largely earthly, though there are Sufi overtones; but to him love is not infidelity. The love is largely earthly, though there are Sufi overtones; but to him love is not...
among the elements involved. But it must not be forgotten that Mir writes about life from personal experience. As Brévié puts it (op. cit., 250), his poetry is the perfect amalgam of life and art. As for his short erotic mathnavis, whilst not without narrative, they are far removed from the more familiar long heroic mathnavis typified by Sîr al-bayyân (see Ḥasan, mîr QUlam). But they are historically important.

High praise of Mir as a poet has led to a reaction, more especially since Muhammad Husayn Azâd in his books and in his lifetime, wrote over his 72 outstanding verses (‘lances’): but some more recent critics have maintained that ‘his high is very high, but his low is very low.’ Writing in 1964, Sadiq (op. cit., 90) complains that there is nothing tragic or heroic about him, and that he is often ‘morbid, unhealthy, and pathological’. Even so, in 1973 Ahmed Ali (op. cit. in Biš., 53) could describe him as a great Romantic who reached heights not attained by Coleridge, Wordsworth, Shelley, and Keats. However, in 1982, Randhir (op. cit., 60), after describing him as ‘a poet with a tearful eye...always gloomy...a realist’ concludes that ‘some of his critics have been too generous in praise.’

Mir’s Persian tadhkira of Urdu poets, Nikât al-‘aśwa’s-‘ayn,1 has been described as no less remarkable than his Arabic tadhkira (Abd Allah, Shâ‘bâna’-I Urdu, 14). The tadhkira form [q.e.] may be described as a collection of specimen verses of a number of poets, with very brief biographical information and critical remarks. There was no standard arrangement: poets might be listed alphabetically, chronologically, by ‘schools’, or with or without dates. Mir’s tadhkira is the oldest extant for Urdu poets, and one of the earliest. It has been strongly attacked for its hasty and unscrupulous method, especially by Muhammad Husayn Azâd [q.e.] in his Ab-î-bayyân, which is itself essentially a large-scale tadhkira, written, however, in Urdu, whereas originally they were in Persian. Whilst Azâd’s criticisms have some substance, they are exaggerated. He also makes a number of statements which are factually erroneous, unless he has had access to some unknown variant manuscript. A more important blemish is Mir’s extraordinary arrangement, which is a mixture of the chronological and alphabetical.

Bibliography: The most recent of several editions of Mir’s collected poetry is Kuliyatî-y-i-Mir, ed. ‘Ībâdat Brévié, Karachi-Lahore 1958, with a 100-page introduction. Some, however, prefer the edn. of ‘Abd Abîr Ashî, Lucknow 1941, which though less complete, is said to be more accurate. Sayyid ‘Abd Allah, Nakî-i-Mir, Lahore 1964, is a full study of the poet in 14 essays. Brévié’s Shâ‘bâna’ awr Shâ‘bâna’ ki tankâd, Karachi 1965, contains three essays on respectively the poet’s ghazal (179-212), his thought (213-36) and his art (257-30), the longest and best account of the poet in English is in R. Russell and Khusro-ud-Dîlamî, Three Mughal poets: Mir, Ḥuseyn, Mir Hasán, London 1969, 257-9. Fârînîn Fâtâhpîrî’s Darydî-yishk awr bahr al-mahabbat kâ takâhibû mutâla’â, Lahore 1972, compares a mathnavi by Mir with a similar one by Muṣṭafâ [q.e.] with the full text of each. The following are more general works with useful sections on Mir: Ram Babu Saksena, A history of Urdu literature, Allahabad 1927, 70-88; Muhammad Sadiq, A history of Urdu literature, London etc., 1964, 94-101, generally hostile in tone; Ahmed Ali, The golden tradition, New-York-London 1973, is a general account of Urdu poetry, with many poems in English translation (23-54, 134-76). L.C. Randhir, Ghazal - the beauty eternal, Delhi 1982, is also useful, though little is said about Mir (60-3, 146). All poetic extracts are given in the Devanagari script, Roman Urdu, and English translation. Furthermore, ‘Abd-î-Layhî Sidîkî, Lakhnâ’î ka dâhistan-i-shâ‘rî, Lahore 1955, 140-9. Muhammad Husayn Azâd, Ab-î-bayyân, Lahore 1917, 203-31 (N.B. the various editions, or more correctly reprints, seem to be identical in pagination); Kâsim (Hakim Abî ‘l-Kâsim Mir Kûdrât Allah Kûsâm) Ma’dâna’-u-yi-nâzîq, Lahore 1933, 229-54. Mir’s autobiography was published as Dâhirî-yi-Mir, ed. ‘Abd Al-Hakk, Awarangâb 1928. His tadhkîra, Nikât al-‘aśwa’s-‘ayn, ed. Muhammad Habîb Al-Rahmân Kûn Shârîwânî, has been published with no date or place of publication. Finally, Sayyid ‘Abd Allah, Shâ‘bâna’-i Urdu kâ tadhkîrî akht tadhkîrîngâr kâ fâm, Lahore 1952, is a general account of the tadhkîra form, with references to Mir at 14-55, 74-5.

MîR MUHANNà [see KURSÂN. iii. In the Persian Gulf].

MîRÂB [see M â’, Iran].

MîRACLÉ [see KÂRÂMA, MU‘ÎGZÂ].

MîRÂDî (A.), originally designates ‘a ladder’, and then ‘an ascent’, and in particular, the Prophet’s ascension to Heaven.

1. In Islamic exegesis and in the popular and mystical tradition of the Arab world.

The Kurân (LXXXI, 19-25, LIII, 1-21) describes a vision in which a divine messenger appears to Muhammad, and LIII, 12-18, treats of a second mission of a similar kind. In both cases, the Prophet sees a heavenly figure approach him from the distance, but there is no suggestion that he himself was carried away to Heaven. However, it is otherwise with the experience alluded to in XVII, 1, “Glory be to Him who transported His servant by night (ašr â’-‘ishhîh layb)” from the Masdîq al-Hârâm to the Masdîq al-Âl-Kâsh which We have surrounded with blessing, in order to show him one of our signs.” For this verse, tradition gives three interpretations: (1) The oldest one, which disappears from the more recent commentaries, detects an allusion to Muhammad’s Ascension to Heaven. This is the more interesting, as these traditions (al-Bûkhârî, Cairo 1278, ii, 185, Bâ’b kânâ ‘l-nabiyyu tandmû ‘aynuhu wa-llâh yamnûmu kâlhu, no. 2; Muslim, Bâlak, 1290, i, 59; al-Tabarî, Taftîsî, xv, 3, cf. B. Schriek, Die Herrlichkeit Muhammed’s, in I. S., vli [1915-16], 12, 14) retain also the original signification of the story of Ascension (A.A. Bevan, Muhammad’s Ascension to Heaven, in Beiträge zur Zeitschr., für die Alttestament. Wissensch., xxvii = Studien ... Julius Wellhausen ... gewidmet, Giessen 1914, 56; Schriek, op. cit.). This explanation interprets the expression al-masdîq al-âla, “the further place of worship” in the sense of “Heaven” and, in fact, in the older tradition tawâ is often used as synonymous with mubâhâ (see I. S., vi, 14). One would thus have, in this verse, witness to the nocturnal ascension of the Prophet to the heavenly spheres (Schriek, op. cit., 13 ff.; J. Horovitz, Muhammad’s Himmelfahrt, in I. S., ix [1919], 161 ff.), but a witness limited merely to an allusion to the adventure, without saying anything about the manner in which it developed. (2) The second explanation, the only one given in all the more modern commentaries, interprets al-masdîq al-âla as “Jerusalem” (Abû ‘l-‘Ardî-yîr al-Qâdirî, and for no very apparent reason. It seems to have been an Umayyad device intended to further the glorification of Jerusalem as against that of the holy territory (cf. Goldzinner, Muš. Stud., ii, 55-6; I. S., vi, 13 ff.), then ruled by ‘Abd Allah b. al-Zubayr. Al-Tabarî seems to
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reject it. He does not mention it in his History and seems rather to adopt the first explanation (see ibid., vi, 3, n. 6). The *idgāna* admitted both interpretations and, when the Umayyad version had arisen, harmonised the two by assigning to *isa*? the special sense of night journey to Jerusalem. The Ascension, having lost its original meaning, was altered in date, being made to fall at a later period, as appears, in fact, to have been done previously by Ibn Isḥāk in the oldest extant biography of Muhammad (Bevan, op. cit., 54).

The story of the night journey to Jerusalem runs as follows:

One night, as Muhammad was sleeping in the neighbourhood of the Ka'ba at Mecca (or in the house of Umm Hāni, *I. sl.* vi, 11) he was awakened by the angel Gabriel who conducted him to a winged animal (see ibid., vi, 15-16). The *idgāna* admitted both interpretations and, when the Umayyad version had arisen, harmonised the two by assigning to *isa*? the special sense of night journey to Jerusalem. The Ascension, having lost its original meaning, was altered in date, being made to fall at a later period, as appears, in fact, to have been done previously by Ibn Isḥāk in the oldest extant biography of Muhammad (Bevan, op. cit., 54).

One night, as Muhammad was sleeping in the neighbourhood of the Ka'ba at Mecca (or in the house of Umm Hāni, *I. sl.* vi, 11) he was awakened by the angel Gabriel who conducted him to a winged animal (see ibid., vi, 15-16). The *idgāna* admitted both interpretations and, when the Umayyad version had arisen, harmonised the two by assigning to *isa*? the special sense of night journey to Jerusalem. The Ascension, having lost its original meaning, was altered in date, being made to fall at a later period, as appears, in fact, to have been done previously by Ibn Isḥāk in the oldest extant biography of Muhammad (Bevan, op. cit., 54).

At Jerusalem, they meet Abraham, Moses and Jesus, who, acting as imams, took precedence of all others, and thereby taking precedence of all others, and thereby taking precedence of all others. This implies that the night journey was not a real journey but a vision. Standing at the heavenly voice, and in VI, 35, the consequences are considered which the signs brought by the Prophet with the help of a ladder to Heaven might have on his hearers. The old poets also talk of ascending to Heaven by a ladder, as a means of escaping something one wants to avoid (Zuhayr, *Mu'alla'ka*, 54; al-'Ašā, no. XV, 32).

Hadīth scholars discuss the addition of further details of the Prophet's ascension. Here the ascension is usually associated with the nocturnal journey to Jerusalem, so that the ascent to Heaven takes place from this sanctuary. We also have accounts preserved which make the ascension start from Mecca and make no mention of the journey to Jerusalem. In one of these, the ascension takes place immediately after the "purification of the heart" (see al-Bukhari, *Sahih*, iv, 207, v, 143; al-Tabari, *Annales*, i, 1157-8). In the last-mentioned Hadīth passage we read: "When the Prophet had received his revelation and was sleeping at the Ka'ba, as the Kuraysh used to do, the angels Gabriel and Michael came to him and said: With regard to whom have we received the order? Whereupon they themselves answered: With regard to their lord. Thereupon they went away, but came back the next night, three of them. When they found him sleeping, they laid him on his back, opened his body, brought water from the Zamzam well and washed away all that they found within his body of doubt, idolatry, paganism and error. They then brought a golden vessel which was filled with wisdom and belief. Thereupon he was taken up to the lowest heaven."

The other versions of the same story show many additions and variants; according to one, for example, Gabriel came to Muhammad through the roof of his house which opened to receive him; according to another, it was Gabriel alone who appeared to him and there are many similar variants. All these versions, however, put Muhammad's ascension at an early period and make it a kind of dedication of him as a Prophet, for which the purification of the heart had paved the way. Ethnographical parallels (Schrieke, *op. cit.*, 2-4) show other instances of a purification being preliminary to an ascension. Similar stories are found in pagan Arabic (Horowitz, in *I. sl.* ix, 171 ff.) and also in Christian legends (op. cit., 170 ff.). Another story (Ibn Sa'd, v, 1,143) says that the ascension took place from Mecca although it does not associate it with "the purification of the heart" which is put back to the childhood of the Prophet (see HALIMA).

How did it come about, however, that this, obviously the earlier, tradition of Mecca as the starting point of the ascension, was ousted by the other
which made it take place from Jerusalem? The localisation of the Kur'anic al-Masdjid al-Aksa in Jerusalem is by some connected with the efforts of 'Abd al-Malik. It might all the easier obtain currency as Jerusalem to the Christians was the starting point of Christ's ascension, and from the 4th century Jesus's footprint had been shown to pilgrims in the Basilica of the Ascension; and now, perhaps as early as the time of 'Abd al-Malik, that of their Prophet was shown to Muslim pilgrims (Horovitz, Muhammad: Himmelfahrt, 167-8). The idea of the "heavenly Jerusalem" may have had some influence on the development of the tina legends; when Muhammad meets Ibrâhim, Mūsâ and 'Isa in Jerusalem, the presence of these prophets in the earthly Jerusalem is not at once intelligible, but it loses any remarkable features if Bayt al-Makdis (Ibn Hîghâm, 267) from the first meant the "Heavenly Jerusalem" (Horovitz, op. cit., 168, another explanation, see above). Perhaps also the phrase allāhdī bârînâ bawalûhu was taken to support the reference to Jerusalem; when these words occur elsewhere in the Qur'ân they refer to sites in the holy land (L. H. Lammers, Les sanctuaires prâislamites dans VArabie occidentale, in MOBF, xi [1926], 72). While the stories quoted above only say that Gabriel took the Prophet up to the heights of Heaven, but are silent as to how, others add that a ladder (mi'^râdî) was used for the ascent (see Ibn Hîghâm, 268; al-Tabârî, Tafsîr, xv, 10; Ibn Sa'd, i/1, 143; this ladder was of precious metals, and in any case it cannot be proved that this identification is correct). It is thus certain that the Prophet was taken to steps to which the dying turn their eyes and with the help of which the souls of men ascend to Heaven. The ladder is probably identical with Jacob's ladder in Genesis, xxviii, 12; the Ethiopic Book of Jubilees, xxvii, 21, calls this ma'ârûgâ, and sûra LXX, 3, 4, calls God ëââm 1-Ma'ârûgî "to whom the angels and the spirit ascend" (êââmûd). According to XXIII, 4, the lamb rises to God; according to LVII, 3, and XXXIV, 2, God knows "what descends from Heaven and what ascends to it", and in XLIII, 32, there is a reference to steps (ma'sârîdî) in the houses of men. The term was already known, and is presumably taken from Ethiopic (Horovitz, op. cit., 174 ff.). Among the Manœdaeans, also, the ladder (sambilûhî) is the means of ascending to Heaven (Gnath, tr. M. Lidzbarski, 49, 208, 490), and there are parallels to the ladder of the dead in the mysteries of Mithras (see Tor Andrae, Die Person Mohammeds, 45; Wetter, Phos, 114, n. 2); the Manicheaean umâd al-sabh (Fihrist, 335, 10), by means of which the dead man is taken to the sphere of the dead (Andrae, 44-5; Schrieke, 17; Ahmad b. Hanbal, Musnad, v, 143; cf. Apoc. Motis, 37). Of the other messengers of God we are only told—in addition to being given a description of their personal appearance—that they greeted Muhammad; Mūsâ is an exception, who expressly says that Muhammad is higher in the esteem of God than himself and that the number of his followers surpasses his own (al-Tabârî, Tafsîr, xv, 11). On another occasion, Muhammad engages in a conversation with Mūsâ after God had imposed upon him 50 salûts a day as obligatory prayers for the faithful. On Mūsâ's advice, Muhammad asks several times for an alleviation, and each time God grants it; but when Mūsâ says 5 salûts are still too many, the Prophet resists for a while and then asks for less (on Genesis, xviii, 23 ff., as the prototype of this episode; cf. Goldzhifer, Mus. Studien, i, 36; Schrieke, 19; Andrae, 82). According to some versions, Mūsâ dwells in the seventh heaven and the conversation seems to take place near the throne; others believe that he belongs to the visits to Paradise and to Hell. Paradise, according to others in the first; in some it is not mentioned at all. The statements about its rivers are contradictory (Schrieke, 19; cf. KAWTHAR), the sidrat al-muntahâ is usually placed in the seventh heaven (Bevan, 59; Schrieke, 18). In one description, Hell is put below the first heaven (Ibn Hîghâm, 269; al-Tabârî, Tafsîr, xv, 10). But objection was raised to the assertion that Muhammad on this occasion saw God face-to-face (Andrae, 71 ff.), and the question was also raised at an early date whether the ascension was a dream or a reality, whether only the soul of the Prophet was carried up or also his body (L. Caetani, Annaîî, Instr. § 320; Andrae, 72; Bevan, 60; Schrieke, 15, n. 1).

That Muhammad appeared before God's throne in the seventh heaven and that the conversation about the obligatory prayers took place there, is already recorded in the oldest stories (see above), but only rarely do they extend the conversation between God and the Prophet to other subjects (al-Tabârî, Tafsîr, xxvii, 26; Musnad, iv, 66, as a dream; Andrae, 70). But objection was raised to the assertion that Muhammad on this occasion saw God face-to-face (Andrae, 71 ff.), and the question was also raised at an early date whether the ascension was a dream or a reality, whether only the soul of the Prophet was carried up or also his body (L. Caetani, Annaîî, Instr. § 320; Andrae, 72; Bevan, 60; Schrieke, 15, n. 1).

The kad bu'^îtha contains, besides these other details which Asîn (Ecstologia, Madrid 1919, 7-52, idem, Dante e il Islam, Madrid 1927, 25-71) discussed, in developing the story of the Prophet's ascension, Muslim writers have used models afforded them by the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses. A few features may also come from the Zoroastrians from the Arda Virâ; cf. the works already mentioned by Andrae, Bevan, Schrieke, Horovitz and W. Bouset, in ARW, iv, 136.

Later accounts (see section 2 below). The ascension of the Prophet later served as a model for the description of the journey of the soul of the deceased to the throne of the divine judge (Asîn, Ecstologia, 59-60); for the Sûfis, however, it is a symb
bol of the rise of the soul from the bonds of sensuality to the heights of mystic knowledge. Ibn al-ʿArabī thus expounds it in his work Kitāb al-Isrāʾīlī: ʿālā mašāq al-ʿārī (Asīn, 61 ff.; Andrae, 81-2), and in his Fīḥāthā, ii, 356-75, he makes a believer and a philosopher make the journey together but the philosopher only reaches the seventh heaven, while no secret remains hidden from the pious Muslim (Asīn, 63 ff.). Abu ʿl-ʿAšāʾī al- Maʿārīnī’s Risālat al-Qaṣīf is a parody on the traditional accounts of the miʿrāḍī (Asīn, 71 ff.). Asīn in his two books quoted has dealt with the knowledge of Muslim legends of the ascension possessed by the Christian Middle Ages and their influence on Dante.

In a separate work (La escatología musulmana en la divina comedia. Madrid 1924), he has collected and discussed the literature produced by his Escatología down to 1923; on later works, see M. Rodinson, Dante et l'Islam..., in RHR, lxix (1951), 203-35.

According to Ibn Saʿd, i1, 147, the isrāʾ took place on 17 Raʾbān 1, the ascension on 17 Ramadān. For centuries, however, the night before 27 Ramadān—a date also significant in the history of Mecca (see C. Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, ii, 71)—has been regarded by the pious as the Laylat al-Miʿrāḍ, and the eve is, like the Maʿāni il-Nābi, devoted to reading the legend of the feast (see ʿAbdārī, Madaḥāl, i, 143 ff.; G. A. Herinckx, ʿAbd al-Maʿān Miʿrāǧ, ii, 86-8; E. A. Andrae, Arabische und muslimische tantalischen, London 1896, 74-6; Snouck Hurgronje, The Achehese, i, 219; Asīn, Escatología, 97).

Bibliography: Given in the article. See also R. Hartmann, in Bibliothek-Warbom, Vorträge 1928-1929, Leipzig 1930, 45-68; Hafiz Ghulam Sarwar, Muhammad the Holy Prophet, Lahore 1967, ch. viii; Annemarie Schimmel, Manners and customs, London 1896, 74-6; Snouck Hurgronje, Al-Baqīʾī, Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Shafiʿ, d. 1317-1899, jurist and specialist in the Sīra of the Prophet, was also ʿAbdī in Medina, and preacher, author of a Kitāb al-Miʿrāǧī. His grandson, ʿAbdī b. Ismaʿīl, d. 1317-1899, jurisconsult and specialist in the Sīra of the Prophet, was also ʿAbdī in Medina and author of the famous Kitāb al-Miʿrāǧī. It was allegedly forbidden to read his Kitāb al-Miʿrāǧī, printed in Cairo in 1314 with the Kitāb al-Miʿrāǧī of his grandfather in the margin. Al-Barzandjī’s version differs perceptibly from that of Ibn ʿAbbas both in its very heterogeneous and tour de force style, and in its amalgamation of three miraculous accounts concern- ing the isrāʾ.

The manuscript of his Kitāb ʿAbdī al-Miʿrāǧī offers a version very close to that of Ibn ʿAbbas.

— al-Ghayyī, Muhammad b. ʿAbdī b. ʿAli, d. 984/1576, ʿAbdī, a traditionalist, author of al-Kitāb li l-taḥfīẓ al-ʿlāʾ ʿl-isrāʾ wa l-miʿrāǧ (printed in 1970), and al-Barzandjī, ʿAbdī al-Miʿrāǧī, of Medina and preacher, author of a Kitāb al-Miʿrāǧī. His grandson, ʿAbdī b. Ismaʿīl, d. 1317-1899, jurist and specialist in the Sīra of the Prophet, was also ʿAbdī in Medina and author of the famous Kitāb al-Miʿrāǧī. According to all the evidence, it is in fact a late version which retains the essentials of Ibn ʿAbbas, enriching them with details. Furthermore, we can easily understand why the author neglects to supply his references: he is handling narratives which are, in a sense, public property. He expresses the imaginary vision of the group and stretches its credibility.

The literature of the miʿrāḍī develops into an amalgamation of three miraculous accounts concerning the Prophet:

(a) That of his purification by the angels, who open his chest and cleanse his heart of all sin. It was at a late date that this act was sometimes regarded as a kind of preparation for the ascension. The idealisation of his personality was carried to its limit. Only al-Barzandjī’s version mentions the opening of his chest. The other authors confine themselves to an ablation.

(b) That of the nocturnal journey from Mecca to Jerusalem on al-Brūk (q.v.). This account was subjected to a process of amplification before being attached to the miʿrāḍī, although different dates were cited for the two events. In some accounts, Muhammad actually meets on his journey some of those being punished in Hell (cf. al-Tabarî’s commentary on sūra XVII).

(c) Finally, that of the ascension proper so-called which includes the visit to the seven heavens, with a glimpse of Hell, the arrival at the Throne, the dialogue with God, the visit to Paradise and the return to Mecca.

A narrative organisation was progressively established according to four essential sequences: an initial miraculous union, an initiatory raising to Heaven, a
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glorifying appearance before God and a return to mankind. Elucidating the series of sequences could be of help in the search for an underlying plan providing the background for the imagination of the text. It happens that some works of a varied nature depict the same subjects as the mi'râдж account; those depictions are concerned with the constitution of the heavens and the fringes of Hell, description of the Throne, the dwellings in Paradise and angelology.

These are to be found in three categories of works:
(a) The Kitâb al-anhâyâf [q. v.] or legends of the prophets, the first of which are devoted to the origin of the universe.
(b) General histories, whose first chapters contain numerous elements of cosmology and cosmogony. A comparative study of the use that is made of certain themes by historians and mi'râдж accounts would be very significant.
(c) The resurrection literature, which brings together the texts devoted to the kiyâma [q. v.]. This literature of "news purveying" consists of edifying opuscula which make no precise reference to canonical texts and provide an account of what happens to the believer from the time of his death until his appearance before God. We find here descriptions of the angels, Paradise and Hell. Some descriptive and narrative sequences, independent elements of another one another in their origin, are joined together. The Prophet himself is included in this universal destiny and, awakened from the rest of death, "he mounts al-Burâk a second time to head for the Rock at Jerusalem and finally appear before the Lord" (Benceiekh, op. cit.).

The accounts of the mi'râдж and kiyâma are clearly related. The same working of the imagination, the same process for setting the portrayals, led to the production of the two texts.

One should mention here besides that the frontiers of writing have not prevented the migration of legends. The Kitâb 'Agâhâb al-makhlibtât al-kâzînîn [q. v.] devotes a long section to angelology; the story of Hâsib Karîm al-Dîn in the Thousand and one nights contains the cosmogonic account of Bulokiyya possibly borrowed from al-Dhâlibî's Kitâb al-anhâyâf. We are dealing here with what we should call preconstituted bodies of writings regarding Heaven, Hell, Paradise, the Throne and angels. Each of these bodies of writings has been given an independent setting following a long process of elaboration during which all kinds of pre-Islamic and Islamic themes have been gathered together. Only detailed analysis of this process will allow us to establish a reliable chronology for this literature.

One should note in addition that we cannot totally isolate the mi'râдж accounts from the great visionary texts of Ibn 'Arabi, Ibn Sinâ and al-Suhrawardî [q. v.]. The remarkable Kitâb al-Tawâwhâm, if it is the work of a mystic, al-Muhâjsî, preserves just as many of these themes as are connected with the literature with which we are concerned (French tr. Roman, Paris 1978).

But one must realise that the imaginary aspect of the mi'râдж is also nourished by the pronouncements of speech. The kâsî [q. v.] or preacher is to be found at the heart of religious observance. "With him we leave learned discourse and mystical meditation to follow the dialogue between a desire and a function: the desire of the believer who needs to believe, the function of the one who gives him something to believe and undertakes to supply him with imaginative depictions in order to do this" (Benceiekh, op. cit., Introd.).

The oral legend of the mi'râдж has not been collected. The narrative structure laid down in the texts considered to be canonical has taken over depictions of diverse origin. The texts have been given an iconography to respond to the need of their listeners for marvels. This need the theologians regard with suspicion. The inventors of fabulous tales were pursued and treated severely by Ibn 'Hanbal, Ibn al-Djawzi, al-Ghazâlî and al-Suyûtî. The establishment of collections of apocryphal hadîthâs for the denunciation of forgeries, if it is informative on the orthodoxy of their thought, is just as helpful in interpreting the ramblings of the imagination.

In fact, the same questions posed by the theologians on the subject of the mi'râдж have determined the direction of the flow of the imagination. There has been lively argument concerning the idea which it was necessary to have of the ascension. We must also review the possible interpretations of this miraculous deed:
(a) The ascension took place in spirit; it is a question of a vision that occurred during the Prophet's sleep. In a sense it was Heaven that visited Muhammad. It was an illumination, and the physical person was not concerned: the mi'râдж annihilates the human condition and registers itself in an unhinging of the intellect.
(b) The isârâ was really performed by Muhammad while awake, but the ascension took place only in the spirit. This artificial distinction is useful: it bears witness to a process of linking the isârâ, at first independent, with the mi'râдж (cf. H. Birkeland, The legend of the opening of Muhammad's breast, Oxford 1957).
(c) The ascension was really effected, body and soul, by a Prophet who was in a full state of consciousness. This interpretation lays the foundations of the miracle, which becomes a theological argument.

In this way there becomes authenticated a willingness to attribute to the Prophet a dimension which goes beyond his historicity: progressively, the opening of the breast at the end of the purification, the isârâ and the mi'râдж constitute a unique account which offers the advantage of crossing important zones of the religious imagination.

This interpretation de-spiritualises the ascension, without removing its character of a supreme initiation. Whilst refusing to see in it an internal impetus, a wandering of the spirit, it affords free range to imaginative portrayals. The account gives formal licence to imagine the unthinkable. Revelation triumphs out of ecstasy. The brilliant but solitary illumination of an individual is abandoned for the benefit of the communal initiation of a prophet. The latter is charged to inform his people of the answers that, in the course of his journey, he is entrusted to communicate.

From that time on, the difference can be seen between Kur'ânic utterance reduced to a mention and the speech of "literature" charged with illustrating the former. A modern application of this splitting of writings is attested; in Radjab 1387/October 1967 Egyptian State Television broadcast a film on the isârâ and the mi'râдж under the responsibility of the al-Azhar authorities. The process of image production is allowed, but controlled.

The literature of the mi'râдж is then embodied in an act of adoration. For one who takes neither the path of thought nor that of spirituality, there remains the portrayal, at the risk of blasphemy. Behind Muhammad, the only one authorised to travel to the forbid-
den space, imagination is set free. A whole community accompanies its prophet on his initiatory journey. Thus the act of faith is progressively established in an account destined to arouse visions. The image here is effective; it revives confidence and provokes fear. In this way the delights of Paradise materialise and the tortures of Hell are displayed to view at the cost, furthermore, of a decisive anticipation of theology, since God will only deliver His sentences on the Day of the Last Judgment.
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Here, the act of faith is progressively established in an account destined to arouse visions. The image here is effective; it revives confidence and provokes fear. In this way the delights of Paradise materialise and the tortures of Hell are displayed to view at the cost, furthermore, of a decisive anticipation of theology, since God will only deliver His sentences on the Day of the Last Judgment.

3. Mi'raj literature in East and West Africa.

The celebration of the mi'raj has here given rise to an extensive popular literature. Among the Shafi'i communities, from Egypt down to the East African coastslands, the most widely-used text is al-Bazrangi1's Kisaat al-mi'raj or, in a later edition, al-Isra' wa al-mi'raj, available in Haji Mohamed's bookshop in Mombasa together with the same author's Ma'wil1 [see Mawlid. 2. In East Africa].

In Swahili, there are two translations in prose and several versified elaborations; for the oldest known version see Haji Mohamed's bookshop in Mombasa.

The Editors regret that they have failed to provide a section on the mi'raj in Persian literature. Whilst they anticipate that they will be able to repair this omission, they would refer the reader to the article by A.M. Piemontese, Una versione persana della storia del 'Mi'raj', in OM lx/1-6 (1980), 225-43, which offers a translation of a passage of the Shi'ite commentary of a sura xvii by Abu Yahya al-Razi (ca. 480-525/1087-1131).

4. Mi'raj literature in Indonesia.

In West Java the celebration of the mi'raj is still very popular; it takes place in the mosque, in the home or in the langgar, the little prayer-cabin near the house. On the eve of 27 Radjab, or in some places even on the preceding evening, people come together in families, or invite friends, usually the men and the women separately. The men do not smoke, since

litrugical hymns, and which can still be sung, see Knappert, Suwwil Islamic poetry, iii, Leiden 1974, 227-75; the same text but with long comments and notes, is given by idem., Mi'raj; the Suwwil legend of Mohammed's Ascension, in Suwwil, Final of the Inst. for Suwwil Research (Dar es Salaam), xxvi (1966), 105-56. A different poem, written before 1922, is given by idem., Utensi wa miraji by Mohamed Jambeini, in Afrika und Ubersee, xlvi (1966), 241-74, and another by Yusuf Ulenge (perhaps from an older oral text) is given in Suwwil, xxxviii (1968), with the title Utensi wa Miraji.

A much longer poem, published by E. Dammann in his Dichtungen in der Lamu Mundart des Swahili, Hamburg 1940, 1-72, was written down for Dammann by the poet Muhammad b. Abubakari Kijuma, who was probably also its author; see Muhammad b. Ibrahim Abo Egl, Life and works of Muhammad Kijuma, Ph.D. thesis, London Univ., 1984, unpubl.

In the mosques of East Africa, the laylat al-mi'raj is celebrated after the night worship by singing these hymns, after which the imam explains its significance to the congregation.

In Hausaland (Northern Nigeria), poetic versions of the mi'raj narrative were first discovered by M. Hiskett, see his A history of Hausa Islamic verse, London 1975, 48-62. Here the theme of the mi'raj is part of the mu'djjaz literature, poems written by scholars in praise of Muhammad which can be sung or read. These are called madahu, from madh 'praise'. They are very popular and often recited during Ramadan when the people are in a receptive mood. A detailed description can be found in the thesis of Abdullahi Bayaro Yahaya, The Hausa verse category of Madahu, with special reference to theme, style and the background of Islamic sources and belief, Univ. of Sokoto, Nigeria 1987, unpubl.; it includes Hausa texts and translations, and the place of the mi'raj as one of the themes of madahu is comprehensively discussed.

In Gana, the mi'raj theme forms part of the Maulud (as it does in East Africa) and is celebrated in the north of the country, in Kumasi and along the coast.

In the Gambia, the theme of the mi'raj appears to have penetrated into the pre-Islamic Mandinka epic of Sunjata. In G. Innes' edition (Sunjata, London 1974, 154-7, I 287), the diveriner Sise, before answering the king's question, "goes into retreat" like a shaman, and states that "for forty days I saw the seven layers of the sky." This is clearly taken from the mi'raj, in which Muhammad himself claims the same; see Knappert, Traditional Swahili poetry, Leiden 1967, 152.

In Peul or Fulani [see Pulaar], there is a long section on the mi'raj in an important long poem edited by J. Haalkens in his Chants musulmans en Peul, Leiden 1983, 193-203. The long poem Busaraa (from Arabic bawaraa, pl. of ba'araa, 'bringers of good tidings', ibid., 144-335), was heard sung and recorded from manuscripts by Haalkens in northern Cameroon, where it is extremely popular.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(J. Knappert)
smoke is disliked by the angels. The proceedings begin after the salat al-maghrib and are concluded by a salat al-subh; ‘Those who know stories’ will tell them, about the life of Muhammad and his night journey.

Customarily, one who is qualified reads from al-Zahr al-basim fi aswār Abī 'l-Kāsim, by Sayyid 'Uthmān b. 'Abd Allāh b. ʿĀkīl b. Yahyā (Jahangir 1342/1924, pp. 80), in Malay. During the reading gahara or aloe wood is burnt as incense. If someone is present who can read Arabic (normally only in the towns), he will be asked to read the Hājjat al-imām al-ṣafīr bi'llāh tālā Abī 'l-Barakāt Sayyidī Ahmad al-Dardī sālī Kiṣṣat al-Mi̇rājī ...(‘alāma al-hammām barakat al-anām Nādim ad-Dīn al-_Closest to the Nizāmī of Yaqūb Beg Aḵ Yūsūf (Topkapı, H. 762), and may well be an early work of the classical poets.

The earliest of these date from the opening years of the 9th/15th century. In the Paris manuscript of 1436 (Suppl. turc 190) written at Herat in the Uighur language, and illustrated by one of the finest and most original sets of miniatures in the whole of Persian painting. But these are special cases, and we are more concerned here with mīrādī miniatures occurring in manuscripts of the classical poets.

The earliest of these date from the opening years of the 9th/15th century. In the Miscellany of Iskandar Sultan (British Library Add. 27261, dated 813/1410-11, fol. 6a) the mīrādī is represented with the Prophet, mounted on Burāk, surrounded by angels, and conducted by Gabriel, soaring above the Kaʿba enclosure at Mecca, and this scheme of representation is closely followed in a detached double-page miniature of much the same date in the Chester Beatty Library (Cat. 292. i, ii). In both these (as in the Paris manuscript of 1436) the Prophet is shown unveiled, but in the latter, as in many subsequent examples, the face has been partially obliterated and repainted. This same basic composition, i.e. with the Kaʿba below and the Prophet unveiled, is followed in ‘main line’ Persian painting of the later Timurid period, as in the Nizāmī of 900/1494 in the British Library (Or. 6810, fol. 5b), and is continued in the Keir Collection miniature (Cat. III. 207) dated 910/1505, which is one of those added under Şhāh ʿImām al- to the Nizāmī of Yaḵūb Beg Aḵ Yūsūf (Topkapı, H. 762), and may well be an early work of Sultan Muḥammad. This latter miniature is among the most striking and original treatments of the subject, the ascet, accompanied by innumerable angels and observed by others through a circular ‘hole in Heaven’, being enclosed in a rectangular frame with the Kaʿba enclosure below and little desert villages with palm trees occupying the margins.

The mīrādī is of frequent occurrence in Shirāz manuscripts of the Timurid period (though, curiously enough, hardly ever found in the mass of manuscripts illustrated in the Commercial Türkman style), but in
these, as in the numerous Safawid examples, the Ka‘ba is omitted, only the Prophet, now veiled, and his grandson, but in his mother’s line, the Prophet, now veiled, and the Prophet is sometimes reduced to a sort of shapeless bundle. But on a fine painted lacquer mirror-case of 1288/1871 in the Bern Historical Museum, Muhammad Ismā‘il’s depiction is in traditional manner, though on a miniature scale.


(B.W. ROBINSON)

**MIRĀN MUHAMMAD SHAH I**, of Khāndesh (q.v.) in western India, was the eleventh prince of the Fārūjī dynasty (regn. 919-937/1514-31). He belonged to the younger branch of that line, which had taken refuge in Gudjarāt, and his ancestors had lived in that kingdom and had married princesses of the Muzaffarī family until Mahmūd I of Gudjarāt (q.v.) had, on the extinction of the elder branch of the Fārūjīs, placed ʿAdil Khān III, Muhammad’s father, on the throne of Khāndesh. Muhammad, who was, through his mother, the great-grandson of Muhāmmed, and the grandson of his son, Muzaffar II, succeeded to the throne of Khāndesh in 926/1520, and in 933/1527 was indemnified by Burhan I for his losses. He accompanied Timur’s senior commanders, and spent much of his time outside the province, accompanying Timur to western Persia in 786-7/1384-5, to Khūrāsān and the Kīpāḵ steppe in 790/1390-2, and on the “five-year campaign” to Persia in 794/1392-6, returning to Khūrāsān only to put down local rebellions. In 795/1393 Mirānghāh became governor of Ādharbāyjān and western Persia. He did not immediately transfer his dependents, but first campaigned with Timur in the Kīpāḵ steppe in 797-8/1395-6. As governor, he executed the founder of the Hurūfi sect [see HURUFIYYA], Fadl Allah Astarabadi, in 796/1394. The Hurūfīs considered him an anti-Christ and referred to him as Mirānghāh ("snake king"). During Timur’s Indian campaign of 800-1/1398-9, Mirānghāh remained in Ādharbāyjān, and according to the histories, fell from his horse and became temporarily insane; this was probably an attempt at independence. He distributed public money, gathered Bagdādis, destroyed buildings in Tabriz and Sultānīm, and persecuted his wife and amirs. In documents of this period he apparently omitted Timur’s name. Timur removed Mirānghāh from his position, kept him close to himself and meted out severe punishment to his retinue. In Shawa’wī 806/April-May 1404, Timur allowed Mirānghāh to leave for Baghdād with his son Abā Bakr.

Mirānghāh and his sons were active in the succession struggle after Timur’s death. His son ʿAbbās Sultān held Transoxania until 811/1409; Abā Bakr and Mirānghāh disputed Ādharbāyjān with ʿUmar b. Mirānghāh and the Karakoynuľ Turkmen. Mirānghāh died fighting with Kara Yusuf Karakoynulu in 810/1408. Sefī Ahmad b. Mirānghāh married Rukiyya Sultān b. Kara ʿUghmān Akoynulu, and his descendants remained in Ādharbāyjān as the Mirānghāh clan, holding an important position within the Akoynulu. Mirānghāh’s grandson Abū Saʿīd b. Sultān Muhammād gained power over the northeastern Timurid realm in 855/1451; Abū Saʿīd’s grandson, Bābur b. ʿUmar Shaykh (q.v.), founded the Mogḥāl dynasty in 922/1516-17.


(Beatrice Forbes Manz)

**MIRĀT (A.)** "mirror," *pl. mirāt,* the noun of instrument from ra‘ā' "to see."
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estate, a view which survived in the levirate marriage usual among the Arabs, to which sura IV, 19, refers in forbidding it. There is no evidence of any preferential treatment of the first-born, which we find else-where in Semitic law. This, the original legal position, had by Muhammad’s time certainly altered somewhat in favour of women; in cases where the deceased left no male relatives, his daughters seem frequently to have obtained the estate; but woman had by no means equal treatment with man, as is clear from the Kur'anic regulations. In addition to these principal heirs, the pre-Islamic Arabs had also secondary heirs who correspond to the later so-called quota-heirs (dhawu 'l-fard'id) and received a part of the estate, the bulk of which went to the 'asaba. From suras II, 180, and IV, 33, which confirm this arrangement, we can see that these included the parents, the 'relatives'—apparently so far as they were not 'asaba—and the so-called confederates (halíf, plur. huláfá); the settlement of the portions falling to them was done—at least in part—according to the last will of the testator. All this has its parallels in the development of a "mitigated agnatic succession" among other peoples.

ii. The Kur'anic modifications, however, occur in a different form. They are not so much a system of secondary heirs as a set of regulations, which have its parallels in the development of a "mitigated agnatic succession" among other peoples. The laws of family life generally: at the same time, there is a clear loge to devise in legal form the prac-tice which had varied considerably in heathen times.

One provision which had been made under special circumstances was abandoned later on: immediately after the hégira, it had been ordered that those who migrated with the Prophet (the muhddirun) and the believers in Medina (the ansâr) should regard themselves alone as relatives. In the meantime, the system of secondary heirs and the whole general prac-tice in regard to inheritance (sura II, 180, is probably to be dated before Râmadân of the year 2, and IV, 33, cannot be much later); that II, 180, expressly makes the fair treatment of the secondary heirs a duty, already reveals the direction which later ordinances were to take. Connected with this is the probably con-temporary II, 240, which secures the wife, if she sur-vives her husband, a legacy of maintenance for a year. Not much later, about the year 3, is IV, 19: "Ye who believe, it is not lawful for you to inherit women against their will"; this is not meant as a regular legal ordinance, but is part of the Kur'anic endeavour to improve the position of women. Very soon after the battle of Uhud, when numerous Muslims had fallen, we—have—as a result of it—the final Kur'anic ordinance of IV, 7-14: "To the men belongs a share of what their parents and kindred leave, and to the women a share of what their parents and kindred leave—whether it be little or much—as a determin-ed share. 8. If the next of kin (not entitled to inherit), the orphans and the poor are present at the division, give them some of it and speak kindly to them (verses 9-10 go on to deal with the treatment of orphans). 11. Allah ordains for you, concerning your children, (as follows): for the male the like of the por-tion of two females; but if there are (only) females (and) more than two, two-thirds of the estate belongs to them and if there is (but) one (female) to her

belong the half. And the parents shall each have a sixth of the estate if (the deceased) has children, and if he has no children and (only) his parents inherit from him, his mother shall have a third. But if he has brothers, his mother shall have a sixth. (All this) after deducting a bequest he may have made or a debt. Ye know not whether your parents or your children be nearest to you in usefulness. (This is) an ordinance of Allah, and Allah is knowing and wise. 12. To you belongs the half of the estate of your wives, if they have no children; but if they have children, a fourth of their estate belongs to you—after deducting a bequest they may have made or a debt. To them belongs a fourth of your estate, if you have no children; but if you have children an eighth of your estate belongs to them—after deducting a bequest you may have made or a debt. If a man or a woman leaves an estate without having a direct heir (i.e. son or father), but has a brother or a sister, each shall have a sixth; but if there are more than that, they shall share a third after deducting a bequest he may have made or debt, without prejudice. (This is) an ordinance of Allah, and Allah is knowing and gracious" (vv. 13-14 contain promises and threats). As the settlement of the succession in indirect lines left questions undecided. IV, 176, supplemented the above: "They will ask thee for a decision. Say: Allah gives you the following decision concerning the suc-cession of those who have died without direct heirs: if a man dies and has no children, but has a sister, half of the estate belongs to her and he is her heir if she has no children; if there be two sisters, two-thirds of the estate belongs to them; but if there be both brothers and sisters, the male shall have like the portion of two females."

The object of these regulations is simply to supple-ment the law regarding the rights of the 'asaba; they are not a reorganisation of the whole law. Each of the persons named is therefore only allotted a definite portion; the remainder, and this, as a rule the major portion, of the estate, falls as before to the 'asaba. Female relatives thus generally receive half the share of male relatives of the same degree. The quotas here given abolished the testamentary settlement of the portions usual in the heathen period, which was still approved by II, 180; this is the historical starting point for the tradition—early interpreted in another sense—that a legacy in favour of the heirs is not valid. II, 240, is probably rightly regarded as abrogated by the settling of the widow's portion. There is a slight difficulty in interpretation only in IV, 12; but there can be no doubt that this passage refers to half-sisters on the mother's side, as indeed it has always been interpreted; the text of Ubayy even inserts an addition to this effect. The verse IV, 176, on the other hand refers to full sisters. In IV, 11, "more than two" is to be interpreted, as the sense requires, as "two and more".

iii. The full details which tradition is able to give regarding the causes of the revelation of the regula-tions on the law of inheritance are not historical; on internal grounds, all we can say is that it took place soon after the battle of Uhud. The numerous hâdîths which simply repeat the Kur'ânic regulations may be neglected here. Tradition can only record very few actual divergences from the prescriptions of the Kur'ân; one of these is that a woman received back as her inheritance a slave whom she had presented to her mother and who represented the latter's whole estate. According to another story, the Prophet is said to have laid down that the wives of the muhâjirûn should inherit the house of their husbands. While nothing
can be quoted in favour of the first *hadith*, the second, which does not seem to be intended as a... with the son of a son; and likewise the full sister, who inherits along with a full brother; finally, also the

ject, so difficult to remember, might disappear from... with the person concerned has adopted Islam, who... which a comparatively large number relate not to... of inheritance in the law of inheritance is also one who has killed the proprietor of the estate, as... a comparatively large number relate not to... may have a kernel of historical truth in it.

iv. The prescriptions of the Kur*ān* are sup-... to be paid for... inheritance is also one who has killed the proprietor of the estate, as... the father and his relations. The *mawla* [...]; the second, which does not seem to be intended as a... of its difficulty, and expresses the fear that this sub-... allowed a share in the... in the female line as well as those female relatives who cannot be quota-heirs—called upon to inherit. But if there are neither *ṣa'aba* nor quota-heirs and the state treasury is... the behalf of the widow or widow. Only if there are... the remaining male relative to whom the person concerned has adopted Islam, who... of the Kur'anic law. The daughter who inherits... The father and his relations. The *mawld*... inheritance is also called *mawld*. Or can be carried through at the expense of the estate... of a daughter while the quota allotted to... it the half of knowledge" on account of... of the estate. At this stage of development, it is already... of the deceased, the... the spirit... three of what is to be divided... female relatives who cannot be quota-heirs—called upon to inherit. But if there are

b. Succession of the *ṣa'aba*. The *ṣa'aba* are called upon to inherit in the following order: 1. The male descendants of the deceased in the male line, a nearer excluding the more distant relatives from the succes-... line with the provision that the father, but not the... the deceased inherits before his brothers. 3. The nearest male relative in the ascending male line among the descendants of the father: first the full brother, then the half-brother on the father's side, then the descendants of the full brother, then those of the half-brother on the father's side. 4. The nearest male relative in the male line among the descendants of the grandfather (as under 3), etc. 5. Lastly, the *mawla*, i.e. the patron (or patroness), if the deceased was a freedman, and then his *ṣa'aba*. —The brothers of the deceased inherit along with the grandfather as *ṣa'aba* in equal shares, but if there are more than two brothers, the grandfather receives not less than one-third of what is to be divided... the male line (which he would inherit as a quota-heir; cf. e., below). He can then choose the most favourable of the three arrangements.—Female *ṣa'aba*. If the deceased left sons as well as daughters, they inherit jointly, the share of a son being twice as large as that of a daughter while the quota allotted to the daughters is dropped, as is intended by the spirit of the Kur*ānic* law. The daughter who inherits along with a son is therefore also called *ṣa'aba*. The daughter of a son of the legator is similarly treated, inheriting along with the son of a son; and likewise the full sister, who inherits along with a full brother; finally, also the
half-sister on the father’s side, who inherits with a half-brother on the father’s side. —If the full sister inherits along with a half-brother and wife, and brother of his son, they do not receive their quota, which in this case goes to the daughter or son’s daughter, but the rest of the estate after deduction of all quotas that have to be paid.

c. Shares of the quota-heirs (dhawu 't-fard\^id; cf. fara‘\^tu). It is true that in the Kur\u0131\u0111 only the daughters inherit along with a半-brother and wife, and brothers of his son, who are allotted a quota, but the rules holding for the daughters have been extended to the daughters of the son and those for the parents to the grand-parent; in addition, a distinction has been made among the sisters between the full sister, the half-sister on the father’s side and the half-sister on the mother’s side. The total number of quota-heirs has thus been raised to twelve: 1. The daughter is entitled to half the estate, two or more daughters get two-thirds, but if daughters inherit along with sons, they become ‘\u0131saba (cf. b, above). 2. The daughter of a son is subject to the same rules as a daughter and takes her place in default of her; inheriting along with the son of a son, she becomes ‘\u0131saba. As the son’s daughter is related to the deceased through his son, she is excluded from participation when the son is a deceased heir. A daughter of a son, on the other hand, does not exclude directly a son’s daughter from the succession; as however daughters and son’s daughters together have only two-thirds of the estate as their quota, a son’s daughter has only a sixth if there is one daughter, and nothing if there are two or more, unless she inherits in these cases along with a son’s son as ‘\u0131saba. 3. The father’s quota is always a sixth of the estate; in addition, he is ‘\u0131saba and receives also any residue of the estate after deducting all quotas, unless there are male descendants of the deceased. 4. The paternal grandfather (in default of him, the remotest ascendent) also receives one-sixth of the estate as his quota, but is excluded by the father; he is also ‘\u0131saba if there are no male descendants nor father of the deceased. But if, in this case, there are also brothers of the legatee, he becomes ‘\u0131saba along with them (on the share which falls to the grandfather in this case and in the case where there are also quota-heirs, cf. b, above). 5. The mother receives one-sixth of the estate if there are children, son’s children or two or more brothers or sisters of the deceased; otherwise a third (in practice, the father in this case as a rule receives two-thirds, i.e. one-sixth as quota-heir and the rest as ‘\u0131saba; in an exceptional case, cf. d, below). 6. The quota of the grandmother is always a sixth; from this, the mother’s mother is excluded by the mother, and the father’s mother by the father and mother; in default of grandmother, their place is taken by the remotest female ascendants of the deceased, so far as they are not related to him by a male descendant not entitled to inherit. 7. A full sister receives half, two or more such sisters receive together two-thirds of the estate; along with a full brother or the grandfather she becomes ‘\u0131saba and receives the half of the brother’s share; along with the daughter or son’s daughter she becomes also ‘\u0131saba (cf. b); sons, sons’ sons and the father exclude her from succession. 8. The treatment of the half-sister on the father’s side is similar to that of the full sister; along with a half-brother on the father’s side or the grandfather, she becomes ‘\u0131saba, and likewise with the daughter or son’s daughter (cf. b); sons, sons’ sons, father and full brothers exclude her from the succession. Full sisters exclude her only so far as daughters exclude son’s daughters (cf. no. 2). 9 and 10. Each of the half-brothers on the mother’s side receives a sixth, two or more together share a third among them; they are excluded from the succession by descendants and male ascendants. 11. The widower receives half of the estate, but only a quarter if there is a child or son’s child; it is indifferent whether these are his own descendants or not. 12. The widow receives the half of what a widower would receive under the same circumstances; if the deceased leaves more than one widow, they share equally the quota allotted to the widow. During the ‘\u0131wata (period of waiting [q. v.]) after a revocable divorce or talak [q. v.], a man and woman are still regarded as man and wife for purposes of inheritance.

d. Exceptions from the general rules. Although the quota-heirs can never all inherit together and, in particular, most of the collateral relatives are excluded by those in the direct line, the number of qualified quota-heirs may sometimes be so large that the sum of their shares is larger than the whole estate; in this case, their shares are proportionately reduced (by ‘\u0131waf). Otherwise, the concurrence of a number of heirs necessitates no change from the main rules, except in a few particular cases which have special names; these are cases in which, if the main rules were strictly carried through, the inheritance would go to an intestate who should have shared, which would be contrary to the spirit of the law. E.g. in the case of the so-called ghunbat\u0131n: if someone dies leaving a husband or wife and both parents, the mother would receive in any case a third, the father’s share however, which is usually two-thirds (cf. c, 5, above), would be here reduced by the quota either of the widow or of the widower; according to tradition, it was 1/3 Umar who decided in this case that father and mother should share, in the proportion of two to one, what remains after deducting the portion of the widow or widower. Another case, the so-called musgaraka, is that in which a wife leaves her husband, her mother, two or more half-brothers on the mother’s side and also one or more full brothers; as the quotas in this case make up the whole estate, nothing would be left for the full brothers as ‘\u0131saba in this case, which is also said to have been decided by 1/3 Umar; the law lays down that the full brothers have the same rights as the half-brothers so that all inherit in equal shares the third originally set aside for the half-brothers.

vi. The most important points of difference among the madhdhib\u0131n are the following. Unbelievers who belong to different religions cannot inherit from one another according to Malik and Ibn Hanbal, but they can according to Abu Hanifa and al-Sh\u00a1\u0111fi. There are contradicting views regarding inheritance from the murtadi\u0131. One who has deliberately (with ‘\u0131waf) and illegally killed the proprietor of the estate, is, by unanimous agreement, excluded from inheriting. Abu Hanifa, al-Sh\u00a1\u0111fi and Ibn Hanbal, but not Malik, also exclude one who has killed him without design (with khata\^ [q. v.]). One who is purely a slave, according to Abu Hanifa, Malik and al-Sh\u00a1\u0111fi, neither inherit nor be inherited from; according to Ibn Hanbal, Abu Yusuf, al-Shayb\u0131n and al-Muzani, he does so in the proportion he is free. The so-called law of reversion to the quota-heirs if there are no ‘\u0131saba (cf. a, above), as well as the precedence of the dhawu ‘t-fard\^id and the treasury if there are no quota-heirs, is disputed among the madhdhib\u0131n. The paternal grandmother is not excluded from the succession by the father, according to Ibn Hanbal only; in his view, in this case she inherits a sixth either alone or shared equally with the mother. There are delicate points of difference regarding the succession of the remote female ascendants. One who is entitled to receive a
quota from more than one side inherits, according to Malik and al-Shafi’i, only on ground of “stronger” relationship, but according to Abū Hanīfa and Ibn Hanbal on ground of both respects; in the case of two cousins on the father’s side, of which one is also the brother on the mother’s side, the latter, it is unanimously agreed, receives a sixth and the remainder falls to the two as ‘asaba in equal portions, while Abū Thawr makes him inherit the whole. In the special case of the so-called ‘asabakara, Malik’s view agrees with that of al-Shafi’i (cf. v d, above), according to Abū Hanīfa and his followers, Ibn Hanbal and Dāwūd al-Zāhirī, the full brothers actually receive nothing.

vii. a. The law of inheritance with the Imāmīs (Twelver Shi’is) is based on the same principles as that of the Sunnīs, but in its final development shows a number of quite important features of its own, which for the greatest part are but the consequences of their dogmatic-political doctrines (‘Ali and Fātimah had to be the only heirs of the Prophet, excluding Ibn ‘Abbās), and partly already expressed in the traditions or result from the rejection of certain hadiths by the Shi’as. Among the main divergences are the ignoring of the ‘asaba and the constitution of one group of “heirs by relationship”, which is divided into three classes: 1. the ascendants in the first degree and the descendants in the second, the latter a third degree; 2. the other ascendants in the first degree; 3. the maternal and paternal uncles and aunts. Each of these classes excludes the following ones from the succession, and within the two categories of the two first classes, the relative of the nearer degree excludes all others of a remoter degree of relationship, i.e. for example, the daughter excludes the son’s son; within the third class, a distinction into degrees is made between the uncles and aunts of the deceased himself and their descendants, the uncles and aunts of his parents and their descendants, etc., and here also the member of a nearer degree excludes those of a remoter degree. An exception which finds its explanation only in the individual case of the heirs of the Prophet, is that the son of the father’s full brother excludes one (but no more than one) half-brother (on the father’s side) of the father, if there are no other uncles. Within the same degree, the full relatives (male or female) exclude all relatives on the father’s (not the mother’s) side, e.g. full sisters exclude half-brothers; the relatives on the mother’s side are excluded by all other relatives of the same degree only from a share in the “reversion” of the estate. If relatives, whose relationships with the deceased are traced through different persons, inherit jointly, the proportion of their shares is settled by the (hypothetical) shares of the persons through whom they are related to the deceased; if, for example, paternal and maternal uncles inherit together, the former divide two-thirds of the estate (i.e. the father’s hypothetical share), the latter a third (i.e. the mother’s hypothetical share). This idea of “representation” reappears in one of the Sunni theories on the succession of the dhātu ’l-arhdīn. The rules applying to the brothers and sisters of the deceased are also applied to his father’s brothers and sisters and so on, if the latter are called upon to inherit; if, for example, father’s full brothers and sisters, and father’s brothers and sisters on the mother’s side exist together, the latter are not excluded by the former but receive a third which is divided equally among them (if there is only one, a sixth), and the former receive the remaining two-thirds (or five-sixths as the case may be), of which each uncle gets twice the share of an aunt; the process is similar when their children take the place of uncles and aunts. The grandfather (and if the case arises the remoter ascendants) always inherits equally with the heirs of the legator. Within homogeneous groups, the male inherits double as much as the female, so as there are no special regulations to the contrary; for the rest, the male relative on the father’s side is not especially privileged before the others, as among the Sunnīs. Besides these “heirs by relationship”, there are “heirs for special reasons”, i.e. husband and wife, and the patron (maṣāq), namely 1. a patron who has freed the deceased from slavery; 2. a patron before whom the legator has become a Muslim, or who has pledged himself to pay the diyā for him (this idea is also attested in the traditions and is to be found sporadically among the Sunnī authorities); 3. the imām, who here takes the place of the state treasury, and who, as the general patron of all Muslims, is entitled to inherit in the last resort. In both main groups there are “simple” heirs, and such as have a claim to a Kur’ānīc quota. If the estate does not suffice to satisfy all the quotas, the shares are correspondingly reduced to the paternal relatives only, never to the maternal. What is left over after satisfying the quotas is given to the simple “heirs by relationship” according to the above rules; if they do not exist, the quota-heirs, with the exception of the husband or wife, receive the residuum also; if there are no “heirs by relationship” at all, the patrons come in, in the order given.

These general rules are sufficient to cause the distribution of an estate often to look very different among the Shi’is from among the Sunnīs. There are in addition differences in detail, of which the most important are the following. The Muslim does inherit from the unbeliever; unbelievers of all sects inherit from one another. In determining the portion of the childless widow, the landed property of the deceased is not taken into account. If the sole existing heir is a slave, he is purchased at the expense of the estate (his owner cannot refuse to sell him), and thus becomes free and inherits what is left; if the parents of the deceased are slaves, they must in all cases be purchased at the expense of the estate; if there are some, the children also. The part-slave inherits to the degree in which he is free. One who has a claim to an inheritance from two sides inherits on both grounds. There are no legal relationships between an illegitimate child and his mother and her relatives, only between him and his descendants; if there are none, the estate goes to the imām. In the special case of the so-called dhātu ’l-arhdīn (cf. above, v d), there is no divergence from the general principles. —On the whole, the Shi’ī law of inheritance diverges further from the old Arab pre-Islamic principles than the Sunnī doctrine in opposition to which it has been elaborated.

b. The law of inheritance of the Shi’ī Zaydis resembles rather closely the system of the Sunnīs, which has influenced its original.

c. The most important peculiarities of the law of inheritance among the Khāridji Ibadis are the following: the paternal grandfather inherits as quota-heir a sixth of the estate if there are descendants of the deceased; otherwise, he inherits as ‘asaba, thus excluding the brothers. The half-sister on the mother’s side is assimilated to the half-sister on the father’s side if neither this relative nor a full sister exists. The grandmother is only excluded by the mother. Female descendants, like husband or wife, have no share in the “reversion” of the estate. Manumission confers no rights of inheritance. If there
are no heirs at all, the estate is given away in charity.

The special case of the so-called musharraka is settled as if the deceased leaves no son, the daughter alone, when in competition with other Kur'anic heirs, is entitled to the estate. —The dependence among the Shafi d, is (cf. v.

long run it must lead inevitably to the splitting up of estates, various endeavours have been made to avoid this result, which was considered undesirable. A method, frequently adopted, was to constitute considerable portions of the estate as religious endowments [see wakf], the proceeds of which could be disposed of by the grantor as he pleased; but most endowments in course of time became much broken up or were completely alienated. Another way adopted, for instance in Indonesia, is, in keeping with the local Ṣa'da, to admit only a portion of the actual estate to division among the heirs; sometimes an estate is divided already during the lifetime of its possessor by gift or friendly arrangement, and not infrequently some member of the family, according to circumstances, simply takes over the estate and obligations of the deceased. In particular, the liquidation of the estate, the relict has priority over all other heirs. In both v.
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take the residue of the estate by radd. In their absence, she takes the whole estate. In Tunisia, she maintains this preferential right even in the presence of collateral.

Jordan has adopted the rule that germane brothers participate in the uterine brothers' third of the estate if the estate is exhausted by the Kur'ānic heirs (the 'case of the donkey').

The Sudan (1939, 1945), Egypt (1943) and Syria (with some variations) adopted a system which admits agnatic brothers and sisters to the succession along with the grandfather. 'Irāk (1959) adopted a Euro-

pean system of succession under which any brother or sister of the deceased totally excluded the grandfather. This system was abolished in 1963.

iii. The most important reform in the position of the heirs of the outer family was introduced in 'Irāk (1963) when the Shī'a law of inheritance, which has a totally different order of priorities, was made applicable to all 'Irākīs. Other important reforms have been effected through the device of 'obligatory bequests' and the principle of representation succession (see section iv, below). Further minor reforms were introduced in Egypt (1943) and Syria following the adoption of the per capita doctrine.

iv. Unlike the traditional formalities, Egypt (1946), Syria (1959) and 'Irāk (1959) provided it obligatory to prove bequests by documentary evidence; the age of capacity for making a bequest has been raised in those countries and also in India and Pakistan; both Egypt and Syria permit bequests in favour of legatees not yet born at the time of the testator's death; they also adopt a more restrictive attitude as to stipulations which the testator may impose with regard to the conduct of a beneficiary.

One of the most significant reforms departing from the Sunni philosophy of succession is the rule, so far adopted only by the Sudan (1945), Egypt (1946) and 'Irāk, that a bequest in favour of a legal heir is no longer ultra vires provided it does not exceed the 'bequeathable third'. This rule fits in with the Shī'a doctrine. Syria has merely permitted a testator validly to apportion particular items of his estate to his heirs within the value of their shares in the inheritance.

Tunisia (1956) adopted a very bold innovation (as regards Malīkī law) by permitting a person who leaves no heir to bequeath the whole of his estate notwithstanding the succession rights of the Treasury. 'Irāk (1959), on the other hand, enacted that the state was the sole heir under such circumstances.

The absence of the principle of representation, which under traditional law resulted in the total exclusion of orphaned grandchildren from the estate by any surviving son of the grandparent, has been remedied. In Egypt (1946), Syria, Morocco, Tunisia (1959) and Jordan it has been circumvented by the device of the 'obligatory bequest' to orphaned grandchildren of what their deceased parent would have inherited had he (in Egypt and Tunisia, he or she) survived, provided it does not exceed the 'bequeathable third'. Pakistan has solved the problem by adopting a comprehensive system of representation.

v. In Egypt (1943), Syria and Tunisia (1956, with minor variations), but not in 'Irāk (1963) as far as the Sunnis are concerned, deliberate homicide is now a bar to the validity of a bequest. Apostasy is no longer a capital offence, but it is still a bar to inheritance, except in India and Pakistan (1850).

In Egypt (1943), difference of domicile is no longer a bar to inheritance between non-Muslim—and in Syria also Muslim—relatives unless the law of the non-Muslim state bars foreigners from inheriting from its nationals. The principle of reciprocity, in cases of difference of religion and nationality, has been extended to testamentary succession in Egypt (1946), Syria, Tunisia (1956) and 'Irāk (1959).

vi. Since the Sunni will is subject to the ultra vires doctrine, the family wakf has become the chief instrument for circumventing the law of inheritance: Kur'ānic heirs are almost totally excluded from the estate; entitlement is transmitted according to the principle of representation; preference is given to agnates over cognates; the female in every generation benefits but may not transmit her share in the entitlement to her descendants.

Under these circumstances, Egypt (1946) and Lebanon (1947) have introduced the 'obligatory entitlement' of legal heirs, equal to their rights of inheritance, to any wakf in excess of one-third of the estate, the purpose being to bring the wakf into greater conformity with the law of testate and intestate succession. The wakf is made accessible to two series of beneficiaries and finally abolished altogether in Egypt, Syria and Tunisia [see wakf].

vii. Though some of the changes in the law of intestate and testate succession are of considerable importance, the major achievement has been the mere fact of codification. Some countries have effected revolutionary reforms, to the extent of complete equality of men and women and of agnates and cognates. But this legislation is a complete departure from the 'ghar'a. It was brought about by adopting comprehensive systems of succession of European origin. The Ottoman Law of Succession, 1913, of German origin, at first applicable only to mūr property, was adopted in Palestine (1923), Israel (1951, with the inclusion of mulk and movables) and 'Irāk (1959-63). The Israeli Law of Succession, 1965, is applicable only in the civil courts. The Somali Family Law, 1975, in inspired by Marxist ideology.

MIRATH (old Anglicised spelling Meerut), (i) a district in the modern province of Uttar Pradesh, India, immediately to the north-east of Dihli, and entirely within the Djanma-Ganges doab. Its principal towns are Mirath city itself, Sardhana (the chief residence of the Begam Samrû, widow of the adventurer Walter Reinhard and known as 'Sombrê'; see samrû); Ghârorhâ; Batnâwâ; and Hâpur, an important grain market. (ii) Mirath city (29°0' N., 77°43' E.), a town of considerable antiquity. The city was the site of a pillar of Aghoka, one of the two taken by Firûz Shâh the Tughluqd to Dihli, and within the town are Buddhist remains of the 11th century by the Hindus ruler of Baran (= Bulandshahar), originally surrounded by a moat and a wall with eight gates (other gates were added in Muslim times); this was the fort captured from the Dör Râjputs by Kutb al-Dîn Aybak in 1205 and destroyed and burnt by Shah Rukh from which to overthrow the Gahadawala Râjputs and make his assault on Dihli. Mirath remained in Muslim control through the entire sultanate of Dihli (the names of several skâdârâ are recorded by the chroniclers Minhâdî, Isâmî, and Barani); in 727/1326-7 the forces of the Mongol invader Tarâbûn Girâd returned to Mirath but by 802/1399 the city had been sacked and destroyed by Timûrzâb. There seems to have been some return to prosperity in Mughal times: the fort is mentioned in the Aâ'm-i Akhûrî. Mirath was briefly a copper mint under Akbar, and the Mughal emperors seem to have taken some interest in the buildings (repar of Dajâmî mosque by Humâyûn, a couple of dargâhs, of Abu ʿÂrî Muhammad Khân (1039/1629) and Abu Muhammad Khân (1099/1688); the makbara of Shâh Pir of 1038/1628 erected by the order of Nûr Dzhâhân, a red sandstone building with the characteristic wide four-centred Mughal arch (photograph in Meerut gazetteer, UP Govt., Lucknow 1963); the presence of a karbhâla, ca. 1009/1600, and two inâmânîn, indicates that some Shâhî settlement had taken place. In the early 12th/18th century, with the rise of the Sayyid brothers as king-makers, there were many grants of land made in the Mirath area, and there was some industry in the course of indigo-processing and in the manufacture of the fine lambswool sansa blankets; but after the invasion of Nâdir Shâh (q.v.), 1152/1739, the land fell into anarchy, and by the early years of the 19th century Mirath was ruinous and depopulated. The considerable gain in British prestige after Lord Lake's success in the battle of Dihli, 1803, led to the establishment of an extensive military cantonment at Mirath (a tactical mistake, according to P. Spear, Twilight of the Mughals, OUP India 1973, 145, in that Dihli itself was not strongly garrisoned and held), whereby the city regained its prosperity to the extent of securing a reputation as one of the best laid-out towns in Upper India. The events of 1857, when the mutiny of the Bengal army started in Mirath, leading to the final loss of all power by the ruling Mughal house, do not concern us here. Many Muslims migrated to Pakistan after Partition in 1947, and the 1961 Census of India showed Mirath with a Muslim population of only 20%, mostly Sunni. Monuments. Apart from those mentioned above, there are a few Muslim monuments, some of considerable antiquity, which have been poorly described, and no photographs are available. The Dajâmî mosque, on the site of a former Buddhist temple, is said to have been erected in 410/1019 by Hasan Mahdî, a ważîr of Mahmûd of Ghaznî; the dargâh of Makhdûm Shâh Wilâyât in the reign of Shîhâb al-Dîn (see Muizz al-Dîn; Ghurî; and the makbara of Salâr Ma'Rûd by Kutb al-Dîn Aybak at the end of the 6th/12th century (since he was killed in battle at Bahrâyî in 425/1034, and has cenotaphs in other Indian towns, this makbara may refer rather to his cult as a folk-divinity; see Panjî pir). The gazetteers mention some "scores of other temples and mosques, of no particular interest", but no-one seems to have looked at them to see: Mirath, although only some 40 miles from Dihli, seems to have been badly served by archaeologists. Other buildings within the district include the Begam Samrû's palace (Dikhuğa Khûth) of 1822, at Sardhana; at Batnâwâ, on a (pre-Muslim) mound south of the town, are the dargâhs of Bald al-Dîn Shâh and Shâh ʿAlî al-Dîn (undescribed) and the makbara of Pir Sârwar, Persian inscr. dated 948 (1541-2). Biography. There are sporadic references to Mirath city and district in Minhâdî-i Sirāжд dânjî, Ţabâkî-i Nâsîrî; Isâmî, Futûh al-salâtîn; Dîyâ al-Dîn Baranî, Ĥûšt-i Firuz Shâhî; Ibn Battûtâ; information on all aspects of the city and district in the District gazetteer of the United Provinces, Meerut vol., and the corresponding vol. of the Uttar Pradesh Government, 1963. Useful account of city and district under the latter Mughal in Percival Spear, Twilight of the Mughals, Cambridge 1951, repr. with new introd. OUP India 1973. Monuments: a few mentioned in A. Führer, The monumental antiquities and inscriptions of the North-West Provinces and Oudh (= ASI, N.S. ii), 1891, s.v. Mirath. (J. Burton-Page) AL-MIRBAD, the name of a celebrated public place in al-Basra [q.v.] which, although situated outside the metropolis of southern ʿIrâq, played an outstanding role in the economic life of that town as well as in the shaping of the specifically Arabic culture. Etymologically, the term could be a noun of place anomalously formed from the root r-b-d which implies, amongst other things, the meaning of "to halt, make a stop" and could thus designate a spot where nomads encamp, and then, by extension, where camels and sheep are penned up. The various denotations of the word nevertheless cause a problem, since it is difficult to reduce them to a common element, even if the sense of "an open space where one puts out dates to dry" which it has at Medîna (see Yâkût, iv, 484; Tâ and Fâ s.v.; al-Maklî, al-Bad wa l-tâbâr, tr. C. Hart, iv, 805) suggests one, which could possibly be that of "a flat piece of ground of varying size". But it may nevertheless be a simple proper noun, more or less artificially attached to a well-known root. At Basra, the Mirbad was a market outside the town which formed the oldest commercial centre of the town; it extended along the edge of the desert, to the west of the urban agglomeration, and was originally placed under supervision by the government; but since Basra developed westwards in the normal course of events, the open space was fairly rapidly filled up, and the extensive open area, whilst retaining...
its original character, became transformed into a flourishing suburb, which was connected by a wide street, along which lay buildings and which was oriented from west to east, via the Bāb al-Bādiyya, to the town’s centre and the port along the river (al-Furda). Whilst the Mirbad formed a market where the Bedouins came to sell their camels and sheep and a halting-place for the caravans which raised up clouds of dust, it appears that merchandise was for a long time a halting-place for the caravans which raised up clouds of dust, and it is characteristic of the area, since various activities which had contributed to its fame still retained a certain vitality for a long time afterwards. Although this suburb was one of the points from which the Zanj [q.v.], rebels’ depredations did not stop it from continuing to play its former role, as is particularly illustrated by the example of the baker-poet al-Khubza’aruzzi (d. 938 [A.H.]), whose shop was the place where a group of admirers met. It is even possible that this state of affairs lasted for several centuries, since Yakut (d. 626/1229) describes the Mirbads as forming in his time a kind of island in the midst of the desert, whilst the street which had formerly linked it with the town centre and the port was now, for the whole three miles of its length, nothing but a field of rubbish.

Bibliography: In addition to works mentioned in the text, see Le Strange, Lands, 45; S.A. al-Ali, Al-Tanzimāt al-nilgimā’iya wa-l-iktisādiyya fi ’l-Basra, Baghda’d 1953, index; O. Schemama, Le rôle du Mirbad de Basra dans le conservatisme poétique jusqu’au début du IIIe siècle, in IBLA, xx (1957), 369-79; Ch. Pellat, al-Qābiyya wa-l-Mirbad, to appear.

AL-MIRBA’T (A. ‘place of securing, tying up, i.e. anchorage,’ a port of the South Arabian coast in Zufar [q.v.], lying in 17°00’N. and 54°41’E., some 40 miles/70 km east of the modern town of Salala [q.v.] in the Sultanate of Oman. Yākūt,
Buldan, Beirut 1374-6/1955-7, v, 97, describes it as being five farsakhs from the town of Zufar (i.e. the modern al-Balid) and as the only port of the coast of the region of Zufar; it had an independent sulimun, and its hilly hinterland produced frankincense [see Lurani]. In the early 19th century, its ruler was a corsair chief, Muhammad b. Aziz, and the ruins of a fort built by him in 1806 were mentioned by J.G. Lorimer as still visible (Gazetteer of the Persian Gulf, Oman and Central Arabia, Calcutta 1908-15, IIB Geographical and statistical, 1274-5). The population of the area anchored in this well sheltered from the north-east monsoon, includes a high proportion of sayyids, and a notable feature of the place today is the shrine of Muhammad b. Ali, Sahib Mirbat, ancestor of the Bu A'Alawi [q.v.], Husayni sayyids of Hadrarnaw; see G. Oman, The burial stelae of Muhammad «Sahib Mirbat», in Studia taurculturale memoriar Alecti Bombarci dicta, Naples 1982, 397-401.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(C.E. Bosworth)

Mirdas, Banu or Mirdasids, an Arab dynasty of Kilab origin, founded by Salih b. Mirdas. The latter and some of his descendants were, on several occasions between 415/1024 and 473/1080, either tolerated or recognised as princes of Aleppo. In succession to the Hamdanids, they maintained a tradition of looting in northern Syria, thanks to the tacit protection of the Byzantine Empire, which they accepted in order to ward off pressure from the Byzids of Bagdad and the Fatimids of Egypt. However, they did not hesitate on various occasions to launch a frontal attack, in general victoriously, on the heavily-laden Byzantine army and notably on the nearby garrison of Antioch, under Christian domination until 477/1084. The Turkish seizure of the region after 463/1071 was harsher for the Muslim Arabs than it was for the Christians.

From the Umayyad period, among the Kays tribes of Syria, the Banu Kilab occupied an original place, both on account of their military ability and their wish to participate in maintaining order and administering the regions in which they lived. In 215/830, it was a matter of Kilab whom the caliph al-Mamun designated as kadi of Aleppo. In 328/939, the Ikshid Muhammad b. Tughdi chose Abu'l-'Abbbs Ahmad b. Sa'id al-Kilab as governor of Aleppo. The Kilab of Nadji then flooded into northern Syria and took possession of the region of Ma'arrat al-Nu'man designated as kadi of Aleppo. In 333/944 the Ikshid appointed Ahmad to Antioch and his brother Abu'l-Fath 'Uthman to Aleppo, provoking the jealousy of the other Kilab chiefs who asked Sayf al-Dawla to come and install himself in Aleppo. 'Uthman greeted Sayf al-Dawla and, sitting by his side in his 'ammariyya, he presented him village, with the country that he knew perfectly. The Kilab fought alongside the 'Ukayl, Kalb and Numayr in the Hamdanid ranks against the Ikshid Ibn Tulun [q.v.].

In association with other tribes belonging to Kays, 'Amir b. Sa'id, 'Ukayl, Numayr, Kughayri, Kinana, 'Adljan and Kab'a b. Rabbi'a b. 'Amir, in the 4th/10th century the Kilab held the Syrian steppe on the field of battle. While other tribes were happy to give themselves up to pillage with consequences as damaging for the Bedouin as for the sedentary population, the wish to gain access to the state revenues in return for participating in the activities of maintaining order characterised the political goal of the Kilab until the end of the 5th/11th century.

The history of Salih b. Mirdas and his descendants is relatively well-known. The three principal sources are the Egyptian historian al-Munabibi (d. 420/1029), whose chronicle has only come down to us for 414-15/1023-4; another historian who was also Egyptian, but Christian and resident in Antioch, Yahya b. Sa'id, whose chronicle is preserved up to 425/1034; and finally the historian of Aleppo Kamal al-Din Ibn al-'Adim, who, although he died in 660/1262, has numerous pages devoted to the Kilab in his chronicle as well as those of his biographical dictionary of the city of Aleppo to the exploits of the Kilab. Indeed, three of his ancestors had successively held the post of kadi of Aleppo for some fifty years in the 5th/11th century. Ibn al-'Adim was very sensitive to the legend which idealised several Mirdasid princes. According to his accounts, they, following the example of Sayf al-Dawla, were amirs in the noblest Arab tradition, strong and courageous, expert in the skills of adab as well as in those of war, using the finest blades, mounting the noblest horses and husbands of the most beautiful women in the East. Their mothers, admirable for devotion and political intelligence, were ready to confront the world and the great in order to...
defend and to promote the political careers of their progeny.

All the Arab historians who have dealt with this age have mentioned the role of the Mirdasids, who also appear in the accounts concerning Abu l-ʿAlāʾ al-Maʿṣarī and the dāʿī al-Muʿayyid li-Dīn Allāh (see M. Saleh, Abī l-ʿAlāʾ al-Maʿṣarī, bibliographie critique, in BEO, xxxi [1969] and xxiii [1970], and Abu l-ʿAlāʾ al-Maʿṣarī, Épitope du pardan, Fr. tr. V.-M. Monteil, Paris 1984; idem, R. al-Ṣāhī wa l-ʿlḥābdī, ed. Bist al-Ṣāhī, Cairo 1975. See also AL-MAʿṢARĪ and other works of P. Smeor).

The historian of the Mirdasids experiences some difficulties in identifying personalities. Indeed, a certain number of inscriptions bore the name of Kilāb, such as Thīmāl, Mukallad, Manf ṣ and Wathāḥ, are from the Kayṣī tradition and recur in the allied or neighbouring tribes of Nuṣayr, Kuḥayr, ʿUkayl, Asad and Kīnānā. When matrimonial alliances united these tribes, the younger sons often received the ism of the maternal grandfather or one of the mother’s brothers. Similarly, the labākus which the Banū Mirdās received or which they gave themselves could be confusing, for they made frequent allusion to their perseverance and temper by the use of the names of animals of the steppe, persistent and tenacious, dogs, wolves and wolf cubs, scorpions and scorpion-like. Frequently, at a late date, the copyists of manuscripts confused their nisba (Kilābī) with that of their neighbours (Kalbī).

Ṣāḥī b. Mirdās al-Kīlābī appears in the texts as amīr of Rabbā in 399/1009. In that period, the Kilāb were in firm control of the steppe of northern Syria. Luʾluʿ, the old Hamdānī ghulām who had usurped power at Aleppo, died in the same year; his son Murtada al-Dawla, Mansūr’s successor, succeeded him and was recognized by the Fatimid Imām al-Hākim bi-amr Allāh. The Byzantine Emperor Basil II then allowed the master of Diyar Bakr, Muhāshīd al-Dawla Ahmad b. Marwān, to attempt to reestablish at Aleppo, with the help of the Kilāb, a Hamdānī in the person of Abu ʿl-Haḍiyāb b. Saʿd al-Dawla. Fatimid diplomacy, supported by a military expedition which set out from Tripoli, caused the plan to miscarry by obtaining from the Kilāb a disguised act of treason. In 402/1011-12, the Fatimid attempted a Hamdānī restoration, in their turn, with the help of a grandson of Saʿd al-Dawla; an act of treachery by the Kilāb also brought about the failure of this operation. Having saved Mansūr b. Luʾluʿ on two occasions by their inaction, the Kilāb demanded from him the grant of ḫūdā in fertile regions to pasture their sheep and war horses. To rid himself of them, the master of Aleppo resorted to a well-known trick and invited a thousand Arab warriors to a feast; as soon as they were giddy and drunk, they were either massacred or thrown into the dungeons. Ṣāḥī b. Mirdās figured among the number of the prisoners, and was subjected to the roughest treatment by Murtada al-Dawla Mansūr, who seized from him his splendid sabre and forced him to repudiate to his advantage his wife Tarūd, the most beautiful woman of the age. But in 405/1014 Ṣāḥī managed to escape by acrobatic means. Some days later, having recovered his sabre, he raised an army, hastily levied around Aleppo were therefore ravaged by the Arabs who had been deceived, while there were mutterings of revolt in the town. Fearing betrayal by Fath al-Kaffī, the governor of the city, Mansūr fled to the nearby Byzantine territory, where in 406/1016 he received a fief and built himself a fortress.

Ṣāḥī showed his good sense after his victory. He arranged to have join Mansūr the wives and daughters whom he had forgotten in Aleppo in his hasty flight, only deflowering the one who had been promised to him. He obtained from the Byzantines, at first hostile towards him, the maintenance of the commercial traffic across the region that he controlled. The Fatimids who, since the death of Ibn Killis, had coveted northern Syria. The envoys of al-Hākim [g. v.] persuaded Fath to yield to them first the town and then the citadel. Ṣāḥī b. Mirdās did not yet control an adequate military force to drive out the Egyptian army.

The new Fatimid governor Azīz al-Dawla Fāṭik was given the citadel of Aleppo in 407/1017, and swiftly made himself an autonomous prince; as master of the city, he ceded control of the plain to the Kilāb. Enjoying good relations with the Byzantines, he thus maintained peace in the region. Such independence was unacceptable to the Fatimids, and, in 415/1022, the regency of Sitt al-Mulk al-Dawla of Mosul, who had vanished, had Fāṭik assassinated and put two Fatimid officials in charge of both the citadel and the town.

In order to counter this attempt at direct Fatimid administration, Ṣāḥī b. Mirdās, who at that time commanded Rabbā, Rakka, Bālis, Mānbiḏū and Rafāniyya, founded allies among the Kalb of central Syria and the Tayy of Transjordan, who were very hostile to the Fatimids. From 390/1000 onwards, violent movements in Western Asia and North Africa were stirring up not only Kayṣi and Yemeni Arab tribes, but also nomadic groups of Berbers and even disbanding black military slaves, driven to despair by the rise in prices and the scarcity of grain. The nomads, threatened by famine, resorted to violence in order to gain access to the cultivated lands.

In the spring of 1024, the death of Sitt al-Mulk, while Egypt was entering a serious corn crisis, brutally interrupted a planned rapprochement with the Byzantines, who resumed an offensive action to the south of Antioch. In the months that followed, the majority of Fatimid officials of proven authority posted in Syria were replaced by barely competent newcomers. In the reign of al-Hākim, and then under the regency of Sitt al-Mulk, the Arab tribes of Syria had already contemplated an alliance to chase out the Fatimid army. The Byzantine Basīl II, made aware of the plan, was opposed to it, an opposition which collapsed on the death of the Christian regent. During the summer of 415/1024, Ṣāḥī b. Mirdās began hostilities in northern Syria and entered the town of Aleppo, which the former kāʾid of Murtada al-Dawla, Sālim b. Mustafād, surrendered to him. He entrusted to him the continuation of the siege of the citadel and the administration of the city to his secretary Sulaymān b. Tawk; then he reached central Syria, besieged Baṣlah, and joined up with his allies, the repudiated Tarūd, promised Ṣāḥī the hand of his daughter and a very heavy ransom, and above all agreed to hand over the Kilāb half of the fiscal revenues of the principality of Aleppo. After he was freed, he only partially kept his promises. The lands around Aleppo were therefore ravaged by the Arabs who had been deceived, while there were mutterings of revolt in the town. Fearing betrayal by Fath al-Kaffī, the governor of the city, Mansūr fled to the nearby Byzantine territory, where in 406/1016 he received a fief and built himself a fortress.

Ṣāḥī showed his good sense after his victory. He arranged to have join Mansūr the wives and daughters whom he had forgotten in Aleppo in his hasty flight, only deflowering the one who had been promised to him. He obtained from the Byzantines, at first hostile towards him, the maintenance of the commercial traffic across the region that he controlled. The Fatimids who, since the death of Ibn Killis, had coveted northern Syria. The envoys of al-Hākim [g. v.] persuaded Fath to yield to them first the town and then the citadel. Ṣāḥī b. Mirdās did not yet control an adequate military force to drive out the Egyptian army.

The new Fatimid governor Azīz al-Dawla Fāṭik was given the citadel of Aleppo in 407/1017, and swiftly made himself an autonomous prince; as master of the city, he ceded control of the plain to the Kilāb. Enjoying good relations with the Byzantines, he thus maintained peace in the region. Such independence was unacceptable to the Fatimids, and, in 415/1022, the regency of Sitt al-Mulk al-Dawla of Mosul, who had vanished, had Fāṭik assassinated and put two Fatimid officials in charge of both the citadel and the town.

In order to counter this attempt at direct Fatimid administration, Ṣāḥī b. Mirdās, who at that time controlled Rabbā, Rakka, Bālis, Mānbiḏū and Rafāniyya, founded allies among the Kalb of central Syria and the Tayy of Transjordan, who were very hostile to the Fatimids. From 390/1000 onwards, violent movements in Western Asia and North Africa were stirring up not only Kayṣi and Yemeni Arab tribes, but also nomadic groups of Berbers and even disbanding black military slaves, driven to despair by the rise in prices and the scarcity of grain. The nomads, threatened by famine, resorted to violence in order to gain access to the cultivated lands.

In the spring of 1024, the death of Sitt al-Mulk, while Egypt was entering a serious corn crisis, brutally interrupted a planned rapprochement with the Byzantines, who resumed an offensive action to the south of Antioch. In the months that followed, the majority of Fatimid officials of proven authority posted in Syria were replaced by barely competent newcomers. In the reign of al-Hākim, and then under the regency of Sitt al-Mulk, the Arab tribes of Syria had already contemplated an alliance to chase out the Fatimid army. The Byzantine Basīl II, made aware of the plan, was opposed to it, an opposition which collapsed on the death of the Christian regent. During the summer of 415/1024, Ṣāḥī b. Mirdās began hostilities in northern Syria and entered the town of Aleppo, which the former kāʾid of Murtada al-Dawla, Sālim b. Mustafād, surrendered to him. He entrusted to him the continuation of the siege of the citadel and the administration of the city to his secretary Sulaymān b. Tawk; then he reached central Syria, besieged Baṣlah, and joined up with his allies, the
Kalbi Sinan b. ‘Ulayyan and the iVi Hassan b. al-Djarrah. He sent the first to attack Damascus and the second to attack Ramla. The dīwān of Cairo did not lend much support to the Turkish general Anūhūtin al-Duzbārī, who had been entrusted with the defence of Palestine. Distrusting him, they negotiated behind his back with the Tayy b. Umar, who, at the same time, established secret alliances with the Banū Kurra of Libya so as to create a united front hostile to the Fātimids from Aleppo to Tripolī in North Africa.

Ramla was pillaged and burnt by Iblīn al-Djarrah, but then al-Duzbārī regained the military advantage in Palestine. Damascus, defended by its population and by the Fātimid army, repelled the Kalb. In the course of the year 415/1024-5, the population of Aleppo opened its gates to the Kilāb. The Fātimid garrison defended itself for some time in the citadel, taking advantage of the misgivings of the city’s Muslims over the Byzantine sympathies of Iblīn Mirdās. Underground mining led to the destruction of the well which supplied the citadel with water and, in Dhu‘ al-Ḥijād 416/June 1025, the Kilāb finally gained access to it. Sā‘īd b. Mirdās was in central Syria at that time and only took possession of Aleppo three months later. He allowed the Fātimid dā‘ī and governor of Aleppo the best had been preserved of the old state of the citadel executed and immured the old kādī alive. His action had allowed him to include Aleppo and Hims in his domain of north Syria and to extend his rule in central Syria to Baḥlabakk, Ḥisn (Ibn) ‘Akkār and Saydā.

Having brought to success the plan which had guided his forebears for a century, Sā‘īd b. Mirdās gave to his principality the attributes of a mediaeval Islamic state, a fiscal apparatus, a vizier described as sāhib al-sayf wa ‘l-kalam and a kādī. His concern for order and respectability, once victory was won, contrasted with the behaviour of Iblīn al-Djarrah, a cowardly and cruel ruffian. But al-Duzbārī, nominated Fātimid governor of Damascus and Syria in 419/1028, could not tolerate Mirdās’s control over the cities of central Syria while Hāsān b. al-Djarrah continued to ravage Palestine. The Tarāt, having lost the aid of the Kilāb since the death of Sinan b. ‘Ulayyan, appealed to Sā‘īd to defend Arab autonomy in Syria. The battle of al-Ukhwawānā, on the eastern shore of Lake Tiberias in Kāfīb II 420/May 1029, saw the total defeat of the tribes. The Banū ‘l-Djarrah took to flight, and Sā‘īd b. Mirdās and his younger son as well as his vizier, the Christian Tadrūs b. al-Ḥasan, deserted and fled with most of their forces to the Ajlūn. They abandoned the city to the Byzantines some places in the Djazlra. He behaved in every respect as a vassal of the Emperor, and the Fatimid governor of Aleppo opened its gates to the Kilāb notables against Mirdās’s preponderance.

Several incursions into northern Syria, trying to rouse the population, who were very hostile to the non-Muslims. By relying on the old Aleppo citizens and on the Euphrates, which still let him pass his cavalry, Sā‘īd quelled a dangerous revolt. Sā‘īd b. Mustafād, ra‘ī of the town and mukaddam al-ahdāth [see AHDĀTH], from his house in the glassmakers’ souk, was preaching hatred of the Byzantines and had stirred up the rabble; he was caught and put to death.

In Dhu‘ al-Ḥijād 422/April-May 1031, in order to protect himself against a possible attack from his brother Thīmāl, Sā‘īd concluded peace with the Byzantine Emperor. Yahyā’s text describes in detail the symbolic gestures which demonstrated the rapprochement between the two parties as well as embodying the clauses of the treaty. Recognising the protection exercised by the Byzantines over his principality, Naṣr undertook to pay them 500,000 dirhams annually. The following year, together with the new catapanus of Antioch, the eunuch Nikīrā, he mounted an expedition to exterminate the Hākimi Druzes who had become numerous in the Djabal Summāk. He did not stand in the way of Nikītā at all when the latter occupied or raised in a few months’ time the fortifications built, without the approval of Romanus III, by some autonomous Muslim families on the slopes of the Djabal Bahārī to the east of Bānīyās and Latakaya. He allowed the Tayyī to pass, in their mass emigration from southern Syria into Byzantine territory. Romanus III was wanting to use them to put pressure on al-Duzbārī and obtain from the Fātimids the renewal of the traditional decennial truce suspended since 415/1024. Naṣr b. Sā‘īd did not intercede either on behalf of his allies of Numār, who had to cede to the Byzantines some places in the Dēqāzirā. He behaved in every respect as a vassal of the Emperor, and the Byzantines occupied at this time several forts and castles in the wilayāt of Diyar Muḍar. The Byzantine catapanus of Antioch, provoked by incidents which had brought the Christians and Muslims of Ma‘arrat al-Nu‘mān into conflict in the time of Sā‘īd and by the construction of fortresses by Muslim families in the coastal zone without his agreement, wanted to profit from the inexperience of the two princes in order to impose a protectorate on them. Refusing all conciliation and without notifying the Emperor, he sent into battle an army which was wiped out by the Kilāb at Kaybar in Dhu‘ al-Ḥijād 420/July 1029. The reconstitution of a force capable of defeating the Byzantines in a pitched battle, two months after a total defeat in Palestine, demonstrates the rare military ability of this tribe, the importance of its manoeuvre and the great number of its mounts, even if the valour of this cavalry is explicable in part by the abundance in northern Syria of pasturage permitting the keeping of powerful war horses.

The following year, on learning that the Emperor Romanus III was arriving with a powerful army to avenge his catapanus, the two brothers tried in vain to negotiate. Faced with the refusal of Romanus III to accept anything other than the surrender of Aleppo, they decided to fight again. A modest squadron of Arab cavalry inflicted in the heat of Shā‘bān 421/July 1030 near Ḥayyās a memorable defeat on the huge Byzantine coalition. The booty was considerable; their allies, the Numārī, seized 300 mules loaded with gold denarii.

In this period, Naṣr b. Sā‘īd seized the citadel during the absence of his brother and became the sole master of Aleppo. He chose a new vizier, who was popular although he was a Christian. The latter, with the help of his brother, presided over the urbanisation of the town’s suburbs which were bursting out from the confines of its walls and had a mosque built there to facilitate the integration of the newly-settled population, who were very hostile to the non-Muslims. By relying on the old Aleppo citizens and on the Euphrates, which still let him pass his cavalry, Sā‘īd quelled a dangerous revolt. Sā‘īd b. Mustafād, ra‘ī of the town and mukaddam al-ahdāth [see AHDĀTH], from his house in the glassmakers’ souk, was preching hatred of the Byzantines and had stirred up the rabble; he was caught and put to death.
badly situated for a new Byzantine campaign, Ibn Marwan, the master of Diyar Bakr ([see MARWANIDS], the Banu 1-Djarrār and the Kalb, also made for Con-
stantinople in order to take part in the conference which was to decide the fate of the borders between the Muslim and Christian domains in northern Syria and Džazira.

The negotiations lasted for nearly four years. Romanus III died in 425/1034 and Michael IV replaced him. The truce was not definitely concluded until 425/1034-9. Among the numerous points which were discussed, one concerned Naṣr b. Sāliḥ, who had straight away given allegiance to Romanus III and claimed a royal Byzantine dignity which would distinguish him from the mere tribal leaders. Romanus III seized this opportunity to have Aleppo included in a specific treaty, apart from the treaty which he was proposing to the Fāṭimid. Al-Zāhir refused to see Aleppo, a noble Islamic frontier post, figuring in the Byzantine domain (banz). After the death of Romanus III, Michael IV was more conciliatory, and advised Naṣr b. Sāliḥ to recognise his allegiance to the Fāṭimid, but since Yahyā’s text for this period is lacking, we do not know the details of the treaties.

The periphery of the Syrian steppe was held by dynasties who all, with the exception of the Marwānid Kūrds [see MARWANIDS] of Diyar Bakr, were descend-
ants of Kaẓīr tribes. The chiefs of Numayr spread out their so-called territories over the south-east of that of Kūlāb; the region of Mawṣal, to the south-east of Marwānid Diyar Bakr, was administered by Kīwāb b. Mukallad, a prince of ʿUkayl; further south, the Assād of Dūbahs b. ʿAlī b. Lāzād controlled the ‘urban’ Mesopotamian section of the Tigris and Euphrates, disputing their territory with the Khāfāḏja who were regrouping, even further south, on the west bank of the Euphrates towards Kūfā. The degree to which each of these chieftainships reached the level of actual states was very problematical, and the Mirdāsid was among the most favourable towards traditional Islamic urban institu-
tions. This choice of theirs contrasted with that of the Fatimids, who were more given to pillage than to administration.

The head of the diwan in Cairo, al-Djarrārāt [q.v.], distrusted al-Duzbari and looked favourably on the action of Naṣr b. Mirdās. The latter made a gift to al-Zahir of the booty gathered at the time of the battle of ʿAṣāz, and was authorised to annex Bālūt to his principality, and his ladāb was inflated. The governor of Hims, ʿAṣāz b. Kulaḏy al-Kutāmī, claimed the help of al-Duzbari, who could not accept a destabilising encroachment of the Kūlāb in a region traditionally Yemeni. He wrote to the Byzantines asking them for authorisation to relieve them of Naṣr, who had just married the daughter of Shābib b. Wāṭṭah b. Mirdās, their enemy, the Numāyri prince of Harrān. The alliance between the Mirdāsid and Numayr, added to a possible seizure of Hims, would have given this Arab coalition control of all the lowland roads between ʿIrāk and the Mediterranean or Byzantine world. Without waiting for agreement to come from Cairo, al-Duzbari and Ibn Kulaḏy set out for the north. At Tall Fās, near Lātica, in Shābān 429/May 1038, Naṣr b. Sāliḥ was killed and his brother Thīmāl fled to Aleppo in the company of Shābib b. Wāṭṭah b. Numayr. Thīmāl set off again with his brother’s children, while Shābib b. Wāṭṭah took along his sister, Naṣr’s widow. Mukallad b. Kāmil b. Mirdās was holding the caliphate. When al-Duzbari entered the town of Aleppo in Ramadān 429/June 1038, he was well received by the population, who was still hostile to the alliance between the Mirdāsid and Byzantium. Mukallad negotiated his own departure and was able to carry off an important part of the caliphate’s treasure. Al-Duzbari attacked Thīmāl’s principality, capturing Bālūt and Manbūd but failing before Rahba.

In 431/1039-40, Shābib b. Wāṭṭah b. Numayr died and was replaced by his brother Muṭṭārīn. Their sister, the Numāyri princess al-Sayyida b. ʿAlāʾiyya, Naṣr’s widow, received Rikāra-Rakka which she gave, with the middle Euphrates, to her new husband, her brother-in-law Thīmāl b. Sāliḥ. Al-Duzbari, still in his post at Damascus, then acquired Kaṭfat Dawsar, the future Kaṭfat Ḍajābbar, in order to protect Aleppo against an attempt at a Mirdāsid restoration, and against the advice of Cairo began a rapprochement with the Marwānid ruler in Mayyūfārīn.

The Byzantines broke the truce in 431 or 432/1039-
41 and attacked northern Syria with some success, obtaining from Thīmāl b. Sāliḥ and his cousin Mukallad offers of tribute or even of the sale of the town of Rakka. Al-Duzbari tried to play a game of his own by relying on the Banū Ḍajāfar section of the Kūlāb, seduced in the Mūdīk of Apamea and hostile to the Banū Mirdās as well as to the Byzantines. The tension between Cairo and al-Duzbari intensified. The vizier al-Djarrārāt had the military governor of Damascus and Fāṭimid Syria publicly condemned, whereupon the army of Aleppo abandoned its commander-in-chief. Accompanied by ten faithful ḡulūmams, al-Duzbari took refuge in Aleppo. Al-
Djarrārāt asked Thīmāl b. Sāliḥ to go and attack him, but this proved useless, for al-Duzbari, in despair, died at Aleppo in Qaḥāra 1045. In 431/1042. The following month, after one or two spells of indecision, the citizens of Aleppo opened their gates to Mukallad and Thīmāl. The siege of the caliphate in which the Fāṭimid ḡulūmam had taken refuge lasted for six months. Thīmāl’s seizure of Aleppo had immediately been recognised by the Empire of Théodora, who awarded him the title of emir of Aleppo and thalāt of patrician for his wife, and admitted into the imperial hierarchy six of his brothers, cousins and nephews. The development of commercial exchanges actually led to fierce competition between Muslim and Christian merchants, notably at Aleppo, where the Christians were better protected by a Mirdāsid prince than by a Fāṭimid governor. In 436/1045, the year of the death of al-
Djarrārāt, a diploma from al-Mustansir confirmed Thīmāl’s investiture in Aleppo; however, relations remained strained, notably because the four to six hundred thousand dinars of al-Duzbari seized in the caliphate had only been partially returned to Cairo. In 439/1047-48, the decennial truce was renewed by the Byzantines, who were confronting in Armenia and Trebizond the first Turcoman bands as well as an inciter to ḡulūmā to near Kā’ā al-ʿAyn.

Naṣir al-Dawla Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan b. Hamdān, governor of Damascus, and Ibn Kulaḏy, governor of Hims, attacked Aleppo in 440/1048. Thīmāl, at the head of several thousand men, resisted the great Fāṭimid army which, having lost its equipment and mounts in one night following the flooding of the Kuwayk river, retreated to Damascus. Thīmāl, worried about the outcome of events, negotiated success-
ively with the Fāṭimid vizier Ṣadāka b. Yūsuf al-
Falāḥī, an Aleppo Jew, and after the latter’s execu-
tion, with another Jew, Abū Saʿd, official in charge of the private treasury, who was also executed. Once his cousin, Ḍajāfar b. Kāmil b. Mirdās, had killed Ibn
Kulayd at Kafar Tāb, a new military expedition on a grand scale was launched against Thimāl, involving 400,000 dinārs and 30,000 men, and entrusted to the elderly eunuch Rifq. The Emperor Constantine IX, having proposed his mediation to the Fatimids in vain, sent two armies to keep a watch over northern Syria. Mukallad b. Kamil b. Mirdas destroyed the fortifications of Mar'arrat al-Nu'mān and Hamāt, and the Mirdāsid troops assembled before Aleppo. The Fatimid army, in which there coexisted with great difficulty regular soldiers, either Berbers, blacks or Turks, together with Kalbī and Djarrābī Bedouins, was wiped out on the Djabal Dżawšīn near Aleppo in Rabi‘ 1 442/August 1050 by the ever-effective cavalry of the Kilāb. Rifq, wounded, was taken prisoner and died with his mind unhinged three days later. Thimāl, embarrassed by the unexpected scale of his victory, sent to Cairo his young son and his tireless wife, al-Sayyida al-_DUMP; whose political intelligence and pertinent remarks charmed the Fatimid Imam al-Mustansir [q. v.], the latter recognised as being in fief to Thimāl Aleppo and all the lands which he effectively held. From 442/1050 to 449/1057-8, Muizz al-Dawla Thimāl administered his principality peacefully, with the help of his successive viziers, Abu ‘l-Fadl Ibārāhīm b. ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Anbārī, then Fakhr al-Dawla Abū Naṣr Muḥammad b. Dżahir [see Dżahir, Banū], and finally Sādī al-Dawla Hībat Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Raḥūbī al-Raḥī. The two last were experts in public finance who, before or after their stay in Aleppo, performed the same function for other rulers. Aleppo enjoyed at that time low prices and great prosperity; numerous houses built in this period were still in existence two centuries later. External relations were peaceful. A tribute was conveyed each year by Ibn al-Aysar to the Byzantine Emperor who, for his part, promoted the Mirdāsid notables in the imperial hierarchy. At the same time, relations with al-Mustansir, to whom the above Ibn al-Aysar regularly brought a gift (al-kist), were good. Thimāl supported al-Basāsīrī [q. v.] at the beginning of his revolt against the ʿAbbāsid caliphate and gave him the town of Rūba. However, from 449/1057-8 onwards, Thimāl had to face the jealousy of his Kilāb supporters, who reproached him for treating them less well than his Numayrī allies. In exasperation, he arranged with al-Mustansir to exchange Aleppo for Dźubayl, Bayrūt and ʿAkka, far from Kilāb agitation, and a Fatimid governor was installed at Aleppo. In 451/1060 the defeat and death of al-Basāsīrī lessened Fatimid prestige in eastern Syria, and Asad al-Dawla ʿAtiyya b. Sālīh, Thimāl’s brother, occupied Rūba, capturing the treasure and weapons which had been stored there in preparation for an expedition against ʿIrāk. The Kilāb entrusted to the young prince Muḥammad b. Sḥībīl al-Dawla Naṣr b. Sālīh b. Mirdās and his cousin Mana’s b. Mukallad b. Kāmil b. Mirdās the task of regaining possession of Aleppo. After a first unsuccessful attempt, they received the support of the abdīl of the town as well as the notables, whereas the rich
Ashraf of the Alids remained once again the most faithful to the Fatimid power. In Djumada II 452/July 1060, Aleppo opened its gates to the Kilâbi. The Fatimid governor, entrenched in the citadel, asked for help from Cairo, who commanded the governor of Damascus, Nâsir al-Dawla Abû 'Ali al-Husayn b. Abî Muhammâd al-Hasan, to go to Aleppo, where he was however coldly received. In Radjab 452/August 1060, he confronted the Kilâbi army and in his turn experienced defeat at al-Funûn. Abandoning his Kalb, Tayyî and Kilâbi allies and overcome by thirst, he was taken prisoner together with the majority of the Fatimid commanders. The next day, 4 Atiyâa b. Sâlih took possession of Aleppo, which two days later fell into the hands of Mâhmûd b. Nasr b. Sâlih. Ten days later, the last Fatimid troops surrendered the citadel to him and left northern Syria for good.

4 Thîmile b. Sâlih was meanwhile staying in Cairo. Al-Mustansîr informed him that since the town of Aleppo had eluded him, he was resuming possession of the coastal towns. Thîmile then decided to return to Aleppo. But his nephew Mâhmûd, relying on his Numayrî allies, refused to give up the city to him, sent the poet Ibn Sinân al-Khafadî in order to ask for help from Byzantium, and freed Nâsir al-Dawla and the other Fatimid prisoners. Abandoned by his Kalb, Tayyî and Kilâbi allies and overcome by thirst, he was taken prisoner together with the majority of the Fatimid commanders. The next day, 4 Atiyâa b. Sâlih took possession of Aleppo, which two days later fell into the hands of Mâhmûd b. Nasr b. Sâlih. Ten days later, the last Fatimid troops surrendered the citadel to him and left northern Syria for good.

4 Thîmile b. Sâlih was meanwhile staying in Cairo. Al-Mustansîr informed him that since the town of Aleppo had eluded him, he was resuming possession of the coastal towns. Thîmile then decided to return to Aleppo. But his nephew Mâhmûd, relying on his Numayrî allies, refused to give up the city to him, sent the poet Ibn Sinân al-Khafadî in order to ask for help from Byzantium, and freed Nâsir al-Dawla and the other Fatimid prisoners. Abandoned by his Kalb, Tayyî and Kilâbi allies and overcome by thirst, he was taken prisoner together with the majority of the Fatimid commanders. The next day, 4 Atiyâa b. Sâlih took possession of Aleppo, which two days later fell into the hands of Mâhmûd b. Nasr b. Sâlih. Ten days later, the last Fatimid troops surrendered the citadel to him and left northern Syria for good.

4 Thîmile b. Sâlih was meanwhile staying in Cairo. Al-Mustansîr informed him that since the town of Aleppo had eluded him, he was resuming possession of the coastal towns. Thîmile then decided to return to Aleppo. But his nephew Mâhmûd, relying on his Numayrî allies, refused to give up the city to him, sent the poet Ibn Sinân al-Khafadî in order to ask for help from Byzantium, and freed Nâsir al-Dawla and the other Fatimid prisoners. Abandoned by his Kalb, Tayyî and Kilâbi allies and overcome by thirst, he was taken prisoner together with the majority of the Fatimid commanders. The next day, 4 Atiyâa b. Sâlih took possession of Aleppo, which two days later fell into the hands of Mâhmûd b. Nasr b. Sâlih. Ten days later, the last Fatimid troops surrendered the citadel to him and left northern Syria for good.

4 Thîmile b. Sâlih was meanwhile staying in Cairo. Al-Mustansîr informed him that since the town of Aleppo had eluded him, he was resuming possession of the coastal towns. Thîmile then decided to return to Aleppo. But his nephew Mâhmûd, relying on his Numayrî allies, refused to give up the city to him, sent the poet Ibn Sinân al-Khafadî in order to ask for help from Byzantium, and freed Nâsir al-Dawla and the other Fatimid prisoners. Abandoned by his Kalb, Tayyî and Kilâbi allies and overcome by thirst, he was taken prisoner together with the majority of the Fatimid commanders. The next day, 4 Atiyâa b. Sâlih took possession of Aleppo, which two days later fell into the hands of Mâhmûd b. Nasr b. Sâlih. Ten days later, the last Fatimid troops surrendered the citadel to him and left northern Syria for good.
Alp Arslan could not stamp out the brave and resourceful resistance of the people of Aleppo. Negotiating with the other chiefs of Kilâb factions, the sultan publicly offered to let them name a replacement for Mahmûd b. Nasr. The latter, having more faith in the courage of the Aleppo citizens than in the loyalty of his fellow-tribesmen, left the town. Together with his mother al-Sayyida al-`Alawiyya, they trod on the sultan’s carpet. The Numayri princess, wife of two Kilabî princes and mother of a third, adored in the face of the Seljuk an attitude of vanquished pride, quite different from the respectful humility which she had displayed, twenty years earlier, before the Fâtimid Imam. Alp Arslan, recovering his equanimity, confirmed Mahmûd b. Nasr in his territories and entrusted to him the task of chasing the Fâtimids out of central Syria, the first stage before the destruction of the Isma`ili caliphate. Then the sultan went to confront the Byzantine army which had penetrated into Armenia.

Mahmûd b. Nasr, at the head of an army composed of Kilâb and Turcomans, went therefore to Ba`labakk and was about to besiege Damascus when he learnt that his uncle `Atiyya had left the territory of Antioc, where he had found refuge, in order to attack Ma`arrat Mar`în to the south-west of Aleppo. Mahmûd b. Nasr hurriedly gathered together his principalities and the Kilabî leaders (Afshin b. Mubarak, Tadj al-Dawla Tutush) and put his sister Fatimah his appanage to his brother Tadj al-Dawla Tutush. Accompanied by some Turkish leaders (Afghîn b. Bakdji, `Sandik al-Turkî, Muhammad b. Dumlâdî, Ibn Tu`至尊 and Ibn Buravk), Tutush reached Diyar Bakr with the opposition Mirdasids. During this time, Mahmûd b. Nasr, having become distrustful of his vizier, the Christian Abu Bishr, who had always helped him in hard times, beheaded and forced the latter to carry these two heads tied together around his neck, then, on a false charge, he had him killed in his turn and thrown into the well of the citadel. He quarrelled with the Kilabî `Atiyya having died in Constantinople, Mahmûd b. Nasr in 465/1072-3 took Ra`ba for the Turkamans, and twenty horses back to Sabik b. Mahmûd. He pacified his fellow Turks. The Kilabî al-Turkman al-Turkl, was coming to help the last Kilabî who were still participating in the siege, he discreetly arranged for his soldiers to join forces with Kilab and with Tutush, who were besieging Aleppo. Mahmûd b. Nasr was killed in the fighting.

Muslim was crowning secret connections with Sâbîk, of whom he was fond, and blamed the Khurasan for having called in the Turks against their own prince. Although he obtained permission to withdraw from the siege, he discreetly arranged for his soldiers to sell to the people of Aleppo all that they needed in order to subsist. His departure was followed by that of most of the Kilabî. As the Turks committed atrocities, the last Kilabî who were still participating in the siege rallied to Sâbîk. On learning that an ensemble of the Khurasan, al-Turkman al-Turkl, was coming to help, Ahmad Shah prisoner by surprise and sold him for 100,000 dinars and twenty horses back to Sâbîk b. Mahmûd. At the beginning of 470/summer of 1077, three leaders of the Kilabî rebellion, Wathib b. Mahmûd, Surrent b. Mahmund al-Turkl, Muhammad b. Dumlâdî, went to confront the Byzantines, entrusting the whole of Syria in appanage to his brother Tadj al-Dawla Tutush. Fearing Tutush who was approaching Aleppo, the Turks who dwelt with Ahmad Shah outside the walls in the Hadrî went, with Sâbîk’s authorisation, to put their wives in safety in the Castle of the Bridge over the Orontes which Ibn Munkidh had restored; but they could not endure the change of climate and succumbed to sickness. In Dhu `l-Hijja 469, Ibn Dumlâdî took Ahmad Shah prisoner and sold him for 100,000 dinars. Ahmad Shah received, in addition to the lâsk of `Imam al-Mulk Abu `l-Fad`al, a purse of 1,000 dinars and the promise of a monthly allowance of 30 dinars. He pacified his fellow Turks. The Kilabî al-Turkman, master of Damascus, Alp Arslan, easily dispersed the Kilabî coalition, 70,000 cavalry and infantry, assembled near Kinnarîn. The Turks captured 100,000 camels and 400,000 sheep as well as a large number of Kilabî wives and concubines. Ten thousand military slaves of Kilabî were counted. Ahmad Shah returned to Aleppo with all the booty taken in the tents and all the prisoners. Sâbîk gave the order to free the prisoners and brought to live with him his sister, wife of Mubarak b. Shihîl, who was one of the captives.

In Dhu `l-Hijja 469, Ibn Dumlâdî took Ahmad Shah prisoner by surprise and sold him for 100,000 dinars and twenty horses back to Sâbîk b. Mahmûd. At the beginning of 470/summer of 1077, three leaders of the Kilabî rebellion, Wathib b. Mahmûd, Surrent b. Mahmund al-Turkl, Muhammad b. Dumlâdî, went to confront the Byzantine army, led by the Turcoman Ahmad Shah, retook Antioch, reduced to famine, then agreed to lift the siege in return for 5,000 dinars. Fearing Tutush who was approaching Aleppo, the Turks who dwelt with Ahmad Shah outside the walls in the Hadrî went, with Sâbîk’s authorisation, to put their wives in safety in the Castle of the Bridge over the Orontes which Ibn Munkidh had restored; but they could not endure the change of climate and succumbed to sickness. In Dhu `l-Hijja 471/May 1079, Sharaf al-Dawla Abu `l-Makârim Muslim b. Kura`ayf, amir of the Banû `Ukayl of Mawsil, came on the orders of Malik Shah to join forces with Kilab and with Tutush, who were besieging Aleppo. Ahmad Shah was killed in the fighting.
In spring, he resumed the campaign, conquered Manbad and attacked a certain number of castles belonging to the Kilâb, notably the fortified town of 'Azâz. At the same time, Abu Zâ'ida was massacring any isolated groups of Turkish cavalry whom he took by surprise. It was a very hard war, paid for by the peasants and merchants. Finally, Tutush undertook a forced march on Aleppo to take it by surprise, but the Kilâb were victorious. Tutush then left northern Syria and set out for Damascus, which Aţâz surrendered to him, since he was in difficulties facing a Fâtimid counter-offensive.

According to Ibn al-ʿAdim, Tutush then entrusted the main part of his army to his general, the Turk Afschin, who returned northwards, pillaging the villages around Baḥlabak and attacking Rafanîyya. Some caravans of merchants, coming from or going to Tripoli, were there; Afschin and his men massacred the merchants, raped the women, pillaged the merchandise, with the carnage lasting for ten days or more.

Afschin was received by the lord of the Castle of the Bridge Abu ʿl-Ḥasan Ibn Munkidh, and promised to spare Kafar Tâb which belonged to the latter. Afschin resumed his march and, thanks to manoeuvres which accompanied him, was able to capture by bombardment one of the all-fortified towns and all the defensive towers of the Djalab Sumkâm, in addition to some villages lying to the east of Maʾarrat al-Nuʾmân. The populated areas were pillaged, sometimes burnt along with their inhabitants, the women and children who had escaped were raped or captured, and the men killed. But failing before Tall Mannas, Afschin was satisfied with imposing on its inhabitants a tribute of 5,000 dinars.

Tutush, on being informed of what was happening, made for Kafar Tâb, but the army had left the region to go to ravage the Byzantine lands around Antioch. Tutush returned to Damascus, attempting to reassure the people on his way. When Afschin and his men left for the east, the plain of northern Syria no longer had a single village intact. Famine was widespread. Wheat was selling for a dinar for six saṣṣ and cases of cannibalism were recorded. The inhabitants were leaving to seek refuge in the Dīzāra in the ʿUkaylîds lands.

In Ramadan 472/March 1080, Sharaf al-Mulk b. Kuraysh al-ʿUkaylî, informed of the situation in northern Syria, judged the moment to be propitious for intervention. A letter from Sâbik b. Mahmûd proposed giving up Aleppo to him. Accompanied by a convoy of provisions, he marched on Bâlis and then on Aleppo, but Sâbik refused to open the gates of the town to him. Thanks to the help of the aḥdâth, and especially of the starving population, Muslim was able to enter without a fight at the end of the year 472/June 1080. Muslim found such a state of famine in Aleppo that he wanted to leave the town, but Ibn Munkidh persuaded him to stay. Sâbik had taken refuge in the citadel, but his brothers Shâhib and Waththâb, entrenched in the palace, succeeded in winning back the favour of the citadel's garrison. Sâbik was handed over to his brothers and Shâhib became master of the citadel. Negotiations took place with Sharaf al-Mulk, with Ibn Munkidh as intermediary. Muslim undertook to marry Mânīa, daughter of Mahmûd and sister of Sâbik, and to give important fiefs in the region of 'Azâz to Shâhib and Waththâb and in that of Sabik to Sâbik. The three brothers left the citadel, where there was no water, and thus the Mirdâsid state came to an end in 472/1080.

The three brothers continued to play a role as local lords in northern Syria, still changing sides as easily as ever, first helping Muslim b. Kuraysh, then allying themselves with his enemies. At the time of the Franks' arrival in Syria in 491/1098, Waththâb b. Mahmûd was leading a contingent of Kilâb who tried to block their advance.

The Banû Mirdâs offer an example of those Kayṣî princes of the Syro-ʾIrākî steppe who succeeded in implanting within a sedentary territory an ordinary state structure which functioned for half-a-century in the manner of the quasi-autonomous provinces of the caliphate. The agricultural richness of the plateaux and valleys of northern Syria and the intensive trade between Mesopotamia and the Mediterranean via the Euphrates and Aleppo assured them of good revenues. They were helped in the management of the public finances by viziers, often Christians, and in meting out justice by Imāmī Shiʿî kadîs, chosen from great ʿAḥd or simply Kayṣî families. They were able, in case of necessity, to gather an army of quality, comprising Kilâbî contingents of lightly-armoured cavalry but also aḥdâth of Aleppo, whose militias had acquired an institutional character and whose commander was one of the principal notables of the town. They conducted a skilful diplomacy of maintaining a balance between the declared ambitions of the Byzantines and Fâtimids regarding northern Syria, depending for support alternately on one or the other of these powers. They were free to make an invasion with military resistance. This policy was more suitable for Aleppo than that of Sayf al-Dawla and his successors. The town experienced under the Kilâbî princes some years of great prosperity, and on this point we cannot follow the contemporary historians who reduce their action to a Bedouinisation of the city and its region. This was, furthermore, a very productive period for Arabic poetry both at the court of Aleppo and in cities such as Maʾarrat al-Nuʾmân, where one must remember that Abuʿl-ʿAlâʾ was only the most brilliant representative of a pleiad of men of letters.

But, later on, the weakness of the Fâtimids, facing in Egypt a serious financial and grain crisis, the incapacity of the Byzantines to resist the Turcoman infiltrations, then the defeat of the Basileus by the Saljûks, broke this skilful balance, and the Mirdâsids were forced to recruit Turcomans in their turn and to create for themselves an army of slaves and mercenaries. An analysis of the changes that took place in the tactics of swordsmanship on horseback and in weapon technology would enable us to understand how the Mirdâsids were easily able to overcome heavy Byzantine armies and why they succumbed in their turn under the blows of small Turcoman contingents.

From then on, the power of the dynasty was shown to be fragile. Old causes of weakness were still present: jealousy of the Banû Mirdâs among other Kilâb groups, even though each was given a domain around a stronghold; disputes between Mirdâsid princes; and intervention of their allies from Numayr, ʿUkaylî and Kinânâ in the affairs of Aleppo. To these was added the behaviour of the Turcomans, who ruined the countryside and trade. No longer being able to maintain order in the province, the Mirdâsids lost their legitimacy in the eyes of the inhabitants and had to yield their principality to the ʿUkaylîs. The new Turkish and Kurdish military dynasties were not slow to take over. However, the fact that until the Crusades, some Mirdâsid fiefs had survived in northern Syria shows how deeply rooted this dynasty was in a region where the Kilâb had been established for several centuries.
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386a-387b, is very close to but not identical with Mubarrad's and quotes a large number of verses. He also omits the enad. Tabari, ii, 186-7, 390-1 relies on two sources, Wabah b. Djair and an anonymous one, of which the former does not seem very reliable and the latter follows Mubarrad and Baladhuri, but is much shorter; Yâkût, i, 61-2 (cf. also ii, 434, l. 1) seems to have used an independent source. Ibn al-Âthir, Kamûl, iii, 428-30, iv, 81-2, harmonises Tabari and Baladhuri, and follows: Mubarrad. Dinawari, al-Âkbâr al-fawwâd, ed. Guirgass, 278-9, knows the episode, but wrongly attributes it to the Azrakîs (sic) and does not even mention Mirdas. See also Wellhausen, Die rel.-pol. Oppositionspartenien, in Abh. G. W. Göt., phil.-hist. Kl., N.S. v/2 (1901), 25-7.

mirghaniyya or qatamiyya, the dervish order or tarîka founded by Muhammad Uthmân al-Mîrghânî, more commonly called the Khatamîyya from its founder's claim that it is the seal (khâtam) of all tarîkas. The naissance of the founder does not appear in such works as al-Samî'ânî's K. al-Anâ'î or al-Suyûtî's Lubb al-albâb, but may be derived from the place-name Marghan in Ghur, for family traditions attest to a long residence in Central Asia. The prefixed A- is a Western form due to a supposed derivation from al-amin al-qâbir.

Towards the end of the 18th century, the family, after a short residence in India, drifted back to Mecca, whose shawafa' recognised their claim to descent from the Prophet. Muhammad Uthmân's grandfather, 'Abd Allâh al-Mahdîjah (d. 1207/1792), was a well-known Sufi, and Muhammad Uthmân followed in his footsteps. He was initiated into the Kâdirîyya, Shadhiliyya, Nakshbandîyya, Dzunaydiyya and the Mirghaniyya of his grandfather, whence his later claims to have gathered up all the tarîkas into his own. His shaikh was pre-eminently that remarkable man, Ahmad b. Idris al-Fâsi (1173-1253/1760-1837 [see Ahmad b. Idris]), to whose teaching and inspiration claims to have gathered up all the tartkas.

When the Mirghaniyya was at the height of its influence, the government's recognition of the Mahdi's son, 'Abd al-Rahmân, during the First World War, which was followed by the reconstitution of the Mahdîyya sect, inaugurated an era of rivalry between the two religious movements in which their political role came to assume predominance. The elections of November 1953 for a Sudan Parliament resulted in the victory of the National Unionist Party supported by the Mirghaniyya over the Umma Party supported by the Mahdiyya.

distribution. The main expansion of the order has been in the Eastern Sudan, where it is the predominant tarîka. It is strong among the merchant communities and educated classes throughout the whole country, whence its power in politics. Among the ordinary population, whilst groups will be found all over the country, it is strongest in the north (Donkola and Halfa Provinces), among the Djallâyyin, and in the east and Eritrea, especially among the Badja tribes ('Abâbda, Halanka, Ammar'ar, Bani 'Amir and Habâb). In Kordofan there is a branch order, the Ismâ'îyyin. It was propagated in Egypt by 'Abû Hurayba, an Egyptian pupil of the founder, under whose name the tarîka is sometimes known, and has zâyfnân in the chief towns. It has followers in Abyssinia (Addis Ababa and among the Guma), whilst in Arabia only small groups survive in the Hijâz, 'Asir and Yemen.

bibliography: For the works of 'Abd Allâh al-Mahdîjah, see Brockelmann, S II, 523; for those of Muhammad Uthmân, op. cit., S II, 809; for those of Djallâr b. M. Uthmân, op. cit., S II, 810. Al-Magdûna al-Mirghaniyya (various eds.) includes the most important devotional works of these, al-Raadî al-Mirghaniyya (1939), a collection of 12 essays dealing with the rules of the order and methods of performing of the shukr, the Minhât al-asbâb by Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Rahmân al-Ru'fî, being especially
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MIRI (a), a shortened form of amiri, in Ottoman Turkish miri, literally, “pertaining to the commander or governor, the amir”. Although in early Islam this latter title [q.v.] used to denote the head of the Muslim community, it was downgraded over the ages, and during Ayyubid and Mamluk times was given to military officers, including low-raking ones. Under the Ottomans, the term resumed its initial importance and was singled out to designate assets that belong of right to the highest Muslim authority, the Sultan. Throughout Ottoman history, it was used as a noun meaning “lands belonging to the government”, “land tax” levied from them, as well as “the public treasury”.

Muslim jurisprudence drew a distinction between privately-owned lands, mulk (either 'awar or kharādij land, possessed by Muslims or by non-believers, respectively) and state property, ard al-mamlaka. In earlier years, the latter was designated by several names (e.g. kbiš), and it was only under the Ottomans that it assumed the name mūri. Since the absolute ownership of the rokaba, belonged to the hayir al-mal [q.v.], mūri lands could only be leased by the peasants who enjoyed the rights of usufruct, the tasaruf, and paid the land-tax in return. They could neither sell or grant nor endow these lands, although in later years ways were elaborated to circumvent these restrictions, e.g. the establishment of waqf 'ghayr shari'.

Upon the conquest of a given area by the Ottomans its agricultural lands, the most promising source of income, were declared mūri. This was explicitly stated in the Kānūn nāme of the veldiṣet (e.g. Wilâyet-i Mura, in Barkan, Kanunlar, 326), then recorded by the land registration (taši'ir) committee in the relevant dafar-i kbiškāni [q.v.]. As long as the peasants tilled the land and paid its taxes (e.g. the ēfṣem, 'ughr) no one could interfere with their holdings or with the right of their descendants to inherit them.

The taxes that accrued from these lands were assigned as salaries for the upkeep of the Ottoman army, either directly (the timār system) or through the emanat [see emi] system that accrued to the treasury. As late as the 10th/16th century, the administration tried to overcome the deterioration that occurred in these systems. Vacant timars as well as ordinary mūri villages were in the various forms of kbiš [q.v.] leased out to muļasim tax farmers. The tax-division (muvalat) was farmed out, and in return the lease holder was expected to convey to the state treasury the annual mūri tax (mal-i mūri, al-i mal, etc.) due. Two ways were resorted to in order to compensate the tax farmer for the depreciation in the actual value of the mūri; the tax farmer had to pay an advance, mal-i muqādil, upon his nomination, very often at a higher rate than the actual tax returns. Secondly, there were other sums that were added over the years under various names (jā'd, damā'um, etc.), and gradually became part of the established tax. The muļasim or the muṭhānaqī were granted their lease for a limited period of one to three years, and although the tax system replaced the timārs that ended the end of the 12th/17th century it underwent certain modifications. The relatively short term of office of the tax farmers prevented any meaningful interest in the well-being of the peasants who cultivated the mūri plots under their control. A third method was then introduced by the Treasury, the life-long lease of mūlkan [q.v.]. Here, too, the muļasim undertook to pay the annual mūri due and he retained the surplus amount which he had collected. He did not, however, have to apply for renewal, hence the mūri became more reminiscent of mālk. During the 12th/18th century, although the notion of state absolute ownership over all mūri lands prevailed, its actual control over the tenants and lease holders diminished as the empire declined.

During the Tanzimāt [q.v.] period, an overall attempt was made to redress this situation by way of re-establishing the state’s authority over the mūri holders. Many of the rights which they had gradually usurped were legitimised and codified, whereas future attempts to impair the status of the mūri became contingent upon the specific consent of the central government. The construction of new buildings or the planting of trees on mūri land, which might ipso facto grant full ownership rights, was forbidden (unless specifically authorised) by the land law of April 21, 1858 (articles 25, 31); official permission became imperative to enable the sale of mūri plots, and so was the division of mūri lands held in partnership or their mortgaging (articles 36, 17, 116, respectively). Mūri lands left fallow for over three years would be con-fiscated by the state (articles 68-71).

The distinct and clear establishment of the differences between mūri and mālk could not change the historical trend involving the transformation of the former into the latter. This tendency reached fruition in Egypt, where close links with the world economy brought about a rapid increase of mālk properties to almost one-third of the land by the end of the 19th century. At that point, the Egyptian mūri (referred to as kharādijya) was ultimately incorporated into the mālk. In the Fertile Crescent, this process was much slower; mūri lands hardly increased, and in a series of laws passed in 1913, and then in Syria and 'Irak in the early 1930s, ownership rights over mūri were extended, although certain restrictions remained valid well into modern times. Thus in the middle of the 20th century, most lands of the Fertile Crescent (with the exception of Lebanon) were still mūri. Moreover, although the 1858 law explicitly prohibited any collective ownership (muṭābî [q.v.]), this clause was also evaded. No general registration was carried out (in southern 'Irak, not even theoretically), and the villagers, fearing conscription and taxation, registered their land in the name of tribal heads or city notables. In practice, however, they continued to cultivate their land according to the traditional ways. Unlike Egypt, where a full land census was completed just after the turn of the century, a state of anarchy persisted in the Fertile Crescent in this field up until 1914. Land settlement and registration of titles progressed very slowly during the Mandatory period and in the independent successor states. Even when the status of mūri was abolished (e.g. in Israel from 1 January 1970), it still remains valid in unsettled lands. Even the term “pure mūri” (mūri 'isti), referred to by the registration commissions of the 19th century in the Fertile Crescent, has not disappeared. In contemporary 'Irak, where modern legislation introduced separate categories for mūri turned almost fully to private ownership (lakmā, 'āfâlā), mūri 'isti still exists for unsettled lands which are still within the realm of state formal ownership.

Bibliography: G. Baer, Studies in the social history of modern Egypt, Chicago 1969, 67-78; idem, A history of landownership in modern Egypt, 1800-1950, Oxford 1962, 1-2, 79-80; H. Inalcik, Land problems in Turkish history, in MW, xlv (1955), 221-8; M. Belin,

MIRKAS or MIRKâS (A.), a kind of mutton sausage. There would probably be no reason to devote an article to this culinary speciality had it not enjoyed for some time in Europe, and especially in France, an unexpected success, being known as "murguez", after the arrival of a considerable number of Maghribi immigrants and above all, repatriates from the lands of North Africa, where the word and the thing itself were not widespread, it seems, until a relatively recent period. Thus there is a problem worthy of examination.

Sausages are not unknown in the East, where they are called by a name resembling the Latin laxânsk/makânsk/mâkânsk which Dozy has already mentioned (Suppl., s.v.v.), tracing them back to *luxania, which shows a Roman influence, and remarking that Ibn al-Hashâshî's gloss on the Mansûrî of al-Râzi explains the first of these three words as the Maghribi mîrkaš. In the West also, E. Laoust notes (in Motis et choses bergères, 79 and n. 7) the existence, in Berber lands, of sausages, the word for which varies according to the local dialects. In any case, M. Beaussier, whose Dictionnaire dates from 1887, records, under the radical r-k-z, a word *mirkâsa, coll. *mirkâz, but adds that it is Tunisian; Marcel Cohen, in Le parler des juifs de Tunis, Paris-The Hague 1964, 152-3, has mîrkaš in a colourful text which provides information on the preparation of these sausages with mustard, fennel seeds, garlic and a paste made from red peppers. G.-S. Colin (in his ed., with E. Lévi-Provençal, of al-Sâkati, 33-4) observes on the one hand that the writing of the word with k- or k- in the ms. used shows the difficulty caused by the wish to render a *q- and, on the other hand, since it is obviously not a Bedouin word, that it is possible to regard mîrkaš/mîrkaš, whose origin is unknown, as a Roman borrowing which has been preserved in Maghribi dialects under strong Spanish influence. It may furthermore be remarked that, under the radical r-k-s, Dozy had already noted that mîrkâš, pl. mårkâš, means "in the Maghrib, sausage, chitterlings, black pudding"; he refers in this connection to several sources, among which the Vocabulista of Pedro de Ncâla translates (295) mürqâz [pl.], mürqâz, as longanizo (= sausage) and (515) mürqâz al-kânâzîr [pl.] mürqâz al-kânâzîr, as mortella (= black pudding or chitterlings). This latter expression probably relates to a preparation in use among the Mozarabs and not among the Muslims, since Islam not only forbids the consumption of pork (*khdnsî [q.v.] but also of blood that has been shed [see dam in Suppl.]. In Muslim circles, *mûrqaţ thus meant, as mûrqaţ does today, sausages prepared entirely with mutton. Moreover, the Kishâb al-Tâbilh, an anonymous work published in 1965 at Madrid by A. Huici Miranda, under a significant title La cocina hispano-mauresca en la época almohade, contains in the first lines of the ms. the recipe for the ordinary mîrkâš, which is considered very digestible. It is made from minced leg of mutton, kneaded with a little oil and with the addition of various spices and ingredients: pickle, pimento, dried coriander, nard and cinnamon. There is then added to it 3/4 of its weight in fat, which it is sufficient to cut into small pieces, without grinding or mincing, for they must be melted on the stove; everything is kneaded once more and put into skins from the intestines of mutton washed as a preliminary. The sausages are fried in a mild oil, then sprinkled with an oil and vinegar dressing or a more elaborate sauce. A little dried cheese and some eggs can also be added to the meat itself (op. cit., 24). Other recipes were certainly in use.

These "murguez" were not only prepared in private homes; they were also sold outside, in the shopping streets and on stalls, as appears in works of hist(ê) [q.v.], which especially enjoin the mûdrâbî to watch the sabbâdân (whom one hesitates to describe as "caterers") and ensure that they use fresh products and not (like so many sellers of murguez today) spoiled meat which is cheaper (Ibn ʿAbdûn, 45; Fr. tr., 124) and oblige them to work in public view (*miadâd zâhir), using very smooth chopping boards so as to avoid splinters penetrating the sausage meat; during preparation, the sabbâdân must drive away the flies with a burning piece of charcoal; and, moreover, the details of preparation, the proportions to observe and the ingredients to use (al-Sâkati, Ar. text, 31; 36; Fr. tr. 165, 175-6, based on a corrected and extended text).

Literature does not appear to make frequent allusion to these "murguez", and H. Pérès has only found a few lines to cite (La poésie andaloue, en arabe classique, au XIe siècle, Paris 1933, 315-16), where the mîrkaš gives rise to a macabre comparison with the fingers of a crucified man.


(Ch. Pellat)
The Rawdat al-safâ is arranged in seven volumes, with an epilogue (khâtima) on geography:

1. General aspects. In the Muslim East, from the 10th/16th and 12th/18th centuries, and into the 13th/19th. It was widely used by European historians up to the late 19th century, and until the late 19th century, it was the basis for the history of mediaeval Iran. The seventh volume, almost identical with the Rawdat al-safâ, was written after the death of his daughter's son Khâdîm al-Murâdî, who, indeed, the murâdî [g.v.] of Ibn Kasî [g.v.], commanded by a certain Ibn al-Kâfîb, seized the fortress on 12 Safar 539/14 August 1144 and facilitated the arrival of the Almohads in that region. Various vicissitudes, the place was definitively reconquered by the Christians towards the end of that same century.


MIRWAH (A.), "fan, vane

1. General aspects. In the Muslim East, from the Middle Ages to the present day, fans of various sizes have been simply a means of resisting the heat. Good ventilation and, where possible, reduction of the temperature are vital for the improvement of living conditions in regions where intense heat prevails throughout the summer. The civilisations preceding that of the Muslims were aware of some reasonably effective solutions to this problem, and it seems that the Muslims continued to apply them, to perfect them and to supplement them with inventions of their own. These techniques include, besides small hand-held fans and larger ones operated by servants, the construction of windows and skylights which may be opened for ventilation, the elaboration of systems directing every breath of air towards the interior of the building and the skill necessary to construct ventilable machines (or rather, installations) based on a process of humidification and ventilation and capable of freshening the air.

2. Pools, hydraulic wheels and gardens. It is possible to enjoy wind and fresh air without needing to resort to any particular machinery. During the
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summer, it may be convenient to sleep, at night, on the roof or on a terrace (in the 4th/10th century: Mez, *Renaissance*, 360; later, Ibn Batūtā, i, 30, relates that it is general practice to sleep "on the roof", but in their translation Defrémery and Sanguinetti add, in parentheses, that this should be understood as meaning "on the terrace"). During the day, it is possible to recline comfortably in a garden, near an artificial lake (*biṭka, fiṣḥiya and faṣḥiya*) or in places close to running water, near pools and fountains (*naḥūra, näfaūra, fiṣḥiya and faṣḥiya*) and hydraulic wheels (*naḥūra = nūrida; the more commonly found form is dawlab = wheel for raising water), which freshens all the ambient air. Waterwheels were designed to raise the water (from one canal to the other, in the open air, or from a river to some kind of building); some wheels of this type were constructed in such a way that their upper part was located in the basement of the houses of the wealthy, built on the bank of a river, while the base of each wheel dipped in the water. Although the principal role of such a wheel was the provision of water, it also served as an instrument for freshening the air in the house and, as is shown by a miniature of the 7th/13th century (see below, Fares), people enjoyed sitting around it. Similarly, the entire garden could lend its freshness to the house or the palace when the architect took the trouble to incorporate the garden within the perimeter wall or when the architectural concept consisted of small pavilions spreading across a large garden.


3. Wind vents, *biḏḏhandj* and methods of humidification. In the court of the *Abbasids, a technique was invented for the use of a tightly stretched screen of coarse linen fabric [see *Khaysh*] which was sprayed with water (al-ʿAbāli, *Lattaʾī*, ed. Djeong, 14-15, tr. Bosworth, 48; al-Dāhibī, *Rashīd ed.*), A.-S. Hārūn, states that the Sasanid kings were unaware of this technique; al-Sarî al-Raflī, *op. cit.,* i, 272, 426, ii, 106, 203, describes a kind of cabin-pavilion (*bayt* and cf. below, the more complicated constructions) in *Khaysh* (or in *Kaitin = in linen*); for other forms and sources, see *Khaysh*. On the ventilations chimneys called *biḏḏhandj* or *bāsidr*, see *Bāsidr* in Suppl. For illustrations, see figs. 1-6.

4. Fans. In order to distinguish between small individual fans (see figs. 8-9) and the large fans operated by servants (see fig. 7), the sources call those of the former category "hand fan" (sometimes "palm fan") or specify the material from which it is made, i.e. palm-leaves, while the second category is called *mirwahat al-khaysh* (*khaysh* fan; see *Khaysh*). The "hand fan" which is most often seen in miniatures is square in shape (fig. 9); since the miniaturists meticulously paint its interwoven surface, this form can be easily identified as the *mirwahat al-khaysh* = palm-leaf fan, described in the texts. The round shape is less common in miniatures (furthermore, one of the Ottoman miniatures which depicts it belongs to a series devoted to women of diverse ethnic origins, and the lady in question is, in fact Spanish, see fig. 8), but the existence of round fans, made of leather, is attested by the written sources. As for the large fan operated by servants (fig. 7), certain authors, including al-Sharījī and al-Guzzūlī (see references given below), who talk of the *mirwahat al-khaysh* in *Irāk, are referring to a large linen cloth which is sprayed with water (sometimes perfumed) and which is attached to the ceiling with cords, which may be unfolded as they are pulled; the wet cloth, continuing to move automatically, freshens a small amount of air. It is quite possible that the miniatures which vouch for the presence of a servant who operates the large "fan" reflect the situation in wealthy homes more accurately than does al-Sharījī (copied by other authors, see *Mēz, loc. cit.,* al-Dāhibī, *c. Pellat, Le livre des saures*, 316-17; and *Khaysh*): even the analogies in verse which these authors quote refer to a person or to the hand of a person. Similarly, it was not necessary to moisten this large fan; in some circles, or in a certain period, the combination of fan/*khaysh* consisted of two
separable elements: an apparatus of khaysh, which was moistened and which freshened the air in the room, and a large fan (not wet, apparently) which served to spread the fresh air.

Amir-zdda, and originally meaning "born of a slave". Thus the identification of fans, in the sense of primary material, could refer to a wide range of fans/ly-whisks. Furthermore, ly-whisks (and possibly fans, at the same time, see figs. 10-14) could themselves, in turn, be mistaken for regal accoutrements (see especially, fig. 12, in which the objects in question are held in a heraldic manner, as it were, on either side of a prince), but the presence of a servant (or two), standing behind the prince or at his side, holding a fly-whisk, in order to throw into relief the regal appearance of the person, does not mean that the object cannot also serve a useful purpose (on fans and fly-whisks in the written sources for iconographic sources, see below) see: Kushadhjm, Didi±a, 8; al-Sari al-Raffa', op. cit., i, 426, ii, 290, 556; al-Shabdighi, Dijvdaj, 185; al-Raghb al-Isfahani, Muhadadrat, ii, 381; al-Ha'diri, Makmadat, ed. de Sacy, 544; al-Warrak al-HazTri, Dictionnaire des antiquites, under fla'bi and muscarium; even al-Shabdij, loc. cit., makes no distinction in his commentary between mirwaha and midjhaba; see also Mi'st layla wa-layla, ed. Tarshina, 78; al-madhdnib wa 'l-mazdwhih to be read al-madhdnib wa 'l-nawwad marawwih. Thus the identification of fans, and the presence of the title: Man Singh [q.v.], Sindh under Akbar, his son Mtrza GhazI Beg under Akbar and Dha'hangi (see argun, also sundar; Tar-ku'an; fnañtis); (c) certain Mughal nobles, apparently merely as a mark of royal favour: the Khani, Khani, 3. Abd al-Rahim [q. v.], son of Bayram Khan, was known first as Mirza 'Abd al-Rahim, and later entitled Mirza Khan; his four sons bore the title: Mirza Yusuf Khan [see yusuf ku'an], son of Mir Ahmed-i Radawi, who from 995/1587 was governor of Kashmir; Akbar's foster-brother Mirza 'Aziz Koka [q. v.], whose father was certainly not of noble birth, and his five sons; even favoured Hindis bore the title: M. Singh [q. v.] was familiarly referred to as Mirza Rajia. A mosque inscription in Mungar [q. v.] of 1074/1664-6 uses the rare feminine form mir-zani in describing its foundress (Qeyamuddin Ahmad, Corpus of Arabic and Persian inscriptions in Bihar, Patna 1973, 269-70).

In modern times in India and Pakistan, the prefixed Mirza is particularly used by men of the Mughal division of Ashraf Muslims.

Bibliography: See those to the various mirzâs.

(J. BURTON-PAGE)

MIRZA AHMAD KHAN, Indian Muslim noble and traveller to the West, the son of Nawwâb Mu'azzaz Khân (Nawwâb in 1769), descended from 4. Abd Allah Beg, the Mughal governor of Broach, a town in Gujîrat [see BHAROC], situated on the right bank of the Narbada river about 30 miles from its mouth.

Since the town of Broach was an important trading and manufacturing centre and the Nawwâb would not allow the English to establish a factory there, the governor of Bombay decided to seize it. Under the pretext that the Nawwâb had violated the treaty with the East India Company and insulted Morley, its representative, Broach was attacked, and abandoned on 18 November 1772, and the state was annexed. As the Nawwâb died soon afterwards, four of his sons decided to proceed to England and petition the Court of Directors for the redress of the injustice done to their family. The governor of Bombay,
having come to know of this, ordered their movements to be watched and later detained them. In spite of Mirzā Ahmad Khan’s efforts, they managed to escape and boarded a ship which took them to Maskat. The British authorities provided them with a carriage which took them to Lyons. Here Mirzā Nawāzish Khān fell ill and died after a prolonged illness. As by this time Mirzā Ahmad Khan’s money had run out, he appealed to the town authorities for help. He was given money for his journey to Paris and, since he did not know French, he was given a companion named François who could converse a little in Persian.

When Mirzā Ahmad arrived in Paris in May 1794, the town was in the full grip of revolutionary fervour; so Mirzā Ahmad appealed to the Committee of Public Safety for financial help and for news of his two brothers who were living in Istanbul, either at the Residency of the Mughals or with Darwish Abd Allah Khankhān. Since the Committee was anxious “to fulfil towards this foreigner the duty of hospitality”, because the “French nation honours the unfortunate”, it instructed the French ambassador in Istanbul to obtain information about Mirzā Ahmad’s brothers and to convey to them news of their eldest brother’s death. It also authorised the Minister of External Affairs to give Mirzā Ahmad 1,200 livres so that he might be able to continue his journey to England. Furthermore, the Committee ordered that François, who, out of goodness of heart, had accompanied Mirzā Ahmad to Paris, should be sent back to his home in Lyons at the expense of government. Later, the Committee issued instructions to the Commissaire of External Affairs that, since the date of Mirzā Ahmad’s departure was uncertain, his stay in Paris might be prolonged, and that Mirzā Ahmad should be allowed to know French. Ruffin, Government Interpreter of Oriental Languages, should be asked to keep him in his house at Versailles as a paying guest and teach him French, which he was so anxious to learn. This would make him useful to the Republic. Ruffin was greatly impressed by Mirzā Ahmad’s intelligence, good education, frankness and honesty, and it was due to his suggestion that Mirzā Ahmad’s allowance was fixed at 360 livres per month, excluding the expenses for board and lodging.

Mirzā Ahmad learnt French in three months, and in gratitude for what the Republic had done for him, he paid his homage to it by translating the Declaration of the Rights of Man into Persian. He then presented it to the Committee of Public Safety, which by order of Robespierre and Danton, sent it to be deposited in the Bibliothèque Nationale. It was felt that the learning and use of French language by a Muslim was a victory of French culture. This translation of the Declaration of the Rights of Man was the first to have been made in any Oriental language. Unfortunately, this document is not now traceable in the Oriental Section of the Bibliothèque Nationale.

Although the Revolutionary government of France was opposed to kings, princes and nobles, it adopted an extremely generous attitude towards Mirzā Ahmad. This was due partly to the ill-treatment he had received from their enemies and partly to the ideals of the French Revolution to help the underdog, the oppressed and the wronged.

Meanwhile, before Mirzā Ahmad was able to leave Paris, Mirzā Wahīd al-Dīn Khān, one of his brothers whom he had left behind in Istanbul, arrived in London and claimed certain rights from the Company on behalf of himself and his brothers. All of his claims were not granted, but each brother was granted a stipend of Rs. 200.00 monthly.

After this, Mirzā Ahmad visited London and secured funds from the Company for carrying the body of his brother, who had died at Lyons, to India overland for burial beside his father’s tomb. He was already suspected by the British authorities to be pro-French. The British Chargé d’Affaires in Istanbul was firmly convinced that he was not only pro-French in his sympathies but was actively working as an agent on behalf of France. When, therefore, he reached Basra, the English Resident was suspicious and persuaded him to embark on a ship for Bombay. On arrival at Bombay, Mirzā Ahmad was handed over to the police “as a spy inimical to the British interests, and in collusion with our enemies”. In 1798 he petitioned the Company which ordered the Bombay government to “examine his allegations and report thereon”. It is not known what happened to him afterwards. Probably he died in obscurity, unable to do anything to promote the cause of the French Revolution in India.

Bibliography: Ministére des Affaires Étrangères, Archives et Documentation: Memoirs and Documents, vol. xviii, 20; Archives Nationales: Archives des Affaires Étrangères, Vol. xx; India Office, Despatch to Bombay (Public Department), 30 May 1794; Despatch to Bombay (Political Department), 17 February 1797 (paras. 28 and 29); Despatch to Bombay (Political Department), 20 March 1799 (para. 7); Despatch to Bombay (Public Department), 20 May 1799 (para. 30); Letter received from Bombay (Public Department), 19 January 1796 (paras. 173a to 183); Letters received from Bombay, 22 August 1796, Public Consultations; Letters received from Bombay (Public Department), 18 December 1796 (para. 27); G.W. Forrest (ed.), Selections from the Letters, Despatches, and other State papers preserved in the Bombay Secretariat, Home Series, i, 389; M.S., Commissariat, A history of Gujarāt, 2 vols., i, 1938, ii, 1957.

Mohibbul Hasan

Mirzā Askarī, Mughal prince, the third son (neglecting infant deaths), of the emperor Bahādur Shāh of Delhi [q. v.], full brother of Kāmrān Mirzā [q. v.] and half-brother of the emperor Humāyūn [q. v.] and Hindī Mirzā [q. v.], born 922/1516 in camp, as his sobriquet indicates, died 965/1558.

He received his first military command at the age of 12, during Bābur’s eastern campaigns beyond the Ganges. After Humāyūn’s succession in 937/1530, Kāmrān was assigned Kandahār, but left ‘Askarī in command there when he moved to attack Humāyūn’s possessions in Lāhawr; but a couple of years later we find ‘Askarī in Agrā, whence he was sent against the Gudjarātī invaders under Tātār Khān Lōdī, and had some success against a weakened force at Mandrāyl south-west of Agrā. He accompanied Humāyūn on the conquest of Gudjarāt in 942/1535, and was appointed governor of Ahmadābād; but after Humāyūn had left to quell disturbances in the recently-acquired Māndū, the Gudjarātī army regrouped and ‘Askarī abandoned his camp, hoping to capture the treasury at Čāmpānēr before making for Agrā, where his advisers had suggested that he
MIRZA 'ASKARI — MIRZA 'AZIZ "KOKA"

declare his independence. The Mughal governor of Câmpâner was, however, loyal to Humâyûn, and both Akbar’s forces and those of the Mughal viceroys of Cambay were repulsed. Akbar, having heard that Khânj, the Malwa army, and then Khambayat (Cambay); this resolved the state of affairs. Since rebellion had broken out in the eastern provinces, Humâyûn greeted ‘Askari with a show of forgiveness, and they moved together towards Bengal; but they were outgeneralled by Shâr Khan (946/1539) and only with difficulty made their way back to Ágrâ. Pursued by Shâr’s army, the Mughals were once more forced intoAnimation, and Akbar, having shown his treachery to Humâyûn by entering into negotiations with Shâr Khan, resumed his governorship at Kâbul accompanied by ‘Askari. After Humâyûn’s abortive Sind campaign with Mirzâ Hindâl, Kâmrân attacked Badakhshân; the governor of Kandahâr made the town over to Hindâl, whereupon Kâmrân took Kandahâr and sent Hindâl prisoner to Kâbul, where he appointed ‘Askari as governor. ‘Askari restored the defences of Kandahâr, and instigated the Balûc chiefs to attack Humâyûn. Kâmrân proclaimed himself emperor and struck coins in Kâbul and Kandahâr; when eventually he was captured (956/1549) at Kâbul, ‘Askari, who had sided with his full brother, was also taken, and after a period of confinement was sent to Mecca on pilgrimage in 958/1551, and died between there and Damascus in 956/1558. He was a weak creature (he was much in Kâmrân’s shadow), of no great courage; Gulbadan Bégam merely calls him “unjust” (bi-minus). Bibliography: Gulbadan Bégam, Humâyûn-nâma, text and Eng. tr. t. A. Beveridge, London 1902, index; Tuzuk-i Bâhuri, Eng. tr. Beveridge, London 1922, index; Mirzâ ‘AZIZ, Dâghhtâr, Târîkh-i Rażhidî, passim; Bâdâ’u’ni, Maqasâd al-tavârîkh, index; Nizâm al-Dîn Ahmad, Tabakât-i Akbarî, must be used with caution, as he is a partial of ‘Askari, his father having been ‘Askari’s wazir; Ahmad Yâdgar, Târîkh-i Sâdûn-i Afsânhâna, is derivative, almost entirely copied from Majlis-i Akbarî. (J. BURTON-PAGE)

MIRZA ‘AZIZ “KOKA” (c. 949-1033/ca. 1542-1624) (the sobriquet occurs also in the Turkish form kakolâsh or kokolâsh, “father-brother”), the son of the Mughal Emperor Akbar’s wet-nurse Dîdji Anaga, who rose to prominence in the Mughal court, army and administration. His exact date of birth is not recorded, but it must have been within a month or two of Akbar’s birth in 949/1542; his father was Shams al-Dîn Ahmad Ghaznavi, who had been advanced to the branding regulation) and had occupied Gudjarat in a subordinate capacity, and died in Ahmadabad in 1033/1624.

Akbar himself arrived from Fathpur Sikri rapidly, by which time the Mirzas finally besieged ‘Aziz in Ahmadabâd when Akbar himself arrived from Fathpur Sikri in pursuit. The Mughal governor of Gudjarat was, however, loyal to Humâyûn, and both Akbar’s forces and those of the Mughal viceroys of Cambay were repulsed. Akbar, having heard that Khânj, the Malwa army, and then Khambayat (Cambay); this resolved the state of affairs. Since rebellion had broken out in the eastern provinces, Humâyûn greeted ‘Askari with a show of forgiveness, and they moved together towards Bengal; but they were outgeneralled by Shâr Khan (946/1539) and only with difficulty made their way back to Ágrâ. Pursued by Shâr’s army, the Mughals were once more forced intoAnimation, and Akbar, having shown his treachery to Humâyûn by entering into negotiations with Shâr Khan, resumed his governorship at Kâbul accompanied by ‘Askari. After Humâyûn’s abortive Sind campaign with Mirzâ Hindâl, Kâmrân attacked Badakhshân; the governor of Kandahâr made the town over to Hindâl, whereupon Kâmrân took Kandahâr and sent Hindâl prisoner to Kâbul, where he appointed ‘Askari as governor. ‘Askari restored the defences of Kandahâr, and instigated the Balûc chiefs to attack Humâyûn. Kâmrân proclaimed himself emperor and struck coins in Kâbul and Kandahâr; when eventually he was captured (956/1549) at Kâbul, ‘Askari, who had sided with his full brother, was also taken, and after a period of confinement was sent to Mecca on pilgrimage in 958/1551, and died between there and Damascus in 956/1558. He was a weak creature (he was much in Kâmrân’s shadow), of no great courage; Gulbadan Bégam merely calls him “unjust” (bi-minus). Bibliography: Gulbadan Bégam, Humâyûn-nâma, text and Eng. tr. t. A. Beveridge, London 1902, index; Tuzuk-i Bâhuri, Eng. tr. Beveridge, London 1922, index; Mirzâ ‘AZIZ, Dâghhtâr, Târîkh-i Rażhidî, passim; Bâdâ’u’ni, Maqasâd al-tavârîkh, index; Nizâm al-Dîn Ahmad, Tabakât-i Akbarî, must be used with caution, as he is a partial of ‘Askari, his father having been ‘Askari’s wazir; Ahmad Yâdgar, Târîkh-i Sâdûn-i Afsânhâna, is derivative, almost entirely copied from Majlis-i Akbarî. (J. BURTON-PAGE)
Aziz is celebrated as a scholar and a wit, a poet, and a distinguished general, honest, fearless, but short-tempered and outspoken. He is remembered for the construction of a great water-tank, the Khān Sarōwar, at Pāfān in Gudjarāt, and is buried within a great marble pavilion (Cawnasa Khandam) inside the complex at the shrine of Nizām al-Dīn Aḥwālī at Dibīl [g.v.].

Bibliography: The fullest account of the life of Aẓīz is in Aḥmad al-umārī, Bibl. Ind. ed., i; copious references in Abu ʾl-Faḍl, Akhār-nāma, ii; and ʿAbd al-Kādir Bādūnī, Mumtaqāb al-tawārīḵ, index. H. Beveridge, Aẓīz Koka, in JRAI (1921), 205-8, is a mere short character sketch. Background to Aẓīz’s viceregal periods in Gudjarāt is well covered in M.S. Commissariat, History of Gujarat, ii, Bombay, etc. 1957. See also Bibl. to Akbar, and other references in the article.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Kādiyānī [see Ahmadiyya].

Mirza Haydar Dughlāt [see Haydar Mirza].

Mirza Hindāl [see Hindāl, Mirza].

Mirza Kāmārān [see Kāmārān, Mirza].

Mirza Muḥammad Ḥakīm, brother of Abū al-Fadl Ḥakīm, Mirza Muḥammad Qandīr, Mirza Muḥammad Aḥmad Māzānnānī, brother-in-law of Humāyūn [see Muḥammad Zāmān, Mirza].

Mirza Raʾfī, Muḥammad b. Haydar, Husaynī Tabāṭābāʾī Nānī (988-1083/1580-1673), Persian scholar of the time of the Safawī religious jurisprudence, theology and jurisprudence as well as in the current philosophy and his time, and was regarded as the master of the philosophers and theologians of his time. He lived about 95 years and died in Isfahān on 3 Shawwāl 1083/22 January 1673, and was buried in the Taḵt-e Fūlād, the famous cemetery of the city.

He was a pupil of Mulla ʿAbd Allāh Shūshtrī (d. 10 Muharram 1020/25 March 1611), Shāhī Bahāʾī al-Dīn Muḥammad ʿAmlī (953-1031/1546-1622) and Mir Abuʾl-Kāsim Dīrirīsīkī Astarābādī (d. 1049 or 1050/1639-40). Muḥammad Ḥurr ʿAmlī (1033-1104/1624-93) and Muḥammad Bākī Majdīsī (1027-1110/1618-98) were among his famous pupils. Mirzā Abu ʾl-Haṣan Dīwānā (1238-1314/1823-96), a philosopher of the Kaḏar period, regarded himself as a descendant of Mirzā Raʾfī and as his follower.

Aḥmad b. Taḥārī Ṭabarī (d. 11th/17th century) has a eulogy in prose about Mirzā Raʾfī, written in 1070/1660, consisting of an introduction, five subjects (makāna), and a conclusion (published in ʿAmārī-nāma, Tehran 1353/1974, 274-321).

Mirzā Ibrāhīm Adham (11th/17th century) has a eulogy in prose about Mirzā Raʾfī, the manuscript of which is in the Central Library of Tehran University (no. 3294/4).

Mirzā Rāfaʾī, Muhammad b. ʿAlī Ardabīlī, (1578/1666-1738), a pupil of Abū ʾl-Ḥasan Dīrāsī Kayāmī (1238-1314/1823-96), a philoso-

\[\text{Bibliography:} \begin{align*} &\text{Muhammad b. ʿAlī Ardabīlī,} \\
&\text{(J. Burton-Page)} \\
&\text{Mirzā Takī Khān [see Amīr Kābir, in Suppl.]}
\end{align*}\]

Mirzā, an appellation, somewhat contemptuous, given in India to a follower of Mirzā Ghulam Ahmad of Kādiyān; see Ahmadiyya.

Mirzāpur, a district and town in the Uttar Pradesh province, formerly the United Provinces, of the Indian Union, forming a district in the Benares division of that province, with an area of 5,238 sq. miles, and with a population (1971 census) of 731,403. It is a Mughal foundation. The town of Cūnār, which guarded the gateway of the east. Rāṣīlpūr near Ahraura is the tomb of a Muslim martyr called Sayyid Aḥṣārī ʿAlī which is a place of pilgrimage. Near the gateway of the fort of Bīgaipāth is the tomb of Sayyid Zayn al-ʿAbīdīn, the saint who miraculously took the stronghold for Sīrī Shāh. The town of Čūnār contains two mosques, at one of which are preserved garments said to have belonged to Hasan and Husayn. The tomb of the ʿAfgān saint Shāh Kāsim Sulaymānī (952-1015/1545-1606) with those of his family forms a group of buildings of architectural interest. His festival is celebrated on 17-21 Dżumādī I of the Islamic month.

Mirzāpur city (lat. 25°9' N., long. 82°35' E.) is the capital of the district of the same name; of its population, a sixth are Muslims. It is a Mughal foundation dating from late in the 11th/17th century: in the 12th/18th and early 19th centuries it attained great prosperity as a trading centre, being at the junction of important roads and at the highest point of the Ganges reached by the larger ships. During the Mutiny of 1857-8, it remained quiet under a garrison of loyal troops. In 1864 the opening of the East India Railway left the town isolated; after then it declined, as the railway then carried the trade with which it used to deal.

Among the mosques is one founded in the middle
of the 19th century by a Muslim lady named Ganga Bibi, who also left funds to build a dargah. The town contains the celebrated Hindu shrine of Vindhesvarl, much visited by pilgrims and formerly held in special veneration by thugs.

Bibliography: D.L. Drake-Brockman, District gazetteer of Mirzapur, Allahabad 1911; Imperial gazetteer of India, xvii, 366-77. (J. Allan*)

MIRZĂS, the name commonly given by Indian historians to a turbulent family of Timurid descent, troublesome especially in the 10th/16th century, in the reign of the Mughal emperor Akbar, to whom they were mostly sixth cousins, as descendants of ʿUmar Shaykh Mirzâ, the second son of Timur (Akbar was descended from Djalal al-Dīn Mirān Shāh, the third son of Timūr). Abu ʿl-Fadl and Badāwūnī refer to them as mirzadān, and Hājjī al-Dābir as avāld Mirzā Muhammad Timūr Sultan (M. ʿīsā?). The Mīrzās of Badakhshān are also considered here, but only with regard to their involvement in Indian affairs.

1. The Mīrzās of Gudjarat.

The accompanying stemma makes their relationship clear; it might be added that Ibrahim Husayn Mirzâ was married to Gulrukh Bégam, daughter of Mirzâ Kamran; and that Uways Mirzâ was married to the daughter of Sultan Husayn Mirzâ, the ruler of Khurāsān.

The six sons of Muhammad Sultan Mirzâ had all been provided with ḥīşās in the Sambhal and Aʿzampur districts; but (probably assuming too much on their royal kinship, and profiting from Akbar’s absence from the capital to repel the advance of Muhammad Hākim from Kābul to Lāhāw) they spread outside their own ḥīṣās and attempted to occupy crown (khālisa) lands. From these they were dispossessed by the Mughal general Munʿīm Khan [q.v.], and fled first to Mālāwā, in 974/1567 (whose governor was absent with Akbar in the north) and occupied some important towns and districts. They were pursued to Māndā, and thence fled to Gudjarat early in 975/1567. Akbar punished their revolt by imprisoning their father Muhammad Sultan Mirzâ at Bayāna, where he died within a short time. By the end of the year it was reported that these Mīrzās, with the two sons of Ulugh Mirzâ, had again invaded Mālāwā and were besieging Ulūdjayn. Reports of the disturbed conditions under the collapsing Gudjarat sultanate caused their return to Gudjarat, where they consolidated their hold over the next two years [see GUDJARAT for a general description of the situation during the following years and for the conditions of the decline from which the Mīrzās sought to profit]. Here they assisted Činghiz Khan, most able of the Gudjarātī nobles, who at that time held Sūrat, Nan-
död and Čâmpâñér (while his brother-in-law, Rustam Kân, held Bharoc), in raising an army against Čimâd Kân (the local king-maker, regent for the minor puppet king Muzaffar III), and were rewarded by ľťs around Bharoc; Čimâd Kân thereupon invited Akbar, then at Čitawr, to invade Gudjarat. On the invasion of Gudjarat by Muhammad II of Khândesh, asserting his claim to the throne, Muhammad’s armies were defeated by the combined forces of Čimâz Kân and the Mirzâs; the latter were rewarded by the grant of further ľťs, but unfortunately, as had happened before, they encroached on their neighbours’ estates, and earned an unenviable reputation for their cruelty in Bharoc, so that Čimâz Kân sent a force against them; they defeated it, but removed themselves temporarily into Khândesh, where they plundered Burhânpur before retiring into Mâlwâ. They were attacked here by forces under several Mughal generals, were besieged in Ranthambhôr, which they had occupied, and were pursued to the river Narmadâ, where many of the Mirzâs’ army died during the crossing. However, they soon returned to take over their Bharoc lands. Čimâz Kân, who was by now virtually in command of Ahmadâbâd, was assassinated by a Hâbshî [q.v.] faction in 975/1567; after his death all the country south of the river Mahâ fell to the Mirzâs, who took over not only Bharoc but also Sûrat, Barôdâ and Čâmpâñér. After Akbar’s conquest of Gudjarat he decided in 980/1572 to expel the Mirzâs from southern Gudjarat. At this time, Įbrahîm Hûsâyin Mirzâ was established in Barôdâ (dissensions having broken out between the Mirzâs in Bharoc), Muhammad Hûsâyin Mirzâ in Sûrat and Sîh Mirzâ in Čâmpâñér. Akbar’s troops defeated Įbrahîm Hûsâyin Mirzâ, who fled towards Agra, though his wife Gûrlûkh Bégâm fled with her son Muzaffar Hûsâyin Mirzâ to the Deccan. Akbar moved on to invest Sûrat, leaving Mirzâ ‘Azzî Kôkâ [q.v.] in charge of Ahmadâbâd; when Muhammad Hûsâyin Mirzâ and Sîh Mirzâ, having joined Sêr Kân Fûlâdî, a disaffected Gudjaratî noble, moved to besiege Pátan, ‘Azzî attacked and defeated them, whereupon Muhammad Hûsâyin Mirzâ fled to the Deccan. Meanwhile, Įbrahîm Hûsâyin Mirzâ, with his younger brother Mas‘ûd Hûsâyin Mirzâ, at first tried unsuccessfully to take Nâgawr [q.v.] in Râdjâsthân, and then invaded the Pandjâb; the local governor defeated the Mirzâs’ forces, capturing Mas‘ûd Hûsâyin Mirzâ. Įbrahîm Hûsâyin Mirzâ fled south to Multân, and was soon afterwards wounded and captured by some Balûcî tribesmen; he was delivered into the hands of Mughâl officials, and died of his wounds. After Akbar’s return to Agra, Muhammad Hûsâyin Mirzâ left the Deccan, and joined the conspiracy with some of the old nobles, the rebel Hâbshîs, and the Râdžâ of Idrâ [q.v.]. When they marched against Mirzâ ‘Azzî Kôkâ in Ahmadâbâd, Akbar returned in his famous “forced march” of nine days, and routed the rebels in the battle of Ahmadâbâd in 981/1573. Muhammad Hûsâyin Mirzâ was captured in the battle and, while Akbar was pursuing the remainder of the rebel forces, the Mirzâ was executed by his custodians.

In 985/1577 the young Muzaffar Hûsâyin Mirzâ invaded Gudjarat from the Deccan, but was first defeated by Râdžâ Tôdâr Mâll [q.v.]; escaping to Dünâgâfrâh, he rallied his forces and again attacked Ahmadâbâd, but withdrew and was shortly afterwards captured by Râdžâ ‘Allî of Khândesh and handed over to Akbar. He was imprisoned for some 12 years, when Akbar released him, and appointed him in charge of Kânawdj; but he was unstable, and after two further terms of imprisonment he died a natural death some ten years later. This is the last account of Mirzâ disturbances in Gudjarat, which thereafter remained largely peaceful under Mughâl rule.

2. The Mirzâs of Badakhshân in India. The earlier history of this small house has been treated above under BADAKHSHÂN, at Vol. I, p. 852b. Its members were never a thorn in the flesh of the early Mughâls as were their kinsmen in Gudjarat, and they are considered here only with regard to their relations with the Mughâl power. A stemma indicates their relationship.

The sultans Abû Bâkî Mirzâ and Mûmûd Mirzâ, the sons of Abû Sa‘îd Mirzâ, were dispossessed by an

**GENEALOGY OF THE MİRZĂS OF BADAKHSHÂN**

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abû Sa‘îd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abû Bakr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baysunghur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulaymân M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahîm M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shâhbrûkh M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bâdi‘ al-Zamân M.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
usurper, who however submitted to the Mughal Babur [q.v.] in 910/1504-5. Babur then appointed Khan Mirza, son of Mahmud Mirza, as governor of Badakhshan; his son Sulayman Mirza (b. 920/1514, d. Lahawr 997/1589) later also served as governor of Badakhshan, but he and his son Ibrahim Mirza had to surrender to Mirza Kamran [q.v.]; he was, however, released on Babur's orders, and reinstated. After some disagreement with Humayun [q.v.], he eventually held Badakhshan until 983/1575. In 967/1559 he had invaded Balkh, when Ibrahim Mirza was killed. In early 983/1575 he was driven out of Badakhshan by Shahrukh Mirza, son of Ibrahim Mirza, and went first to India and thence to Mecca, but later returned. With the fall of Badakhshan to the Oezbeks under 'Abd Allah Khan in 983/1575, Sulayman Mirza and Shahrukh Mirza fled to India and joined Akbar's court. Shahrukh Mirza later became governor of Multāwā and distinguished himself in the Deccan campaigns before his death in 1016/1607. His son Badr al-Zamān Mirza instigated a brief insurrection in Badakhshan early in the 11th/17th century, which was quickly suppressed. Bibliography: For the general background to the Mīrzās in Gujūdarāt, see that article, its map, and its Bibl., especially M.S. Commissariat, History of Gujarat 1315-1615 (1938), M. Abdul Allīm, Akbar-nāma, especially the 11th, 12th, 13th and 17th regnal years; for Muzaffar Husayn Mīrzā and his later career, 22nd, 36th and 45th regnal years also; 'Abd al-Qadir Badāʿuni, Muntauḥāl al-tasawīrīḥ, and Niẓām al-Dīn Ahmad, Tababāt-āb Bakhir, passim, and indexes to both in the Bibl. Ind. editions. See also Bibl. to Akbar and moghul. History. For the Mīrzās of Badakhshan, see Bābur-nāma, ed. Beveridge, London-Leiden 1905, index, and Bibl. to Badakhshan. (J. BURTON-PAGE)

MISĀḤA, 'ĪLM AL-, the science of measurement, plane and solid geometry, is the name given by the Muslims to the science of comparing magnitudes and its methods. In the wider sense it covers the measurement of all things which can or need be measured, mainly lengths, areas, volumes, weights and numbers; in particular, however, the 'ilm al-misāḥa deals with geometry, with definitions of solids and geometrical figures as well as the laying down of rules for the calculation of lengths, areas and volumes of the different figures in elementary plane and solid geometry. The conception misāḥa therefore includes only a portion of what we call measurement in the wider sense, or practical or technical geometry (i.e. the measurement of things having length, breadth and volume); in particular, it excludes mensuration in the narrow sense, geodesy. The Arabs possessed special treatises dealing with the problems of geodesy. They therefore make the same distinction between theoretical and applied measurement, which had developed among the Greeks from the time of Aristotle and is most clearly expressed by Hero in his Metria and Dīoptra. The definitions given by the Muslims themselves of the conception misāḥa are very varied. Some authors give a very wide one (e.g. al-Umawi: "Measurement consists in ascertaining an unknown quantity by means of a known one. The result gives the amount of the unknown quantity in units of the quantity used for measuring"); most of them mean by it the measurement of lengths, area and volume. Al-Shīnahwī makes a clear distinction between direct measurement, "the test of coincidence" (tābih), and indirect measurement by calculating from certain formulae.

We find treatises on geometry throughout the whole period in which the Muslims acted as the transmitters of the ancient culture with which they had become acquainted, from the earliest beginnings of their literary activity at the beginning of the 9th century A.D. to the decline of Arab mathematics in about 1600. The purpose of such works was to give the future surveyor, architect or soldier the necessary equipment, the theoretical foundation for his profession. Three groups of these treatises can be distinguished according to their method of treatment:

(a) those which are quite like our modern collection of formulae, are made as brief as possible, give only the usual methods of calculation and contain no examples (e.g. that of Ibn al-Bannā');
(b) those which contain examples, completely worked out, illustrating the process of calculation (e.g. that of al-Baghjādī);
(c) those which only contain a series of fully worked out problems, and are a kind of book of exercises (e.g. that of Abū Bakr).

On the method of exposition in these works, it should be noted that we cannot of course speak of mathematical formulae in our sense of the word among the Arabs. They, especially the eastern Arabs, had no language of mathematical formulae; it was only late among the western Arabs, and probably only in the field of algebra, that a technical language was developed. The rules for measuring were always written out fully in words, sometimes even the figures occurring in the text.

The matter of the works on misāḥa, especially the larger ones, as a rule comprise introductory remarks, rules for calculating areas and volumes and the most important lengths found on them, and occasionally also practical exercises.

A. Introductory remarks. These are as a rule:
1. Definition of the term misāḥa.
2. Explanation, description and systematic classification of the geometrical figures to be discussed.
3. Definition and list of the most common units of measurement.
4. B. Rules for calculation.
1. Plane surfaces (and the lengths occurring on them).
2. Quadrilaterals (square, rectangle, rhomboid trapezium, trapezoid, quadrilateral with salient angle).
3. Triangles (equilateral, isosceles, scalene, right angled, acute-angled and obtuse-angled).
4. Polygons (regular, irregular, "drum-shaped figure" (mutababal), "hollow figure" (mufujawwi") "step-shaped figure" (mutardāg)).
5. "Drum-shaped" and "hollow" figures are formed by the combination of two congruent trapeziums in such a way that in the former the shorter, in the latter the longer parallel sides coincide; a number of varieties are distinguished. The step-shaped figure is formed by placing together a number of rectangles of the same length but different breadth, in which the proportions of the breadths form an arithmetical progression.
6. Circle, segments of a circle (semi-circle, segment, sector, circumference) and related areas (horseshoe or crescent [hilāf], egg-shape, bean- or lentil-shaped, or oval figures).
7. The crescent is formed by the subtraction of two segments of circles of different radius with a common chord, egg-shape and bean-shape by the addition of two congruous segments which in the egg-shape are less, in the bean-shape greater than the semi-circle.
The area of the oval (ellipse) is given by Savasorda as \(\pi(a + b)^2/4\).

II. Solids (and the areas, especially superficies, and lengths that occur on them).

1. Prism (ordinary straight and oblique prism, square column, rectangular column, dice, triangular prism, obliquely cut prism, corpus simile domui in Abū Bakr as translated by Gerard of Cremona).

2. Cylinder.

3. Pyramids (straight and oblique pyramids, sections of pyramids).

4. Cones (straight and oblique cone, section of cone).

5. Sphere and section of a sphere, hemisphere, segment, sector and zone.

6. Regular and semi-regular bodies (the five Platonic and two Archimedean are treated at any length only in al-Kāshi).

7. Other bodies, sc. cylindrical vault (ażādā and tikān; the only difference between them is the length), hollow dome (kuhbā), roof-shape (corpus simile caburi in Abū Bakr), wreaths and discus (hollow cylinder), and terrace-shaped figures.

C. Practical exercises.

These are, generally speaking, rare in works on misāḥa. We frequently find exercises in dividing fields mainly geometrical, geometrical and arithmetical. This has been used also in the form of measuring long after they obviously knew of their inaccuracy. Ibn Māmātī [q. v.] criticises the usual formula for the area of a triangle \(1/2 (a + b) 3/4 c\) and \(1/2 (a + b) 2/3 c\), al-Baghdādi the formula for a quadrilateral \(1/2 (a + c) 1/2 (b + d)\) which comes from the Egyptians.

The reasons for the long survival of such rules are partly that the formulae gave in practice quite useful results and partly that the practical men who were concerned with measurement in the exercise of their trade wanted values easy to calculate rather than great mathematical accuracy, and took no note of slight errors, especially if they thereby avoided calculations with roots. For similar reasons and in keeping with the traditional practice, almost all works of misāḥa give no scientific geometrical proofs of the accuracy of the formulae they quote. Only the book of the Jew Abraham Savasorda, who may be reckoned among the western Arabs, gives logically worked-out proofs in any number; we occasionally find references to early mathematicians (especially Euclid) in Ibn al-Bannāʾ and Ibn al-Hānbal. Probably inspection was quite sufficient ("Abāl-ʿAlī Azīz, for example, draws plane figures in a network of squares each of one unit and counts the squares and their parts within this area), or a simple demonstration in some form or a calculation to prove the correctness of the procedure, which was frequently illustrated also by examples completely worked out.

A further peculiarity of Arabic authors was to give formulae which agree completely in substance in different algebraical forms. The Berlin ms. no. 5954 gives, for example, for the calculation of the hypotenuse \(q\) in the right-angled triangle the following formulae: \(q = 1/2 [a + (c^2 - b^2)^{1/2}]\); \(a = 1/2 [a + (c + b) (c - b); a - 1/2 [a + (c + b) - c]^2 b^2 = 1/2\) and \((c^2 - b^2); a\). This differentiation was probably only intended to give as many forms as possible of the relations between the known and unknown magnitudes so as to afford the practical man a choice of different correct formulae, of which one might suit the special case better than another.

The sources of Arab geometry are to be sought among the Greeks and Hindus. The form and
The substance of the rules are almost entirely Greek, especially in the older authors. Hero’s ‘elaborations’, in particular, which in turn go back to Egypt, seem to have been the model for Arab works on geometry. To Egypt may be traced the prefacing of a metrological section (found in many books on misaba), the problems on dividing fields, the formula for the trapezoid, the special name for the upper side of a quadrilateral (raʾ al-ʿand). Hindu are the values for π in al-Khārazmi, the formula √a + b + d, for the quadrilateral inscribed in a circle, the terms are, perpendicular from the summit of an arc and chord, the marking of lengths in Hindu figures, the use of algebra to solve geometrical problems (equations, method of double error, combinatorial analysis). The chief teachers were, however, the Greeks, whose achievements the Arabs generally speaking never surpassed; the requirements of practical mensuration gave them no new problems, and practical geometry remained down to quite modern times elementary, the majority of the problems of which had been finally settled long ago by the Greeks.

The services of the Arabs to geometry lie less in the extension of the field by ascertaining new, hitherto passed; the requirements of practical mensuration achieved the Arabs generally speaking never surpassed; the requirements of practical mensuration gave them no new problems, and practical geometry remained down to quite modern times elementary, the majority of the problems of which had been finally settled long ago by the Greeks.

The services of the Arabs to geometry lie less in the extension of the field by ascertaining new, hitherto passed; the requirements of practical mensuration remained down to quite modern times elementary, the majority of the problems of which had been finally settled long ago by the Greeks.

Bibliography: a. I. Manuscripts; Arabic authors translated into Latin: 1. Liber in quo terrarum et corporum continentur mensurationes Ababuchri (author presumably Abū Bakr, d. 447/1055; cf. H. Suter, Die Mathematischen und Astronomischen Araber, etc., in Abh. der k. Ges. d. math. Wissenschaft., xlii; 1910, Heft 10, 1909, no. 224), Cambridge, Univ. Libr., Mm. ii. 18, fol. 69b-76a; 2. Librer Saiyid abuuthmi (author presumably Zayd Abū ʿUṯmān, d. 444/1052; Suter, no. 222); idem, fols. 76b-77a; 3. Liber ademari (author presumably ʿUmar al-Ḥadrami, d. 449/1057; Suter, no. 227), idem, fols. 77a-b.


MISĀḤA (a.), the measurement of plane surfaces, also in modern usage, survey, the technique of surveying. In this article, measures of length and area will be considered, those of capacity, volume and weight having been dealt with under MAKĀVĪ WA-MAWĀZIN. For the technique of surveying, see MISĀḤA, ʿILM AL-.

1. In the central Islamic lands. In pre-modern times, there were a bewildering array of measures for length and superficial area, often with the same name but differing locally in size and extent. As Lane despairingly noted, “Of the measures and weights used in Egypt I am not able to give an exact account; for, after diligent search, I have not succeeded in finding any two specimens of the same denomination perfectly agreeing with each other, and generally the difference has been very considerable” (The manners and customs of the modern Egyptians, Appx. “Egyptian weights and measures”). Measures of capacity and weight, being much more intensively used in everyday commercial transactions, tended to be more closely defined and regulated either by the governing authority or by the local market inspector or muwathth [see HISBA]; those of length and area were more the concern of the officials making cadastral surveys for taxation purposes [see kānin]. Il. Cadaster or else estimating the value of growing crops (al-mukdsama), especially for the type of tax collection involving a share-out of the crop (mukdsama) [see mawāzin].

(a) The basic measures of length related, as in many other cultures, to various parts of the body and positions of the limbs. An iṣba [q.f. ]“finger” was the breadth of the middle joint of the middle finger, conventionally 1/24 of the ḥirār [q.f. ] or cubit, itself originally the length of the arm from the elbow to the tip of the middle finger. The kābara “Baʿb’s width” was the breadth of the four fingers of one hand put together. The ḥirār “span” was the span of the hand, from the thumb to the little finger. The ḏīr or kāma was the width of the two arms outstretched, i.e. a fathom, canonically equal to four ḥirār. The kasaba, meaning of the rules are almost entirely Greek, especially in the older authors. Hero’s “elaborations”, in particular, which in turn go back to Egypt, seem to have been the model for Arab works on geometry. To Egypt may be traced the prefacing of a metrological section (found in many books on misaba), the problems on dividing fields, the formula for the trapezoid, the special name for the upper side of a quadrilateral (raʾ al-ʿand). Hindu are the values for π in al-Khārazmi, the formula √a + b + d, for the quadrilateral inscribed in a circle, the terms are, perpendicular from the summit of an arc and chord, the marking of lengths in Hindu figures, the use of algebra to solve geometrical problems (equations, method of double error, combinatorial analysis). The chief teachers were, however, the Greeks, whose achievements the Arabs generally speaking never surpassed; the requirements of practical mensuration gave them no new problems, and practical geometry remained down to quite modern times elementary, the majority of the problems of which had been finally settled long ago by the Greeks.

The services of the Arabs to geometry lie less in the extension of the field by ascertaining new, hitherto unknown facts (although in the misaba works we do find a series of new and novel rules) than in their extending the surveying science by calculation and teaching, and especially in their preserving the inheritance of the ancients and handing it down to the western world. Although Hero’s geometry first became known in north-western Europe through Roman surveyors, it was mainly the Arab sources which gave new life to this subject which had become stagnant in its old form. Arabic original works were first made accessible to the west in Latin translations. Leonardo of Pisa in his Practica geometria, which remained a standard work for three centuries, depended closely on Savasorda, who most probably owed a great deal to Abū Bakr since there are striking similarities between the Liber embadorum and the Liber mensurationis; down to late in the 16th century, we continually come across writings on practical geometry which in form and content show to what originals they go back.
“pole, shaft” equalled a number of dhrīps varying between five and eight, but giving an average length of four m. In the Persian lands, the gaz was the equivalent of the Arabic djarīb; in the 17th century, Chardin stated that the “royal” gaz, gaz-i ṣāḥī, was “trois pieds moins un pouce”, i.e. 94.745 cm., and it seems to have been on average 95 cm. In 1926, soon after Rūdā Shāh Pahlavi’s accession to the throne, an attempt was made to equate the traditional Persian measures with the metric system, so that the gaz was fixed at 1 m; and after 1933, the metric system was introduced, the older measures nevertheless remaining in popular use.

(b) The basic measure of area in earlier Islamic times was the djarīb, which, as well as being a measure of capacity for grain, etc., equal to four kafires [see MAKAYIL WA-MAWĀZĪN], became a measure of surface area, originally the amount of agricultural land which could be sown with a djarīb’s measure of seed. The extent of the djarīb of area varied widely. Canonically, it was made up of 100 kasabas, hence approx. 1,600 m². In Fārs, this was known as the “small djarīb”, the “large djarīb” being 5,837 m², but in later mediaeval times, the djarīb of the Persian lands was by the 11th/17th century reduced to 958 m². In modern Iran, since 1926, the djarīb has equalled one hectare, but in later times can still represent an area ranging from 400 m² to approx. 1,450 m². This reflects in part farming practice, a djarīb of unirrigated land being larger in area than one of irrigated land, since the amount of seed sown over a given area of irrigated land is greater than that sown over unirrigated land.

In Egypt, the standard measure of land has been the farddīn “yoke of oxen”, being defined by al-Kaikashandī [q. v.] (9th/15th century) as equaling 400 square kasabas, i.e. 6,368 m². The official reckoning of this measure decreased from the equivalent of 1,100 English acres to less than one acre (1 acre = 0.4046 hectare). Since 1830, the farddīn has corresponded to 4,200.833 m² (1,038 English acres).

In the Turkish lands of the Ottoman Empire, and the Arab lands of Ṭrāk, Syria and Palestine directly under Ottoman rule till 1918, the standard measure of area was the dönüm (“turn, turning”), Arabic dānum, the area which originally was considered to equal one day’s ploughing. In Turkey it equalled 393 m² (i.e. approx. 1,000 sq. yards), but the “new” (yeni) dönüm was in the 19th century equalised with the hectare; and in 1934 the metric system of weights and measures was officially adopted by the Turkish Republic. In Syria and Palestine in recent times, the dönüm is one of 1,000 m² = 0.247 acres, whilst in Ṭrāk a larger one of 2,500 m² is used, despite the official adoption in Ṭrāk of the metric system in 1931. In any case, in all these lands, the traditional measures have remained in daily use side-by-side with the newer metric ones. In Turkey it equalled 939 m², and in later times can still represent an area ranging from 400 m² to approx. 1,450 m². The official reckoning of this measure decreased from the equivalent of 1,100 English acres to less than one acre (1 acre = 0.4046 hectare).

2. Muslim India. (a) Measures of length. In traveller’s accounts, distances are frequently stated in “days”, marhala: “Fulānshahr is two days’ journey from Fulānānād.” The practical convenience of this method should not be underestimated; it remains in use at the present day for travellers in the high hills who may expect to find a shelter, stabling, water and possibly even minimal provisions at a convenient end of a day’s march, whose physical length may be very variable depending on the nature of the terrain to be crossed. The principle of the convenient day’s march has of course been a determining factor in the siting of sara’ās along major-routes [see MANZIL, SARA’ĀS, TARĪK; on the difficulties of interpretation, see especially S. H. Hodivala, Studies in Indo-Muslim history, i, Bombay 1939, comment on distances in al-Īṣṭaḵārī et alii, 30 ff.). Other travellers, including al-Birūnī, describe distances in terms of the parasang or farašk [q. v.], but since al-Birūnī uses the term to interpret information which he obviously received in terms of Hindū units of length, his figures are far from reliable (useful discussion in Hodivala, op. cit., 42-5). He and others occasionally use the word mīl, the Arab mile, which later becomes a source of confusion, as it may be used as a synonym of farašk: mīl rather than māhī persists in modern Indian languages for the English mile, possibly helped through Portuguese.

The Hindu unit of distance which misled al-Birūnī is the Skrt. yodāna “league”, a distance of four goruta “cow-roar”, the length at which a cow’s lowing can be heard, or krośa “the bow-root”. The yodāna, later djan, is the bow used by Muslim writers, but the krośa, later kōś (or the Persian cognate kārōs), becomes the standard term for describing distance. This has been differently reckoned at different periods and in different regions and, like the sēr and the mān [see MAKAYIL WA-MAWĀZĪN], has almost everywhere a distinction between a larger and a smaller measure, the pakkō kōś and the kaḷkō kōś.

New imperial standards were introduced in the hey-day of the Mughals with bewildering frequency, but the surviving records, and the references to foreign standards, allow a reasonably sure interpretation. These standards may be considered under the significant reigns.

1. Bābur (932-7/1526-30), in a mnemonic rhyme under the year 935/1528, establishes that the Indian lea, i.e. a measure of 100 “steps”, fāras, equal to 400 paccas, kādam, was thus of 4,000 paces, each being of one-and-a-half cubits, kāri; a cubit was of six handbreaths, tālam, each of four “hands”, ellig, each of six barleycorns, gaw. He refers to Čahātāy and Persian units, explaining that the kūrdh is equivalent to a mīl (Bābur-nāma, fol. 351a-b). The “hand” is evidently a digit in fact.

A thorough inquiry into the value of both digit and hand-breath was made by Col. J. A. Hodgson, Surveyor General of India, in 1843, measuring the hands of 76 men twice; the width at the knuckles (the root of the fingers) averaged 3.2287” (8.20 cm), and that across the mid-joint 3.078” (7.82 cm). These averages yielded finger widths of 0.8053” (in reality, 0.8077”) (205 cm) and 0.769” (1.95 cm) respectively (op. cit. in Bibl. 46 ff.). The former is probably correct (see below, 4 and 5), though he took the latter. He cited experiments by Halhed in 1824, whereby a digit of six barleycorns arranged breadthways was found to be 0.7766” (1.97 cm) (ibid., 49-50).

Bābur’s cubit, if we take the hand width at the knuckles, would be 19.37” (49.20 cm), the pace 29.06” (73.80 cm), the cable 96 10.3” (29.52 m), and the league 2990” (7.95 m).

2. Shēr Shāh (947-52/1540-45) and Humāyūn (937-47, 962-3/1530-40, 1555-6). Shēr Shāh fixed the kōś, or league, at 6 djarīb, each of 60 sekandari gaz; this gaz [q. v. in Suppl.], or cubit, had been introduced by
Sikandar Lodī (894-923/1489-1517), being reckoned at 41 ½ iskandanl sikandan (sc. ianka). This was a round billon coin struck in great numbers (Sikandar (br. Lodī struck in billion only), which continued in circulation well into Mughal times; its average diameter was 0.7 (1.78 cm); a half-tanka of 0.55 (1.40 cm) was also known, with quarter and eighth tankan known in small numbers. (H.N. Wright, Coinage and metrololgy of the sultans of Delhi, Delhi 1936, 250-4, 260-1). Humāyūn is reported to have replaced it with half an ianka (half the diameter of an iskandar, or the diameter of a half-tanka?) to the length of the gaz, bringing the number to 42. Thus Humāyūn’s cubit would be of 29.4 (74.67 cm). However, the remark in the A’īn-i Akbār, iii, 296, that this length was equivalent to 32 aγaγd (‘fingers’-breath’) would lead to an impossibly large aγaγd of 0.92 (2.34 cm); if, however, the diameter of the half-tanka (0.55) is taken, the aγaγd would be of only 0.72, too small (and in any case the half-tanka could not have been referred to as an iskandar). This unsatisfactory explanation must be attributed to an error on Abu ’l-Fadl’s part.

3. Akbar (963-1014/1556-1605). At his accession, three parallel systems were in use throughout Hindūstān. In each the cubit, gaz, was of 24 digits, tassāgū (Bddshdh-ndma, -i pddshdhi), but the latter were designated long, medium, or short (qūn, mdn, kšāv) according to whether their numbers equalled 7, 8, or 6 barleycorns placed breadthways. The first was used in surveying land, the second in building, and the third for furniture and soft goods (A’tn, iii, 294). They were thus related in principle to the dījārgal-šāriyya of 24 digits, which is occasionally referred to in India. The iskandar gaz was retained for agriculture and building, and an akbār-γaγh gaz of 46 angusht (Bddshdh-ndma, -i pddshdhi) was used for cloth (A’tn, iii, 296; cf. i, 170-1).

In the 19th year of the Divine Era (1575), Akbar had a new standard pole, γaγr,ib, made up of canes joined by iron rings. To obviate the moisture movement which made the hemp cable unreliable. On 22 Rabi‘ I 996/21 March 1588 he introduced his new standard gaz, to be known as the gaz-i ilahi, of 41 digits, to replace all others; this appears to have been 32 2/2 (83.36 cm), about the same as 41 of Hodgson’s larger digits. He then re-established the land measure, the tanāb, at 60 of these new gaz; the squared area was known as a bīgah (A’tn, iii, 296). Subsequently, however, the kurāb is defined as of 100 tanāb each of 50 ilahi gaz; the resulting 5,000 ilahi gaz could also be measured with 400 poles, bās, each of 1 1/2 gaz: it seems that a further revision had taken place (A’tn, iii, 297).

4. Djhānjīr (1014-37/1605-27) in turn revised the scale, making the ilahi gaz of 40 digits, and the gaz-i shar‘i of 24; he used the terms gaz and dir‘a (sic) interchangeably. In his memoirs he states that the kurāb used in his reign was the same as that of Akbar, and that like it, it was of 5,000 dir‘a (Tūzuk-i Dējājangirī, ii, 234). The gaz itself must therefore have remained unchanged. His purpose in altering the number of digits is clear in his practice of giving small measurements in aγaγd (sic), 296, that this length was equivalent to 32 aγaγd (‘fingers’-breath’) would lead to an impossibly large aγaγd of 0.92 (2.34 cm); if, however, the diameter of the half-tanka (0.55) is taken, the aγaγd would be of only 0.72, too small (and in any case the half-tanka could not have been referred to as an iskandar). This unsatisfactory explanation must be attributed to an error on Abu ’l-Fadl’s part.

Djānjīr’s reform can only be explained as an attempt to combine the advantage of a division into 40 units with Akbar’s, rather than Djhānjīr’s, digit. It may have been because the latter had proved larger than most fingers!

As well as the variations of the kōs to the smaller units within the Mughal heartland, provincial standards also varied. The kōs in use in Mālwā was of 90 tanāb of 60 gaz, according to the A’tn-i Akbār; in Yule and Burnell, Hobson-Jobson, London 1886, with Crooke’s additions of 1902, the estimated kōs in the Bengal Presidency was “about 2 miles, much less as you approach the N.W.,” in the upper [Ganges-Đhānna] Dō‘ab 1 1/4 miles, in Bundelkhand “nearly 3m or ... even 4”, in Madras 2 1/4, and a suhčāni kōs in Mysore “about 4 miles”. The terms tanāb and γaγr seems to have become interchangeable, although obviously more stable in terms of the gaz, variant to the gaz. The determination of the Mughal “imperial” gaz became a matter of concern to the British when their own revenue surveys were begun in the first quarter of the 19th century; results were so discrepant that an arbitrary value of 33 inches (= 83.82 cm) was assigned.

It should be noted that the term dhārā [q.v.] “cubit” is occasionally used, with no great precision, by Indian Muslim authors, either for the gaz or for the bath, lit. “hand”, the distance between the elbow and top of the middle finger, sometimes used as a cloth measure (Buchanan’s Eastern India, quoted in Hobson-Jobson, s.v. Haud); but the common cloth measure was the gaz in the form of an iron rod marked into
quaters. This implement was certainly still in use in Lucknow in 1955.

(b) Measure of an area. This was a square wooden frame (bighd) 7 to 8 ft. by iron rings—the former having lent itself too easily to fraud by being left out to collect the dew and therefore shrinking from 60 ft. to 51 ft. (as calculated above) 0.5427 acres = 0.2196 ha. (in the West it is 0.5042 acres = 0.2052 ha.). The misalla as calculated above) 0.5427 acres = 0.2196 ha. (in the West it is 0.5042 acres = 0.2052 ha.).


MISALLA (m., pl. misall, lit. "long needle", obelisk. The mediaeval Arab authors speak with awe of the wondrous two obelisks of *Ayn Shams* [q.v.], Helioptlis, the old Egyptian On. Al-Makrizi (*Khitat*, ed. G. Wiet, vol. iv, ch. lxvi, § 1, p. 89) gives the biblical name Ra'amasa, and Abu Dja'far al-Idrisi (*Annuâr wâla'tl-adîrâm fi 'I-luksh* 1895-96, p. 110). The smaller of the two, named Ra'amasa, for the ancient city which is occasionally (Ibn Duqmâk, *Intitûr*, v, 43 ult.) identified with the village al-Matâriyya. The two obelisks had formed part of the vast sun temple (*hakal al-shams*) already in ruins when the Arab conquerors arrived in Egypt. Different practical uses are introduced to use the obelisks: the early Muslim geographers Ibn Khurrahaddah (161, 11. 5-9) and Abu Râßid (80, ch. 9-13) speak of "columns" (*u'ammad*). Numerous later authors (Abû 'Ubayd al-Bakri, the Khadij, Abû Dja'far al-Idrisi, Yaqût, Ibn Sa'id al-Maghribî, al-Makrizi, Ibn Duqmâk and Abû Hâmîd al-Kudsî) simply denote them as "pillars" (*a'mida, *ammad*), whereas al-Mukaddasi (210; cf. A. Miquel, *L'Egypte vue par un géographe arabe*; *al-Muqaddasi*, in *AI*, xi [1922], 134), the Iranian traveller Nasîr-i Khusraw (in his description of his visit to the *bîldh al-Fawâs* in *Ayn al-Shams*) [!] (*Safar-ndma*, ed. Ch. Schefer, Paris 1880, 17, 142 f.), and Abû Hâmîd al-Andalusi (*Tabût al-albâh*, 161, 11. 5-9) and Ibn Râdîd (80, ch. 9-13) speak of "columns" (*u'ammad*). The popular designation, however, was, as we learn from Yaqût (*Bulûn*, ed. Beirut, iv, 179a), *masâll*/*masâllat* *Fawâs*.

When Abû al-Latîf al-Baghdâdi visited Helioptlis at the end of the 6th/12th century, one of the two mighty obelisks had already collapsed: "It was broken in two pieces by the fall, owing to its excessive weight. The copper which covered the top had been taken away" (cf. the Arabic text of *al-Ihûd wa 'l-I'tibâr*, as well as an English tr., in K. H. Zand and J. A. I.E. Vitean, *The Eastern Key*, London 1965, 126-9, for the French and German renderings of this famous description of the obelisks, which passed into later Arab compendia such as *Ishâr* b. *Ali*’s K. *Agâbâl al-balûdân* (see *Ishâr*, ch. 15, 95-6), see Silvestre de Sacy, *Relation de l'Egypte par Abd-al-allatîf médecin arabe de Bagdad*, Paris 1810, 181, and Else Reitemeyr, *Beschreibung Ägyptens im Mittelalter aus den geographischen Werken der Araber*, Leipzig 1903, 102-3). The exact date when this obelisk fell down is unclear. Abû Hâmîd al-Andalusi, who visited Egypt around 512/1118, also mentions only one obelisk, of which de Sacy (op. cit., 228), however, thought that it was this one which collapsed at a later time, i.e. between 1118
and ʿAbd al-Latif's visit around 1195. Certainly, the historian Muhammad b. Ibrahim al-Dzjarī (d. 739/1338 [cf. 739/1338?]) is not correct when dating this event as late as 6 Ramadān 656/6 September 1258 (see the interesting quotation from his unpublished chronicle Ḥuwādīth al-zamān, in Khiṭāt, §16, pp. 96-7; the report of this year in the Gotha autograph of Ḥuwādīth al-zamān is fragmentary, cf. U. Haarmann, Quellenstudien zur fruhmamlukenzeit, Freiburg 1969-70, 44). Perhaps de Sacy was correct (op. cit. loc. cit., 229) in his conjecture that the right year should be 556/1161, and that some scribal error could be responsible for this false chronology to be found also in later authors such as al-Nuwayrī (Nihāya, i, 394, l. 7).

The two obelisks of Heliopolis were unanonymously counted among the outstanding ʿadabīd of Egypt. Ābu Hāmid al-Kuḏsī (PS. Ibn Zahīra) names them as the key monuments of Heliopolis, the second item in his list of a total of twenty Egyptian miracles (al-Fadḍalī li-dhī-biha fi maḥāsin Mīṣ wa-l-Khūra, ed. M. al-Sakhkā and K. al-Muhandhis, Cairo 1969, 150; the text is taken from Yākūṭ, loc. cit., who again quotes al-Ḥasan b. Ibrahimī al-Miṣrī). Their fame is founded not only on their awesome dimensions and weight, but also on the perfect craftsmanship on an exception- al tumohirāt, Khiṭat, § 26, p. 99, 11. 5-9). In the context of the two obelisks of Heliopolis, Ābu Lṭafī and al-Maghrībī, al-Nuḏjam al-zāhīra fi ṭalā hadrat al-Khiṭāra, ed. Husayn Nasāṣ, Cairo 1970, in a special book on Heliopolis—the K. Ladhdhat al-lams fi ṭalā kūrat Ayn Aṣṣān, quoted also by Ibn Dukmak, Intisār, v, 44, l. 1—we read wrongly of this statue as standing between the two obelisks!, cf. 375, l. 2). Particular fascination was caused by the precious copper caps of the two needles, for which various Arabic terms (1) καλανσους沃 “hood”, see ‘Ābu al-Lṭafī and Shāfī b. ʿAlī, (2) saumwār “[monk’s] cell”, see al-Kuḏāli and Yākūṭ and their respective followers al-Kalkhasndi, Shābī, iii, 325, l. 4; al-Makrīzī, Khiṭāt, § 20, p. 97; Ibn Saʿīd, al-Nuḏjam al-zāhīra, 375; Ābu Hāmid al-Kuḏāli, Faddlūl, 150; and (3) taqī “collar”, see Ibn Khurraḍāḏībīhī, Ibn Rusta and Abī ʿUbayd al-Bakrī) are used. ‘Ābu Lṭafī al-Lṭafī speaks with the exactitude of the scient- list about the effect which verdigris had on the copper of this cap. Several authors, among them also Nāṣīr-i Khusraw, who visited Heliopolis in the time of the Fatimid caliph al-Mustanziṣr (as in the mid-5th/11th century), mention the moisture from condensation that could be observed flowing constantly, in all seasons, from beneath the copper top of the obelisk and caus- ing moss and other vegetation to grow miraculously high above the soil on the barren granite of the monu- ment (cf. esp. Ābu Hāmid al-Andalusī’s Ṭuhfā, as well as the French and German translations of his remarks by Beurdeley in Les monuments de l’Égypte au XXI siècle d’après Ābu Hāmid al-Andalusī, in Mélanges Mstoura, iii, Cairo 1935-40 [MIFAO, iii], 61, and G. Jacob, Studien in arabischen Geographen, iii, Berlin 1892, 86-7). Al-Kuḏāli, as well as Yākūṭ, Ibn Saʿīd al-Maghrībī, and al-Kalkhasndi, speak of a connection between the annual rise of the Nile and the flow of moisture from the obelisk. The value of the copper found both on top of, and inside, the fallen obelisk was enormous, al-Dzjarī, and following him both al-Makrīzī and Ābu Hāmid al-Kuḏāli (Faddlūl, 151, l. 2-3), mention a figure of 10,000 dinārū.

Since the living tradition of Pharaonic Egypt had forever ceased in Islamic times, the function of the obelisks—as well as the identity of those who erected them—was free for an intrinsically Islamic or a fan- tastic interpretation. Ibn Khurráḍāḏībīhī names the legendary Iranian king Ḥūṣayn as their builder (161; see al-Khiṭāt, § 26, p. 99, ll. 5-9). In the apocryphal Hermetic history of al-Wasīfī/Ibn Waṣīf Shāhī, Alḥākār al-zamān, the “two pillars” of Helio- polis are the work of the postdiluvian Pharaoh Mīnakwās (ed. ‘A. al-Sāwī, ‘Ibrīr 1980, 200, ll. 11-13; see also Khiṭāt, § 11, p. 93), who is said to have inscribed the date of their erection into the stone. Ibn Saʿīd al-Maghrībī (op. cit. loc. cit., 376, ll. 3-5) mentions the Amālekt al-Rayānb b. al-Walīd b. Dīmāq, Joseph’s Pharaoh, as their builder. Al-Mukaddasī (211), one of our earliest witnesses in Islamic times, surmises, on the basis of a book on talismans, that the obelisks served an apotropaic function against the crocodiles, still a menace at the time of their con- struction.

The less conspicuous obelisks on Egyptian soil are also mentioned here and there in the medievial Islamic sources. In the context of the two obelisks of Heliopolis, ‘Ābu al-Lṭafī al-Baghādādī (and those following him) mention the two needles of Cleopatra in Alexandria (now on the Embankment of the River Thames in London and in Central Park, New York) as being considerably bigger than the numerous small obelisks on Egyptian soil, yet as being inferior in size to the two big ones. That these two Alexandrian obelisks had originally also stood in Heliopolis, and had been transferred to the Ptolemaic capital only in Roman times, was evidently unknown to the medievial Islamic authors.

There is also a brief reference to the unfinished obelisk in the quarry of Aswān. In the anonymous Berlin manuscript 8503 (Petermann, i, 684, no. 12, fol. 13a, written after 814/1411), the author states that he himself found in the “mountain of Assuan” this pillar, all designed and carved (ωυ-καδ χάνδακα δω-νακρία), yet not yet separated from the rock; what its destination was to be remained unknown, he adds. A few monuments are mentioned in direct connection with the obelisks of ‘Ayn Shams, such as the large statue of Isis in Fustāt, called either the “lady” (al-ṣayyida) (see al-Harawi, al-Īṣāṣī tā mawṣīfat al-ziyārat, ed. J. Sourdel-Thomine, Damascus 1953, 40, ll. 14-15) or the laundry-woman of Pharaoh’s kin (al-ğṣāṣāl lāl-l-Fīṣira)n (al-Mukaddasī, 211), or the idol of firm white limestone, allegedly depriving him who saw it of his office, which was therefore destroyed by Ahmad b. Tālin in 258/871-2 (Ibn al-Dāyā, al-Sira al-Ṭamūna, quoted by al-Makrīzī in his Khiṭāt, § 23, p. 98).

Bibliography: Besides the works mentioned in the text, see the titles given by J. Maspéro and G. Wiet, Matériaux pour servir à la géographie de l’Égypte, Cairo 1919, 131-2; Wiet in his ed. of Makrīzī’s Khiṭāt, iv, ch. 66, § 15, p. 96, n. 2; idem, L’ÉgYPTE de Mourtada fils du Coptophile. Introduction, traduction, et notes, Paris 1953, 97 (les merveilles d’Alexandrie). (U. Haarmann)

MISʿAR B. MUḤALĪH [SEE ABŪ DULĀF], MISBAH [SEE SIRĀQ], MISBAHA [SEE SUBHA], MISHMISH [A., more rarely muṣmugh, in the Maghribi muṣmūḥa], a masc. sing. noun with a collective meaning (singulative muṣmīgha), the apricot- tree and its fruit (Praucus amurensis), of the Rosaceae family, and corresponding to Persian zardūdi, zardūdī and Turkish kavūs. It was for long considered as indigenous to Armenia (whence its scientific name), but in fact has been cultivated in China for about two millennia before our era and reached the Mediterranean region of the West.
in the historical ages of Athens and Rome via India, Persia, Iraq and Turkey. In Greece, Italy, North Africa and Spain it was soon acclimatised under the name of “Armenian apple” (σαμένιον μήλον, armeniacum malum) and “golden apple” (χρυσόμηλον, chrysoleum), this last appellation being given also to the quince (ṣafarjal). Nevertheless, in Greece it was more commonly called by the adjective “early” (αρχαίον, praceon), since it is one of the first of the juicy fruits (falsa, pl. fawdik) to ripen in the spring; and it was from this Greek-Latin denomination that Arabic derived bārık which, according to region, is also applied to the plum (ṣafarjal, ‘ain al-bakar). This loan-word al-bārık yields in Kabyle (yields in Kabyle) to Syria and, above all, to Egypt (Kastamuniya). and Kastamonu (Antioch) also applied to the plum whence they are singled out as a speciality of the towns variety), then at Isfahan and finally, in Anatolia which, according to region, is which, according to region, is aubercot, Old Fr. (rubecot, Eng. apricot, Ger. Aprikose. Mozarabic albericoque and in Catalan abercó, whence Old Fr. aurébert (12th century) and then modern Fr. abricot, Eng. apricot, Ger. Aprikose. As early as the high Middle Ages, the Islamic lands which cultivated the apricot distinguished two categories of this fruit: on one hand, the varieties the kernel of whose stone was sweet and edible (mishmih lauzi) and on the other, those where it was bitter (mishmih klidi). In the first category, by far the most sought-after and best-known variety was that called kamar al-dīn (“moon of religion”) and kaws, which had hard juicy fruits perfectly suited for drying. In the 8th century the Arabs crossed the Mediterranean by boat (v. g. v.) on several occasions vaunts their excellence. He first tasted them at Hamāt in Syria (the hamā'ui variety), then at Isfahān and finally, in Anatolia where they are singled out as a speciality of the towns of Konya (Kumya), Antalia (Antalya) and Kastamonu (Kastamuniya). After drying, these fruits were exported to Syria and, above all, to Egypt (Rūbā, i, 142, ii, 44, 238, 281, 336, try. Gibb, i, 91, ii, 295, 416 with arrows). As foodstuffs, these dried apricots offered several advantages since, as well as keeping well, they also produced, after maceration in water (nakbat) overnight, a refreshing and sweet-smelling drink and a tasty side-dish. It would be impossible to enumerate the many dainties (halawiyat), including pastries, confections of sugar, sweets and syrups, in whose composition apricots were used. In connection with dishes of cooked meat, Arabic works on the culinary art mention two recipes for stews involving apricots (mushmushiyat; see M. Rodinson, Recherches sur les documents arabes relatifs à la cuisine, in REI [1949], 131-8). Finally, in the pharmacopoeia, the sweet or bitter kernel of the stone of the apricot yielded an “oil” (dahn tabb na'ud al-mishmih) beneficial for the treatment of haemorrhoids, anal tumours and dysentery (see Ibn al-Baytār-Leclerc, Traité des simples, Paris 1877-83, ii, 929). In the Middle East at the present day, among the numerous varieties of apricots obtained by grafting, one sees always in the markets the hamā'ui and the mishmih lauzi, whose name has become by abbreviations mishlauz. Also to be found, according to region, are the basūs, the ṣafarjal, the bārık and the ‘awjam, all with a sweet kernel (see E. Ghaleb, al-Mawṣa’a fi ’ilm al-tabba, Beirut 1945, v. mishmih). In Syria, the name of mushmush barri is given to the arbutus (Arbutus unedo) regarded as a kind of wild apricot because of the reddish tinge of its fruits; and, in botany, modern Arabic calls mishmih Amīrīkha the Mammea or Santo Domingo apricot (Mammea americana) and mishmih al-Yāḥūb “apricot of Japan” (the Kaki, Diospyros kaki). Bibilography: Given in article. (F. Vire) MISK (\.misk, the gland secretion of the male musk deer (Moschus moschifrons L., Cervidae), discharged from the musk pouch (Moschus in ceticis), the preputial bag-like formation near the navel of small deer resembling toses or gazelles. According to a tradition, “musk is the best and strongest smelling perfume” (Wensinski, Concordance, vi, 224a, 10-11; idem, Handbook, 184b). In antiquity, musk was not known. In Byzantium, it turns up in the 6th century (Cosmas Indicopleustes). Al-Mas'ūdī (Murādī, ed. and tr. Pellat, §§ 391, 392, 407, 434, 902), also quoted by Ibn al-Baytār (see Bibli.) after Ibn Wafid, reports on the homeland and extraction of this highly appreciated perfume. According to him, the “musk gazelle” (qanāl, saby) lives in a region belonging partly to Tibet, partly to China. For two reasons, the Tibetan musk is of higher quality than the Chinese one: firstly because the gazelles in Tibet graze the fragrant spikenard (tumbul, not lavender, Pellat § 391), whereas in China, other herbs; secondly, because the Tibetans leave the musk pouch as it is, while the Chinese take the secretion out of the pouches and add blood, or tamper with it in another way. Besides, the Chinese musk loses part of its quality because of humidity and climatic changes on the long sea journey from China to Near East. In Tibet, the musk gazelles are caught in nets, or killed with arrows. In size, colour and form of the horns, the animals resemble the Arabic gazelle. If the pouch is cut off before the secretion is discharged, the Tibetan musk is treated as an unpleasant smell which, after some time, under the influence of the air, takes on the real musk scent. The best musk is obtained when the secretion ripens completely inside the pouch. In this case, the animal senses a strong itching, from which it frees itself by grating against stones until the pouch bursts open and the contents come out. The Tibetans then go to look for the egg-sized secretions which has dropped up into the air, put it in the musk pouch and take it to their princes. This high-quality musk is reserved for princes, who give it to each other as a present. Others authors essentially affirm al-Mas'ūdī's report, adding further data about the lands of origin. As such, India is mentioned, above all the kingdom of Mūqqa (perhaps Arakan, the coastal region of Western Burma), and also Further India, Ceylon and Java. From Central Asia, the musk came into the Islamic lands by the great caravan routes, and from East and South Asia by way of the sea, through the ports of Dārin (al-Bahrayn) and Aiden. Even in far-away Spain, musk was the most important perfume (al-Mas'ūdī, Murādī, § 407). The most detailed report on musk is given by al-Nuwayrī (see Bibli.). His main source is the Kitāb al-‘urūb of al-Tamīmī, but he also quotes al-Ya'qūbī, Mūqqa b. Abūbās al-Miski, al-Husayn b. Yazīd al-Sirāfī and Yūhannā b. Māsawawī, who give more accurate data about the places of origin, the transportation and the entrepôts, as well as about the various qualities of the musk. Musk was very often tampered with, as may be seen from the substitutes quoted by al-Kinādi (or one of his pupils) in his Kitāb fi Kūnā’ al-‘ir wa ‘l-tas‘īdūl and the list thereof composed by the editor K. Garbers (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Monselandes, xxx, Leipzig 1948, 272-4). Musk also played an important role in medicine. According to Arab physicians, musk intensifies and stimulates the senses, and dispels trouble and affliction. This is in line with the fact that musk, destined by nature to attract the female animal, with human beings has the effect of an aphrodisiac (H. Schindler and H. Frank, Tiere in Pharmazie und Medizin, Stuttgart 1961, 288-92). It further strengthens the brains and eyes, is good for heart palpitation, is an antidote against venomous stings, against the deadly alkaloid
of aconite and against ergot (kurun al-sunbut), secale cornutum).


MISKAWAYH, philosopher and historian who wrote in Arabic, born in Rayy around 320/932. His full name was Abū ʿAli Ahmad b. Muhammad b. Yaʿqūb, which seems to refute Yākūt, who describes him as “Mazdacedan converted to Islam”, whereas it was probably one of his ancestors who was converted. Miskawayh (Miskoye/Mushkoye), and not Ibn Miskawayh as he is commonly designated, performed the central importance he attached to ethics. In his Treatise on ethics (Tadhkira al-abhakh wa-tathir al-ʾarūk, ed. C. Zurayk, Beirut 1967, Fr. tr. M. Arkoun, 2nd ed. Damascus 1988), he pleaded with conviction for the organising of philosophical education around and beginning with ethics. In fact, this work compels recognition in Arabic literature as the most didactic, the fullest and most open to the Greek, Iranian, Arab, Muslim traditions, which Miskawayh knew perfectly, as is confirmed by his anthology al-ʾHikma al-ḫâlidīa “The eternal wisdom” (ed. A. Badawi, Cairo 1952) or Dīmūsamād al-qarāwī (q.v. in Suppl.). Al-Ǧazāʾirī was largely inspired by it in his Misān al-ʾumal wa Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī (d. 672/1274) summarised it in Persian in his Aḥkām-i Naṣīrī, as did al-Dawwānī or al-Dawānī (d. 908/1502) in his Aḥkām-i Ṭabābī. Nearer our own time, Abū Ahmad Samīʿ al-Ṭabāb used it much as al-Ǧazāʾirī did in his teaching. We will also remark that no equivalent treatise was composed in Arabic until our own age. This is explained by the abandonment of the philosophical perspective in Arabic thought after Ibn Ruqdū (the ʿIṣrāʾi line followed by the ʿṢūrī thinkers did not respect the classical philosophical attitude as much as the falsāfīs did).

In order to better appreciate the contribution and originality of Miskawayh, we must set his activity within the particularly brilliant intellectual generation who worked in Būyid Persia and ʿIrāk from 350 to about 430/961-1039. We know the life-like and interesting portrait that al-Tawhīdī has left us of this generation; Būyīd princes, viziers and intellectuals of all schools and all conditions were participating in the liveliness of a cultural and intellectual life which in many of its aspects contributed to the humanism of the Renaissance in the West (see J.L. Kraemer, Humanism in the renaissance of Islam. The cultural revival during the Būyīd age, Leiden 1986). The salient fact is the emergence of a philosophical adab; one reads a large number of works composed directly in Arabic in addition to the major texts translated from Greek and Syriac. The reader is less delayed by philosophical and technical analyses; the abstract themes of metaphysics are less deeply explored, but by contrast, there is a larger number of didactic, popularly accessible accounts on the practical problems of the search for supreme happiness, the administration of the city, domestic economy, the education of children, the struggle against sadness, spiritual medicine and preparation for death. In an exchange of questions (al-Ḥawāmī) and answers (al-Shawāmī), Miskawayh and al-Tawhīdī demonstrate the diversity and extent of the horizons of knowledge, always cultivated in a philosophical setting. Recourse to an autonomous reason, the mistress of categories, concepts and methods for establishing the profound realities (al-ʾaṣbāḥ al-ulam), contrasts with religious reason, subject to revealed evidence, in the religious sciences. The “humanists” extol autonomous reason for going beyond blind passions and partisan struggles which split the numerous confessional groups. Miskawayh led the struggle with the constancy and serenity of the sage. His privileged position in the rich library of Abu
In a consistently very didactic style, he is equally interested in three main metaphysical questions in a more modest work than the Tahābīd, his al-Fauz al-arghor, ed. Sālhā'Udayma, Fr. tr. R. Arnaldez, Tunis 1987, demonstrating the existence of God; the soul and its states; and the prophets. In some still briefer epistles, he deals with the intellect and the soul (ed. Arkoun, in BEO, Damascus 1961-2), the intellect and the intelligible (ed. Arkoun, in Arabicia, 1964/1), and justice (ed. M.S. Khan, Leiden 1964).

The global vision held by Miskawayh is that of the Nicomachean ethics linked with the Psychology of Plato, the ideas of Galen on the relationship between psychology and physiology, and by Bryson on domestic economy and the education of children. Psychosomatic considerations, cosmology, the theory of climates and alchemy all supply an arsenal of arguments whose articulation leads to this unity (al-wahda) which inspired all the sages nourished on Greek science, Persian adab and monotheistic religious sensitivity.

The pictures of virtues and vices that he gives in his Tahābīd al-akhldk brings together in a systematic form the cardinal virtues (wisdom, temperance, courage and justice) defined as the just means achieved by philosophical knowledge and the ethical philosophy of Miskawayh, Aligarh 1964; M. Izzat, Ibn Miskawayh: falsafatuh al-akhldkiyya wa-maṣādiruhd, Cairo 1946; M. Arkoun, Deux épitres de Miskawayh, ed. in BEO Dama (1961); idem, Contribution à l'étude de l'humanisme arabe au IV/10e siècle: Miskawayh philosophe et historien, 2, Paris 1982; F. Rosenthal, A history of Muslim historiography, Leiden 1968, 1969; J.L. Kraemer, The meaning of Islam: idem, Philosophy in the renaissance of Islam, Aba Sulaimān al-Sijistāni and his circle, Leiden 1986.

MISKIN (א), pl. masakin, miskinin, ‘poor, destitute’. The word is an ancient Semitic one. In Akkadian, maskenu/maskešu are apparently in the first place designated a social class between the full citizens and the slaves, and thence acquired the sense of ‘poor, destitute’ (see E.A. Speiser, The maskešu, in Orientalia, N.S. xxvii [1958], 19-28; Chicago Akkadian dictionary, Letter M, Part ii, 272-6; Von Soden, Akkadisches Worterbuch, ii, 8641; idem, Msknnun and the Muššuš of the frühen Islam, in ZA, N.F. xxi [1964], 133-41). In the latter sense, it appears in Aramaic as meskina and in OT Hebrew as miskin. In Epigraphic South Arabian, we find miskindy, e.g. in a funerary inscription, apparently here denoting an inferior class not to be buried in the same tomb as the tomb’s more aristocratic owner (see J. Walker, A South Arabian inscription in the Baroda State Museum, in Le Musion, lxx [1946], 159-62, and G. Ryckman’s Note additionelle, 162-3). As also with the Etiopic form meskin, the word must have passed into Classical Arabic from the Aramaic, according to Fraenkel (cf. Jeffery, The foreign vocabulary of the Qur’an, 264-5; A. Hebbo, Die fremdwörter in der arabischen Prophetien-biographie des Ibn Hijismn (gest. 218/834), Frankfurt 1984, 340-3). Here, on analogy with the intensive adjective mišīf form, miskin is usually of common gender (cf. Wright, Grammar, 190), but the feminine miskinā is found with the sound pl. miskināt. In the Arabic of recent times, it has the connotation of ‘wretched, miserable’, e.g. see Spiro, 567, and Hinds and Badawi, 823, for Egyptian colloquial, and Barthélémy, 350, for Syrian, passing into Italian as meschina and into French as mesquin ‘mean, shabby, stingy’.

In the Kur’an, it is very frequent, with the abstract maskūna ‘poverty, indigence’, appearing in II, 58, III, 108, and is often found in lists of the classes whose support was due for the Muslims in sūra IX, 60, it is found alongside of ēkbara, commentators and jurists have felt that some distinction must be made between the two. They usually explain miskin as
MISKIN — MISKIN AL-DARIMI

needy, but not absolutely without possessions like the fukard, and refer to sura XVIII, ... xi, 126-32; Baghdad!, Khizdnd, Bulak, i, 465-70, ii, 116-17 = Cairo, iii, 57-75, iv, 74-6. The editors of the fukard, them. How uncertain this is, however evident from in most needy; cf. also the quotations from hadith of XC, 16, does not help us. Cairo 1383/1963, ii, 385-6, and the definitions collected in Lane, Lexicon, i, 1395. The miskin dīla matrabah of XC, 16, does not help us. From the meaning “poor”, gradually developed that of “base, miserable”, also in the moral sense, cf. e.g. Ibn Sa‘īd, i, ii, 6 ult. where Abī Sufyān’s wife Hind is called al-Miskina. On the other hand, the word can mean “able” as in the words attributed to Muhammad: “Let me live as a miskin and die as a miskin and include me among the miskinīn.

In modern South Arabia, e.g. in Hadramawt [q.v. in Suppl.], the term miskin denotes the top layer of the population subject to the tribesmen, comprising the petty traders and artisans, constituting the layer above the du‘āfī (sing. du‘āf), who are not physically weak but are non-arms bearing, comprising builders, potters and field workers. Here, then, miskin seems not to convey the idea of “poor, wretched”, but to be connected with the root se-k-n “to settle” (in modern South Arabian, sāk ‘n “camp, village”, cf. Landberg, Glossaire datinois, iii, 1958). See R.B. Serjeant, South Arabian poetry. I. Prose and poetry from Hadramawt, London 1951, 27 ff., 47; idem, South Arabia, in C.A.O. van Nieuwenhuijze, ed., Commoners, climbers and notables, Leiden 1977, 230 ff.; idem, Studies on Arabian history and civilisation, London 1981, IX. It is further interesting that the term miskin turns up again in ‘Irāk Kurdistan, where in e.g. the Kirkuk and Bulaymānīyā regions it denotes villagers who do not claim tribal origin, a class of lowly social status and often oppressed by tribal neighbours; see C.J. Edmonds, Kurds, Turks and Arabs, London 1957, 12, 14.

Bibliography: Given in the article, and see also, for hadith citations, Wensinck, Concordantia, vi, 225-7. (R.E. Bosworth)

MISKIN AL-DARIMI, the sobriquet and nisba of a poet from Tamīm of ‘Irāk, whose real name was Rāfī‘ b. ‘Amir b. Unayf b. Shurayb ... dārīm (see his genealogy in Ibn al-Kalbi-Caskel, Djamhara, Tab. 60, and Register, ii, 409) and who lived in the 1st/7th century (Yākūt, ‘Ubda‘a, xi, 132, fixes the date of his death in 89/708).

The biographical notices which concern him tell us that he was very dark, handsome, courageous, and eloquent, but they give little information about his family and his offspring (he is said to have had a son called ‘Uthra or ‘Uthbā but Ibn Kutayba, Shīr, Cairo ed. i, 530, states that he left behind no progeny, nor does Ibn al-Kalbi ascribe any to him). They continue mainly with some items of information about the origin of his sobriquet, on his clashes with al-Farazdak, which the grammarians explain but criticise. The poetic work of Miskin al-Darimī does not seem to have been collected together in the mediaeval period. Ḥāǧīm al-Ta‘ṣān is said to have collected together the remaining verses in a Dīwān published in Baghdād, but the author of this article has not seen this; he has however been able to consult a Dīwān of 55 fragments gathered together by ʿAbd Allāh al-Dībūrī and Khālīl I. al-Atiyāyya and printed at Baghdad in 1309/170. These surviving fragments reveal in Miskin a poet of the classical type endowed with sufficient talent to arouse disquiet in al-Farazdak; they show him as generous, proud and inclined, like so many others, to personal glorification, but somewhat moralising (a verse in the rhyme ar and the mutakārīb metre, given in the Dīwān, no. 36, and also in Aghānī, xx, 170, is said to be the best ever composed on the topic of jealousy). A poem in which several of the ancient poets are passed in review and their places of birth and burial indicated, with the aim of mourning their passing (rhyme s‘ū metre twalī, Dīwan, no. 41; al-Baghdādi, lishān, Bolāk, ii, 116-17 = Cairo, iv, 74-6), develops a fairly frequent theme (see Mārkhīya), but is probably not written by him.

Bibliography: The main biographies are in Aghānī, ed. Beirut, xx, 167-78; Murtadā, Amūli, 1907 ed. 159-33; Ibn al-Kalbi, Akhīr, Tab., i, 169-300-3; Yākūt, Irshād, iv, 200-4 = ‘Ubda‘a, xi, 126-32; Baghdādī, Bolāk, i, 465-70, ii, 116-17 = Cairo, iii, 57-75, iv, 74-6. The editors of the
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Diwan have gone through a large number of works; one may note Djahiz, Baydn, index; idem, Hayawdn, index; idem, 3. Basärän, index; Buburtü, Hamast, index; Naka'd Dİarır u 'l-Fanakud, ed. Bevan, index; Ibn Kutayba, Şirör, 347-8 = Cairo, i, 529-30; Masüd, Murâd, ed. Pellat, index s.v. Rabâb; Ibn Sallâm, Tabakâb, 259, 261; Dî, Zayyân, Ta'rîh al-üdâd, i, 448; Zirîkî, A'lam, i, 318; ZDâM, liv (1900), 448 ff.; see also Marzûk b. Tûnî, al-Tasannîf fi l-ghayra fi shi'r Miskin al-Darîmî, in al-Dâr, viii/3 (1408/1987, 69-97.) (Ch. Pellat)

MISR, Egypt

A. The eponym of Egypt

B. The early Islamic settlements developing out of the armed camps and the metropolises of the conquered provinces

C. The land of Egypt: the name in early Islamic times

1. Misr as the capital of Egypt: the name in early Islamic times

2. The historical development of the capital of Egypt

   i. The first three centuries. [see AL-FUSTâR]

   ii. The Nile banks, the island of Rawda and the adjacent settlement of Dijza (Giza)

   iii. The Fâtîmid city, Misr al-Kâhirâ, and the development of Cairo till the end of the 18th century

   iv. The Citadel and post-Fâtîmid Cairo

   v. Monuments. [see AL-KÄHIRA]

   vi. The city from 1798 till the present day. [see Suppl.]

D. History of the Islamic province and modern state of Egypt

1. The Byzantine background, the Arab conquest and the Umayyad period 602-750

2. From the 'Abbâsîd to the Fâtîmid period 750-969

3. The Fâtîmid period 969-1171

4. The Ayyûbid period 1171-1250

5. The Mamlûk period 1250-1517

6. The Ottoman period 1517-1798

7. The early modern period 1798-1882

8. The British Protectorate and the end of the monarchy 1882-1952. [see Suppl.]


A. As a proper noun in Arabic, diphthong in inflexion and masculine in gender, Misr denotes the eponym of Egypt, the ancestor of the Berbers and the land of Egypt after the Deluge. [see Suppl.]

B. As an Arabic common noun, tripthong and feminine in gender, Misr further denotes the land of Egypt, the ancestor of the Berbers and the land of Egypt after the Deluge. [q.v.]

C. As a proper noun in Arabic, diphthong in inflexion and masculine in gender, Misr denotes the eponym of Egypt, the ancestor of the Berbers and the land of Egypt after the Deluge. [see Suppl.]

D. History of the Islamic province and modern state of Egypt

1. Misr as the capital of Egypt: the name in early Islamic times

   a. In accordance with the Biblical genealogy of Egypt, the ancestor of the Berbers and the land of Egypt, the ancestor of the Berbers and the land of Egypt after the Deluge. [see Suppl.]

   b. There exists, however, also quite a different source of the name Misr, which appears clearly in the form Misra'im or Misram (cf. Kitâb Akhbâr al-duwal, p. 131/1893-4, 4; Z. B. Weiss, 'L'Égypte de Murtadi', Paris 1933, p. 16, § 806; Ibn Khurradadhbih, i, 217; Ya'qûbî, Ta'rîkîh, i, 210; Mas'ûdî, Murâd, al-dâghah, ii, 394 = § 806; Ibn Khurra'dadhbih, 80; Ibn al-Athîr, i, 58; Suyûtî, Haun al-muhâbbara, Bulâk, 15; Muhammad 'Abd al-Mu'tî al-Manûfi, Kitâb 'Arba'ab al-duwal, Cairo 1311/1893-4, 4; G. Wiet, 'L'Égypte de Murtadi', Paris 1933, 16, § 806; (A. J. Wessingh)

   c. As an Arabic common noun, tripthong and feminine in gender, pl. ansâr, misr denotes in earliest Islam, the settlements developing out of the armed encampments established by the Arabs in the conquered provinces outside Arabia and then, subsequently, the capital towns or metropolises of the conquered provinces (e.g. in the tradition of Abû Dâjdîd, Djihâd, b. 28, "the ansâr will be conquered at your hands"; but furthermore, in hâdîth, any town may be called a misr, e.g. in al-Bukhârî, Dhaâbâh, b. 2, Adâhî, b. bîb, 15, 'I'dâm, b. bîb, 25, and in al-Tîrîmdhî, Nikâh, b. bîb, 32, etc.). The word is of ancient Semitic origin; in Akkadian, the noun misrû denotes "frontier, frontier marker, territory", whence magâzitu "watch, guard, guard-house, defence" verb muṣsrû "to fix a border" (W. van Soden, Akkadisches Handwörterbuch, ii, 619-21, 659; Chicago Assyrian dictionary, letter M, Pt. I, 333-44, Pt. II, 113-15, 245); in Jewish Aramaic, misr, mesràn denotes a house or field as an exactly delineated and demarcated territory (J. Levy, Chaldaïsches Wörterbuch, idem, Neuhochdeutsches-lautmedusches Wörterbuch, s.v.).

   d. The classical dictionaries (e.g. L. v. 23-4) give the meaning of misr as a frontier outpost and border (hadid) and as something which separates two regions, like Basra and Rakka; the classical Arabic geographers (e.g. Ibn al-Fakhrî and al-Mu'addâsî) stress its more developed usage as a large urban centre where a ruler or governor resides and which has located there the administrative organs, treasury, etc., of its province. Al-Mukaddasi (13, tr. A. M. Miquel, La meilleure répartition..., Damascus 1963, 122, § 92) has the metaphor of a hierarchy of administrative units, in descending order, with the misr as the maltik or king, followed by the lâzîh as the hadîth or chamberlain, the madîna as the zdûn or army, etc., but notes also the definition of the jurists that a misr is any populous urban centre where an amir or governor resides and where the Kur'ânic penalties (hadid) are applied (cf. Ch. Pellat, Le milieu basirien et la formation de Gâhîr, Paris 1953, 2-3 n. 5).

   e. Thus the term misr was first used for the encampments of the Arab mukätîla or warriors in places like Basra and Kûfâ (often called al-misrân, the two encampments par excellence, e.g. in al-Bukhârî, Hadîth, b. 13, Yâkût, Bulûdûn, iv, 454) when these temporary bases, from which the conquests were extended into e.g. Persia and Armenia, were placed on a more permanent basis by being divided into quarters for different tribal groups (the process of lamâr or takhit, see KUTTA); for examples of this, see AL-BASRA and AL-KUFA. The same process took place at e.g. Fustâjî in Egypt (see below, section C. 2) and doubtless at al-Kayrawân [q.v.] in Ifriqiya. Then within a century or two it became a more general term for the larger urban centres of the Islamic lands, as used e.g. by al-Djâhîz in the title of his Kitâb al-Advary wa'âda'ib al-bulûdîn (ed. Pellat, in Machriç 1966, 169-205) [see AL-DAHÎ], until al-Mu'addâsî can give a list of the ansâr, on the authority of al-Djâhîz, as comprising ten, sc. Baghdad, Kufa, Basra, Misr (= Fustâjî), Rayy, Nîsâbûr, Mawr, Ñalîk and Samarkand (the tenth one having been apparently omitted by al-Djâhîz or by a copyist) (33, tr. Miquel, 76, § 61).

   f. Bibliography: In addition to references given in the text, see Miquel, La géographie humaine du monde musulman jusqu'au milieu du xil siècle, i, Paris-The Hague 1967, 48-9, 67, 324.

(C. E. Bosworth)
Kāhiira) has been known thus, in full, Misr al-Kāhiira. Misr occurs, however, already as the name of the city or the cities situated south-west of later Cairo, when the name had been transferred to this city, the name Misr al-kadīmna (Old Misr) clung to the old settlement, situated between the mosque of ʿAmr and the right bank of the Nile (cf. Butler, Babylon of Egypt, 16).

In the period between the Arab conquest and the foundation of Cairo, the name Misr was regularly applied to the settlement just mentioned (Ibn Khūr-raddābīhī, 247, 251; Ibn Rusta, 115 ff.; al-Bukhārī, Fard al-khums, bāb, 13; Abū Dāwūd, Tahāta, bāb 74).

We are, however, not able to decide which of its parts (Babylon, Fustāt or the Tūlūnīd capital) is especially denoted by it. It may be supposed that the combination of Fustāt Misr “Fustāt in Egypt” (cf. e.g. al-Masʿūdī, Tamhīh, 358; al-Makrīzī, Kūtīs, i, 285, opposes Fustāt Misr to ard Misr) forms the link between the application of the name Misr to the country and to the capital. After the conquest of Egypt by the Muslims there were two settlements only on the right bank of the Nile where it divides, viz. Babylon and Fustāt. The papyri never mention Misr as the name of either of these settlements. Yet in the latter part of the 7th century A.D. the application of the name of either of these settlements to the other or to both must have begun, as is attested by John of Nikiu, who at least once uses Misr as the name of a city, where he speaks of “the gates of Misr” (25). In other passages, Misr appears as the name of the country (201, 209).

The statement that the name Misr as the name of a town arose after the Muslim conquest only, is in opposition to Butler, who maintains that at least since the time of Diocletian there existed on the right bank of the Nile, to the south of the later Babylon, a city called Misr (cf. Butler, Babylon of Egypt, 15; idem, The Arab conquest of Egypt, 221 note). Caetani (Annali, A. H. 19, § 47) has already pointed to the fact that the traditions concerning the Arab conquest of Egypt do not give the slightest credit to the existence of a city bearing the name of Misr. Butler’s reference to the Synaxary proves nothing, as this work was composed many centuries after the conquest. Finally, it may be noted that the Coptic name of Babylon was Kene.


2. The historical development of the capital of Egypt.

i. The first three centuries. See for this period of the Nile banks, the island of Rawda and the adjacent settlement of Dījzā (Gīza).

The task of clearing up the historical topography of Cairo and the neighbourhood is very much complicated by the fact that the Nile has several times changed its bed since the conquest. At that time, its waters washed the Kaṣr al-Šām and the Mosque of ʿAmr, but only a few decades later it had retreated so far back that there was sufficient land left dry between the castle and the new bank to be worth utilizing. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Masʿūd erected buildings here. The struggle with the Nile went on through the whole mediaeval period in the history of Cairo. Any methods of controlling the river were at this time quite unknown to the Muslims, and their amateurish efforts in this direction had at most but a very temporary success. The Nile then flowed much farther east than at the present day and must also have taken a considerable turn to the east in the north of Fustāt so that great areas of the modern Cairo were then portions of the river-bed. The name al-Kabīsh (Kāf’āl al-Kabīsh) is given to that quarter of the town near the Tūlūnīd Mosque. This Kabīsh lay immediately to the west of the Dījzāb Yashkīr and was a favourite resort since it lay on the Nile. At the present day, it is more than 3/4 mile distant from the river; and this is a good deal in the plan of a town. The many dried-up pools (birka) within the modern city also remind one of the gradual shifting to the west of the Nile. First of all, islands arose in the river-bed, then the water-courses which separated them from the banks were cut off from the mainbed; these were only filled with water at periods of flood, then they became birka, till they finally dried up altogether. The areas gained from the river were first of all used as gardens, then finally built on, till now only the ancient name reminds one of the change they have undergone. It is in this way that the whole area between the modern bed of the Nile and the ancient settlements has arisen within the Islamic period.

It is evident that this constant process of change does not facilitate the identification of localities.

At the period of the conquest, there was only one island in the Nile in this neighbourhood, called Dījzārat Misr or simply al-Dījzāra. This island is in its nucleus identical with the modern island of Rawda. With Babylon (see Bāularyn) it formed a single strong fortress and guarded the passage of the Nile. We have no definite information as to whether the Dījzāra was already connected with Dījzā also before a bridge in the time of the conquest or only with Babylon. In the time of the caliph al-Maʾūn (198-218/813-33) —this is the earliest date known— there was a bridge over the whole Nile which was even then known as “the Old” and replaced by a new one. This old bridge must therefore —as is a priori probable— date back to the beginnings of Arab rule. In all the centuries following, this bridge crossed the whole Nile. It was a bridge of boats. According to the statements, the Dījzāra was at first practically in the centre of the river. The arm which separated it from Babylon soon became silted up, however. In the year 336/947 the Nile had retreated so far that the inhabitants of Fustāt had to get their water from the Dījzā arm of the Nile. It was at this period under Kāhiira al-Khālidī (a. e.) that the deepening of the eastern arm of the Nile was carried out, to be repeated several times in the 7th/13th century under the Ayyūbids. In 600/1203, it was possible to walk dryshod to the Nilometer (Mikyas [q.v.]) on the Dījzāra. In 628/1230, the energy of al-Malik al-Kāmil brought about a permanent improvement, though al-Malik al-Salih also annually took advantage of the period of low water to deepen the arm of the Nile which gradually became a canal. Why did they wish to preserve this particular channel? The reason is to be found in the military importance of the Dījzāra. At the conquest, the Arabs found a castle here; the Byzantines, who were shut in by the Arabs, were able to escape over the Dījzāra. After the fall of Babylon, we hear nothing further of the island fortress. In the year 548/663, the naval arsenal (al-sindā), a dock for warships, was laid down here. This arsenal is mentioned in the papyri of the 1st century H. It is also by was also a kind of naval base. Ibn Tūlūn was the first to make the island a regular fortress again, when he thought his power was threatened (263/876); but the Nile was more powerful than the will of Ibn Tūlūn,
and his fortress in the Nile gradually fell into the waters; the remainder was destroyed by Muḥammad b. Tughjīkhādī in 323/934; two years later, this prince removed the arsenal also to Fustāt and the Diqāzīrā became a royal country residence. The island appears to have become larger in course of time and more people came to settle on it. Under the Fāṭimidīs, it was a flourishing town and one talked of the trio of towns, Cairo, Fustāt and Diqāzīrā. Al-ʾAlfādī, the son of the Fāṭimid general Bahdī Khāmālī [q.v.] built a pleasure-palace with large gardens in the north of the island and called it Rawda. This name was gradually extended to the whole island which has retained it to the present day. Later, under the ʿAyyūbīdīs, the island became a waḥfī. This wasfī land was rented by al-Malik al-Sāliḥ, who built the third great Nile fortress on it. This new fortress was called Khāṭat al-Rawḍa or Khāṭat al-Mīṣās. Al-Malik al-Sāliḥ evicted all the inhabitants of the island and razed a church and 33 mosques to the ground. In their place, he built 60 towers and made the island the bulwark of his power; this was the reason of his regular dredging operations to deepen the canal separating the island from the mainland.

There, surrounded by the Nile (Badr), he dwelled with his Mālmūkīs who became known as Bahdī Mālmūkīs from their citadel [see al-Bahriyya and Mālmūkīs], but even in their stronghold in the Nile did not ensure his safety. After the fall of the ʿAyyūbīdīs, the Mālmūkī Aybak destroyed the fortress; Baybars rebuilt it, but later Mālmūkīs like Kalāwūn and his son Muḥammad used it as a quarry for their buildings in Fustāt. In the 9th/15th century the proud citadel of the Nile had fallen to pieces and another dynasty was building on its ruins. Rawda never again took a prominent part in history.

At the present day the most remarkable sight in Rawda is the Nilometer (Mīṣāsī [q.v.]) which dates from the time of the Umayyad caliph Sulaymān b. ʿAbd al-Malik.

At the present day, Rawda is much built upon and only in the north, adjacent to Cairo University Hospital, do any gardens remain. Nothing came of the French expedition's plan of laying out a European plan. The best is the French plan of the year 1798 in the Description de l'Égypte, which dates from the time of the Umayyad caliph Sulaymān b. ʿAbd al-Malik.

From the historical point of view, Rawda is inseparably connected with Diqāzīrā (Giza), with which it formed a defence of the passage up the Nile at the time of the conquest, and during the Middle Ages. Diqāzīrā was certainly not a foundation of the Arabs, but portions of the conquering army planted their khīṭāt there as did their companions in Fustāt. On account of its exposed situation to attack from the other side of the river, the caliph ʿUmar ordered Diqāzīrā to be forti fied. The defences were completed by ʿAmr b. ʿAlāʾ in the year 22/643. It was probably only a case of fortification or extending Byzantine fortifications. The khīṭāt of the tribes were partly outside the fortress, which was probably merely a stronghold at the entrance to a bridge. The strongest tribes settled here were the Himyar and Hamdān; in the madāʾiq of the latter the Friday service was held; it was only under the ʿAyyūbīdīs that a Friday Mosque was built at the entrance to the bridge over the Nile. This bridge collapsed in Ottoman times and was only rebuilt by the French. It was afterwards removed, and in 1907 the ʿAbbās Bridge was built, connecting the western edge of Rawda island with the west bank of the Nile at Diqāzīrā. In 1958 the new Diqāzīrā Bridge connected northern Rawda and the University on the west bank. Diqāzīrā is, of course, the site of one of the most imposing groups of pyramids, containing notably those of Cheops and Chephren, in Arabic al-ḥaram [see haram], and of the Sphinx, in Arabic Abu l-Ḥawāl [q.v.]. The main road from Diqāzīrā to the foot of the Great Pyramid of Cheops and the Mena House Hotel was built for the Empress Eugénie of France when she came to open the Suez Canal in 1869.

Diqāzīrā already had in the 19th century the Orman Gardens and the Diqāzīrā Palace built by the Khedive Ismāʿīl. By the early 20th century the Gardens came to house in part a zoo, and in 1925 the University of Cairo, originally Fustāt al-Awwal University, established its campus there. In recent decades, extensive residential areas have grown up to the north of Diqāzīrā on the west bank at Dūkānī and ʿAḍjūzā. Diqāzīrā has been the chef-lieu of a province of the same name or muddīriyya since the 19th century, comprising the west-bank districts of Īmābā, Diqāzīrā itself and al-ʿAyyāq and the east-bank one of al-Saff, with the governorate covering in 1965 1,009.5 km². Diqāzīrā itself had in 1929 a population of 26,773, a figure now vastly swollen with the new suburban sprawl of Cairo and the influx of incomers from the countryside [see Muḥammad Ramāzī, al-Kānīsī al-qalqānī fī l-bilād al-mūsīriyya, Cairo 1953-68, ii/3, 8-10]

iii. The Fāṭimid City, Misr al-Kāhira, and the development of Cairo till the end of the 18th century.

The modern Cairo was originally only a military centre, like al-ʿAskar and al-Katāʾī, north of the great capital of Misr al-Fustāt. When the Fāṭimidīs in al-Kayrawān saw the precarious position of Egypt under the later ʿIkhsāsīs, they felt the time had come to put into operation their long cherished wish to occupy the Nile valley. On 11 Shaʿbān 58/1 July 969, their general Diwāhar [q.v.] overcame the feeble resistance which the weak government was able to offer him at Diqāzīrā, and entered Fustāt on the day following. He pitched his camp north of the city and for seven days his troops poured in throughout. When on 18 Shaʿbān 9 July the whole army had collected around him, he gave orders for a new city to be planned. Such an important undertaking could not be carried out in those days without first consulting the astrologers as to what would be the propitious hour to begin. The historians tell us that a suitable area had been marked off and all the more distant parts of it connected with a bell-pull, so that the given moment at a sign from the astrologers' work might begin everywhere at the same distant. The bell-ropes was, however, pulled before the auspicious moment by a raven and the building began at a moment when the unlucky planet Mars, the Kāhir al-Falāk, governed the heavens. This calamity could not be undone, so they sought to deprive the evil omen of its malignance by giving the new town the name of Mansūriyya. As a matter of fact, Cairo does appear to have borne this name till the end of the 18th century.

The modern Cairo was originally only a military centre, like al-ʿAskar and al-Katāʾī, north of the great capital of Misr al-Fustāt. When the Fāṭimidīs in al-Kayrawān saw the precarious position of Egypt under the later ʿIkhsāsīs, they felt the time had come to put into operation their long cherished wish to occupy the Nile valley. On 11 Shaʿbān 58/1 July 969, their general Diwāhar [q.v.] overcame the feeble resistance which the weak government was able to offer him at Diqāzīrā, and entered Fustāt on the day following. He pitched his camp north of the city and for seven days his troops poured in throughout. When on 18 Shaʿbān 9 July the whole army had collected around him, he gave orders for a new city to be planned. Such an important undertaking could not be carried out in those days without first consulting the astrologers as to what would be the propitious hour to begin. The historians tell us that a suitable area had been marked off and all the more distant parts of it connected with a bell-pull, so that the given moment at a sign from the astrologers' work might begin everywhere at the same distant. The bell-ropes was, however, pulled before the auspicious moment by a raven and the building began at a moment when the unlucky planet Mars, the Kāhir al-Falāk, governed the heavens. This calamity could not be undone, so they sought to deprive the evil omen of its malignance by giving the new town the name of Mansūriyya. As a matter of fact, Cairo does appear to have borne this name till the end of the 18th century.
because it was prepared before Cairo had been modernised; see also the various maps and plans in Abu-Lughod, *op. cit.* in *B'ét.*. In the centre between the northern boundary of Fustat and Heliopolis (4`Ayn Shams), there lay at this time the little village of Munyat al-`Asbagh, where the caravans for Syria used to assemble. Munyat al-`Asbagh lay on the Khālidjī, a canal which traversed the whole length of the plain, leaving the Nile to the north of Fustat, passing the ancient Helio-polis and finally entering the sea at the modern Suez. This canal was probably originally a silted-up branch of the Nile, which had been excavated for use as a canal even in ancient times. After the Arab conquest, it was again cleaned out by ʿAmr b. al-`Aṣā to make a navigable waterway between Fustat and the Holy Cities in order to supply the latter with corn. It then received the name of Khalīlād Amīr al-Mu`āminīn. This Khālidjī was closed in 69/688 to cut off the corn supply of the anti-caliph ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr in Medina and finally abandoned as a waterway to the Red Sea in 145/762 in the reign of al-Mansūr. It was still to remain for a thousand years the water supply of the plain north of Fustat and formed the water-road, so famed in song, on the west side and at a later period in the centre of Cairo. After the reign of the Fāṭimid caliph al-Ḥikīm, who did much for it, it bore the name of Khalīlād al-Ḥikīmī, at a still later period, a name that has been attached to a series of different stretches of it, which are given on the French map of 1798. Instead of flowing to the sea, in the latter centuries of its existence it ended in the Birkat al-Dbubb in the north of Cairo and in its neighbourhood. It is only quite recently (the end of the 19th century) that it has vanished from the plan of Cairo. Its course is still clearly recognisable; it corresponds to the broad road followed at the present day by the electric tram from the Mosque of Sayyida Zaynab, or rather from a farther point in the south of Cairo to the northern suburb of ʿAbbasīyya (Sharī` al-Halwān).

The Fāṭimid city lay immediately south of Munyat al-ʿAsbagh between this canal and the Mukaṭṭam hill. Its northern and southern limits are still defined by the Bāb al-Futūḥ and the Bāb Zuwayla. The town road followed at the present day by the electric tram from the Mosque of Sayyida Zaynab, or rather than the Cairo of the later Fāṭimid period. At first, the open space in the south, where the Mu`ayyad Mosque now stands, and the Mosque of the Ḥikīm in the north were both outside the walls. In the west, the Khalīlād for centuries formed the natural boundary, as did the heights in the east. The main part of the Fāṭimid city was defined by a series of streets running north and south parallel to the Khalīlād, connecting the two gates just mentioned with another one and dividing the city into two large sections not quite equal in size. This series of streets is also clearly defined at the present day, though it must have been broader originally. It is still known by different names in the various sections, of which the best known is Sharī` al-Nabībāsin. This is crossed at right angles by al-Sikka al-Dbidda, the continuation of the Muskī. Its name "New" Street proves what must be particularly emphasised to avoid misconceptions, viz. that the Fāṭimid city had no such main street running from east to west. It only arose in the 19th century.

If Fustāt had been divided into khitī, Cairo was divided into bāwars or quarters, which is really only another name for the same thing, except that Cairo was intended to be a city from the beginning, while Fustāt grew out of the chance arrangement of the告诉她. The altered conditions of the period are shown in the fact that the quarters were no longer allotted to different Arab tribes but to quite different peoples and races. In the north and south lay the quarters of the Greeks (Rūm), to whom Dja`war himself possibly belonged. His settling his countrymen near the main gates of the city was probably intentional. Berbers, Kurds, Turks, Armenians, etc. were allotted other portions of the town. Some late-comers were settled in the Hārat al-Bāṭiliyya outside the first walls of the city between it and al-Muqaṭṭat. Lastly, the negroes, called briefly al-ʿAbīd, who formed a rather undisciplined body, were settled north of the Bāb al-Futūḥ beside a great ditch which Dja`war had dug to defend the city against attacks from Syria. This part of the town came to be called ʿKhandaq al-ʿAbīd from the ditch and those who dwelled near it.

The splendid places of the caliphs formed the central portion of the town. We must be careful to distinguish between a large eastern palace (al-Kāṣr al-Kabīr al-Sharqi) and a smaller western one (al-Kāṣr al-Saghir al-Dbīr). Their sites had previously been occupied, to the west of the main series of streets, by the large gardens of Kāfūr, to the east by a Coptic monastery (Dayr al-ʿ1sām) and a small fortress (Kusāyr al-Shawk), which were used for the building of the palaces. The East Palace was the first to be built immediately after the foundation of the city. On 23 Ramaḍān 362/28 June 993, the caliph al-Mu`izz was able to enter it in state. It was a splendid building with nine doors, of which three are on the main street and the other six on the side streets, which are given on the French map of 1798. Instead of flowing to the sea, in the latter centuries of its existence it ended in the Birkat al-Dbubb in the north of Cairo and in its neighbourhood. It is only quite recently (the end of the 19th century) that it has vanished from the plan of Cairo. Its course is still clearly recognisable; it corresponds to the broad road followed at the present day by the electric tram from the Mosque of Sayyida Zaynab, or rather from a farther point in the south of Cairo to the northern suburb of ʿAbbasīyya (Sharī` al-Halwān).

The Fāṭimid city lay immediately south of Munyat al-ʿAsbagh between this canal and the Mukaṭṭam hill. Its northern and southern limits are still defined by the Bāb al-Futūḥ and the Bāb Zuwayla. The town road followed at the present day by the electric tram from the Mosque of Sayyida Zaynab, or rather than the Cairo of the later Fāṭimid period. At first, the open space in the south, where the Mu`ayyad Mosque now stands, and the Mosque of the Ḥikīm in the north were both outside the walls. In the west, the Khalīlād for centuries formed the natural boundary, as did the heights in the east. The main part of the Fāṭimid city was defined by a series of streets running north and south parallel to the Khalīlād, connecting the two gates just mentioned with another one and dividing the city into two large sections not quite equal in size. This series of streets is also clearly defined at the present day, though it must have been broader originally. It is still known by different names in the various sections, of which the best known is Sharī` al-Nabībāsin. This is crossed at right angles by al-Sikka al-Dbidda, the continuation of the Muskī. Its name "New" Street proves what must be particularly emphasised to avoid misconceptions, viz. that the Fāṭimid city had no such main street running from east to west. It only arose in the 19th century.

If Fustāt had been divided into khitī, Cairo was divided into bāwars or quarters, which is really only another name for the same thing, except that Cairo was intended to be a city from the beginning, while Fustāt grew out of the chance arrangement of the告诉她. The altered conditions of the period are shown in the fact that the quarters were no longer allotted to different Arab tribes but to quite different peoples and races. In
them being of stone also. Max van Berchem (Notes d’archéologie arabe. 1. Monuments et inscriptions fatimides, in JA, ser. 8, vol. xvii [1891], 443 ff.) exhaustively studied these walls and gates and called particular attention to the fact that the great gates, which still command admiration at the present day, the Bâb al-Futûh, Bâb al-Nasr and Bâb Zuwayla, were built by architects from Edessa and differ in a rather marked degree from the later fortifications of Salâh al-Dîn, which appear to be influenced by the Frankish style of the Crusading period. We also owe to van Berchem an accurate delineation of those portions of the walls which still survive at the present day and which date from the Fâtimid period. The picture we have of the two walls of the Fâtimid period is as follows. In the west, the town was bounded by the Kâhilî which ran below the walls for 1500 yards and served as a moat. It is a debatable point whether we may conclude from the street name Bâyân al-Sûrayn, which is still in use, that two walls existed here one behind the other. Djaîwar’s walls were certainly a fair distance from the canal, the space being large enough to allow of pleasure palaces being built on it. There were three (according to Casanova, only two) gates here, from south to north, the Bâb al-Sâ‘âda, Bâb al-Fârâdîj and the Bâb al-Kantara. At the latter, near the northwestern corner of the area there were various dance shows, a bridge over the canal. This connected the town with the suburb and harbour of al-Maks, on the Nile, the ancient Umm Dûnayn. On al-Maks, cf. Pappi Schott Reinhart, i, 53 ff.; the name appears in the Graeco-Arabic papyri of the 1st/7th century; even before the foundation of Cairo, therefore, this was the harbour at which the customs were collected. Al-Maks must not be confounded with the modern El-Barkiyya and the area adjoining it on the north. The northern side of the town must naturally have been the most strongly fortified. Djaîwar had a ditch dug here along the wall. The two gates, Bâb al-Futûh and Bâb al-Nasr, built by him, lay more within the town than the modern gates of the same name which only date from Badr’s time. The Mosque of al-Hâkim was originally built outside the walls and was first included within the fortified area by Badr. There seem, however, to be reasons for believing that al-Hâkim was the first to advance the line of fortifications here as well as in the south and to build new gates (al-Kâlkhândî, tr. Wûstenfeld, 70; Salom on Bâb. 50). The wall had two gates on the east, the Bâb al-Kârrâtîn (afterwards al-Mâhrûk) and the Bâb al-Barkiyya. In this locality, Badr’s fortification also included the quarters which had arisen after the erection of Djaîwar’s wall. Finally, Badr moved the Zuwayla gate somewhat farther to the south. There were originally two gates. The town as extended by Badr was still anything but ruinous. Of the other religious buildings of the town, as extended by Badr, the modern Citadel or, to be more accurate, its northern strongholds of the Crusaders. This fortress is the Bâtir of Egypt as a whole, dawns with the accession of Salah al-Dîn [q. v.] in Suppl.]. Eye-witnesses, like Nâsir-i Khushraw, confirm these accounts. It must have been a glorious period for Cairo, but was soon followed in al-Mustansîr’s time by a desolate epoch of anarchy when the economic foundations of its prosperity were destroyed by famine and unrest. A better era dawned on Cairo with the accession to power of Badr al-Djamiî. Cairo now began slowly to gain over Fustât in economic importance, a process which gradually became more definite in succeeding centuries.

iv. The Citadel and post-Fâtimid Cairo. Quite a new epoch in the history of Cairo, as in that of Egypt as a whole, dawns with the accession of Salah al-Dîn [q. v.] in Saladin in 564/1169 and the advent of the Ayyubîs [q. v.]; see on these historical events in Egypt, below, section D). The history of the growth of the city only can be briefly discussed here. Salâh al-Dîn twice played a part in this development by erecting large buildings. P. Casanova has thoroughly dealt with this process in his Histoire et description de la Citadelle du Caire (Mém. de la Miss. Arch. Franc. au Caire, vii, though his conclusions cannot perhaps be regarded as final on all points. The material is too imperfect. At any rate he is probably right in saying that Salâh al-Dîn in the first instance in 565/1170 only restored and improved the fortifications erected by Djaîwar and Badr. It was only after his return from Syria, where he was at the height of his power, that Salâh al-Dîn conceived the colossal plan of enclosing the whole complex of buildings forming the two towns of Fustât and Cairo within one strong line of fortifications (572/1179). This new foundation was to be commanded by a fortress (ka‘âfa) after the fashion of the strongholds of the Crusaders. This fortress is the modern Citadel or, to be more accurate, its northern part. In the northwest, Cairo was to be protected by this strong fortress and in the south-west, by Fustât. The exact wall of al-Zafar was to be advanced farther east to al-Mukâţam and the entrance for inroads from the Nile, the ancient Umm Dunayn. On al-Maks, cf. the works of van Berchem just quoted. It is impossible to detail here all their buildings, etc. mentioned in literature; see further on these AL-KÂHİRÂ. Monuments. Most of them did not survive the dynasty or survived it for a brief period only.

During the Fâtimid period, Cairo was not yet the economic centre for all Egypt which it was to become under the Ayyubîs and Mamlûks. This role was first held, as we have seen, by Fustât. On the other hand, Cairo was pre-eminently the seat of a splendid court with all its military pageantry. Ibn Tuwayr and others have given us vivid pictures, preserved in al-Kâlkhândî and others, of the ceremonial processions and festivities, the magazines, treasures and stables, the banners and insignia, the members of the royal household, the various classes of officers of state and court officials with all their punctilious ceremonial (see MAWAKÎB. 1. Under the ‘Abbâsîs and Fâtîmids, and also 6. In the Mamlûk Sultanate, in Suppl.). Eye-witnesses, like Nâsir-i Khushraw, confirm these accounts. It must have been a glorious period for Cairo, but was soon followed in al-Mustansîr’s time by a desolate epoch of anarchy when the economic foundation of its prosperity was destroyed by famine and unrest. A better era dawned on Cairo with the accession to power of Badr al-Djamiî. Cairo now began slowly to gain over Fustât in economic importance, a process which gradually became more definite in succeeding centuries.

MISR
a turn westwards towards the old city wall, the fortifications of which were to be extended farther south to the citadel. The north wall of Cairo was to be advanced westwards up to the Nile and to run along it to near the Kasr al-Shamh, which was the extreme southern point of the whole system. A wall was to run thence in the east of Fustat directly to the citadel. The citadel itself was to be the residence of the sovereign. Salâh al-Dîn's trusted eunuch Karakûşh [q.v.] was entrusted with the task of carrying out this gigantic undertaking; he had previously carried out building operations for Salâh al-Dîn. The huge undertaking was never completed nor did Salâh al-Dîn avail himself of the citadel, but when in Cairo, as a rule he lived in the old vizier's palace of the Fatimid city. The most important part was the completion of the north wall, which was actually built eastwards as far as the Burdj al-Zafer and westwards as far as al-Maks on the Nile. The portion connecting the eastern wall of the Fatimid city with the citadel was not completed. The names of several gates in the great wall which was to run from the citadel to the south of Fustat, have been handed down, but it can hardly be assumed that they were ever built. The wall along the Nile was never begun at all; but it was probably the least urgently required.

These buildings had considerable influence in two directions. After the north wall had been advanced up to the Nile, the broad stretch of land between the Khâlid and the Nile was secure from invasion and the way was paved for an extension of the city in this direction. The Khâlid thus gradually came to be in the centre of this extended city. Through the removal of the forces of defence and later of the court itself to the Citadel, Cairo began to develop in the south also and the union with the northern suburbs of Fustat thus came about. This process was not however completed till the Mamlûk period (al-Makrîzî, Khîti, i, 378 ff.).

The Citadel was first appropriated for the use to which it was originally intended as the residence for the sovereign by Salâh al-Dîn's nephew al-Malik al-Kâmil, who was also the first to build a palatial residence here. He entered the new palace in 604/1207. From this time onwards, with the exception of the reign of al-Malik al-Sâlih, whom we have already become acquainted with as the builder of the fortress and royal residence of Rawda in the Nile, the citadel remained the abode of all the princes and pashas who ruled Egypt till the Khedives went to live in various palaces which they had built for themselves in the plain again. It is difficult, however, to draw a picture of the gradual transformation of the Citadel, as the most radical changes were made in the Mamlûk period. The present walls still show that we must divide the whole area into two sections, the original north or north-east part, the Khâlîf al-Qihbal proper of the Ayyûbid period, which was and is still separated from al-Muṣṭaṭâm by a deep ditch, and, in the south extending towards the town, the Citadel of the palaces where the Mamlûks built a complicated entanglement of palaces, audience-chambers, stables and mosques. We must therefore distinguish between the Citadel proper and the royal town which adjoined the Citadel. Of Salâh al-Dîn's buildings, which lasted several years, there remains today only a portion of the wall and the so-called Joseph's Well [Rîr Yûsuf]; the latter is a deep shaft from which Karakûşh, the architect of the fortress, obtained water. The machinery for raising the water was driven by oxen. A pathway hewn out of the rock leads down to the bottom of the well. The name Yûsuf is not of course the praenomen of Salâh al-Dîn but commemorates the Joseph of the Bible, legends of whom are attached to other portions of the Citadel also. Great alterations were made in the citadel by Baybars and his successors and their buildings again were completely altered by al-Malik al-Nâṣîr Muhammad b. Kalâwîn, many of whose buildings have still survived, as for example the mosque wrongly called after Kalâwîn (erected in 718/1318) and remains of his palace in black and white, hence called al-Kašr al-Abâlîk (built 713-14/1313-14). The same prince also laid down great aqueducts to bring the water of the Nile to the Citadel, as the wells were not sufficient to supply the increasing numbers of military personnel quartered there. At a later period Kâ'ût Bey took an interest in the Citadel again and Kânsawûn al-Qâwirî [q.v.] also laid out a garden here. The Ottoman Pashas built a good deal here also, but they allowed more to fall into ruins. Muhammad ʿAli [q.v.] was the first to take an energetic interest in the Citadel again; he repaired some of the ancient palaces and built the so-called Alâbaster Mosque, the Qâmis Muhammad ʿAli, in the Turkish cupola style, the minarets of which give the present citadel its characteristic outlines. It was begun in 1829 and finished in 1857 by Saʿîd Pasha. The restoration of the walls also dates back to Muhammad ʿAli.

It was not only in the Citadel but in the city lying at their feet also that the Mamlûks erected numerous fine buildings. The Cairo created by them was practically the Cairo that existed when the French expedition arrived there. A vivid picture of the home of the Mamlûks in the period of their splendour may be obtained from the plan of 1798. A series of splendid monuments stood here partly built on the ruins of Fatimid buildings. We will only mention a few that still exist: on the site of the ʿAzîzî palace stood Kalâwîn's hospital, the Madrasa and tomb of his son Muhammad al-Nâṣîr and Barkûk's Madrasa. There were also numerous Mamlûk buildings on the site of the great East Palace, including the Khân al-Khâṣîl, well-known at the present day. Of other large buildings at this period, there may also be mentioned the Mosque of Zâhir, built by Baybars I, of which the massive walls still survive at the entrance to the ʿAbbâsiyya, the Mosque of Šûltân Hasan at the foot of the citadel (cf. Herz Bey, La Mosquée du Sultan Hassan au Caire, Cairo 1895), of great importance in the history of art, the Muʾayyad Mosque at the Bâb Zuwayla, only completed after the death of its founder, and Kâ'ût Bey's Madrasa; we cannot detail the numerous tombs outside the town proper nor the many other smaller buildings. What a lamentable contrast to this period of activity in architecture is afforded by what was done in the Turkish period (since 923/1517) in the city of the Mamlûks; only a few ʿâlîks or residences for Pashas were built, a few Sultâns or fountains and one or two smaller mosques and tekkes. The configuration of the town did not, however, change so much between 1500 and 1800 as in any earlier period of the same length. In spite of the ravages of their soldiers, the city must have flourished and increased under the warrior princes of the Mamlûk period. It must have been a busy and splendid city. But the grave damage done by the Mamlûk system could only be repaired by strong rulers. The Ottoman Pashas were not fit for the task and Cairo slowly declined till Muhammad ʿAli and his successors created a new Cairo which gradually became Europeanised.

Bibliography: The main primary sources are Makrîzî, al-Khitât; Ibn Dukmâk, Kâlîb al-Iwtâj;


v. Monuments. See for these al-Kahira.

vi. The city from 1798 till the present day. [see Supplement.]

D. HISTORY OF THE ISLAMIC PROVINCE AND MODERN STATE OF EGYPT.

1. The Byzantine background, the Arab conquest and the Umayyad period 602-750.

(a) Byzantine Egypt. Byzantine Egypt continued for a long time the Graeco-Roman traditional patterns in culture and administration, but by the time of the Arab conquest some important changes had taken place which had drastically altered its social structure. A great number of Byzantine institutions survived in Arab Egypt for about one century.

Hellenism, paganism and Christianity. During the Byzantine period, Greek was the language of administration in which most of the official documents were written, and was moreover a living language used, side-by-side with Coptic, as a language of the upper Egyptian class, as manifested by the peculiar alterations in the Greek language of the Egyptian papyi. On the other hand, as in older times, a large number of Egyptians did not know Greek. (J.R. Rea, *The Osryhynchus papyi*, li, London 1984, 41).

Greek literary texts were used at schools, and a few Egyptian poets wrote Greek verses in florid style, manifesting an extensive though pedantic knowledge of Greek poetry and metre. (M. Hamdi, *'Η Ελληνομακαρική παιδεία έν Αιγύπτω από το Α' το το δ' Μ.Χ. αιόνιον κατά των παπυρόσκοπων, Athens 1972; H. Livrea, ed. and tr. *Blemmyomachia* [P. Berol. 5003], Rome 1978). But it is noteworthy that one of the best Byzantine historians of the 4th-5th century, Olymiodorus, who wrote in a humble and precise style, was Egyptian. (V. Christides, *The image of the Sudanese in the Byzantine sources*, in Byzantinolaxis, xlii [1982], 8-97).

Hellenism in Egypt was closely connected with paganism which, in spite of the triumph of Chris-
Byzantine Empire in the VIth and VIIth cent., in Klochkov, v. 1 (1971), 303-30; M.J. Hollerich, The Alexandrian bishops and the grain trade: ecclesiastical commerce in late Roman Egypt, in JESH, xxv (1982), 187-207; and also MILÁHA. i. In the pre-Islamic and early mediæval periods.

At the turn of the 7th century Egypt suffered from many evils, especially at the time of the “tyrant” emperor Phocas (602-10). In the strife between Phocas and his successor Heraclius, it became the battleground of the two rivals (Z. Borkowski, Alexandria II. Inscriptions des factions à Alexandrie, Warsaw 1981, 23 ff.). Anarchy prevailed, and Egypt’s shattered monetary system reached its lowest ebb (P. Grierson, The Consular coinage of Heraclius and the recall against Phocas of 608-610, in NC [1950], 71-93). In this period of anarchy, the activities of the circus factions, known as “Greens” and “Blues”, which were not mere sporting clubs, exercised a detrimental element on the administrative structure and social life of Byzantine Egypt, in particular in Alexandria. Heraclius’s victory was followed by a period of pacification and consolidation in Egypt which was again interrupted by the Persian conquest of Egypt (619-29 or 630), about which little is known (E.K. Chryssos, The date of Putphragios, in Byzantina Sebennitica 4483 and the Persian occupation of Egypt, in Dodone, iv (1975), 343-48; L.S.B. MacCoul, Coptic Egypt during the Persian occupation, in Studia Classici et Orientalii, xxxvi (1986), 307-13).

The Emperor Heraclius (d. 641) took great pains to restore order in Egypt, but it was still in disarray when the Arabs attacked it. Yet in spite of their dissatisfaction with the Byzantine administration, the Egyptians did not form a monolithic anti-Byzantine block as has often been suggested. Winkelman, op. cit., has correctly pointed out that there were different layers in the structure of the Egyptian society and that the attitude of each of them varied towards the Byzantine government. Moreover, it should be emphasised that there was no clear separation between Coptic and Greek ethnic elements in Egypt on the eve of the Arab invasion, as wrongly suggested by some scholars (see e.g. the simplistic view expressed by S. Vryonis, Byzantine circus factions and Islamic Futuwawa organisations, in BZ [1965], 39 n. 49; and for the earlier period, A. Lazarou, Présence hellénique en Egypte romaine, in Greco-Arabica, iii (1984), 51-76).


(b) Islamic Egypt.

The Conquest of Egypt.

The study of the conquest of Egypt by the Arabs bristles with many problems because of the confused and controversial accounts of the various sources. There is no comprehensive work to deal with this topic in toto, and A. Butler’s The Arab conquest of Egypt and the latest thirty years in the Roman dominion, Oxford 1902, “Oxford 1978 ed. by P.M. Fraser, contains valuable material, but certain parts of it have become obsolete (see the review by R.S. Bagnall in Classical Jnl., lxv (1979), 247-8).

The Byzantine sources, mainly Theophanes and Nicophorus, are vague and fragmentary. The Arabic sources are also fragmentary with many contradictory accounts. The most trustworthy Arab author is Ibn Abd al-Hakam (d. 257/871 [q.v.]), while The history of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church (10th century) includes certain valuable material of an earlier chronicle written by Abu George at the end of the 8th century. The chronicle of the contemporary Egyptian author, John, Bishop of Nikiu, has been preserved only in a partial Ethiopian version and its valuable material has been distorted. Most of the Arabic accounts and the relevant passages of Nikiu’s chronicle have been collected and presented in English by D.R. Hill in his The termination of hostilities in the early Arab conquests, London 1971.

From the labyrinth of the conflicting descriptions of the Arab conquest of Egypt, we can discern with a certain clarity the following course of events. The expedition against Egypt was undertaken by the Arab general Amr b. al-Årîṣ [q.v.]. Many Arabic sources describe Amr’s expedition against Egypt as a spontaneous action with the reluctant approval of the caliph ‘Umar. M. Ibrahim has correctly pointed out that Amr decided to undertake the Egyptian campaign because he had traded in Egypt during pre-Islamic times and was familiar with its importance as an international trade centre (The social and economic background of the Umayyad Caliphate: the role of Mu’awiyah ibn Abi Sufyan, diss., UCLA 1981, unpubl., 192 ff.). While this statement is valid, Ibrahim’s assertion that Amr acted as an agent of the merchant class of Mecca (op. cit., 198) is farfetched.

Amr b. al-Årîṣ reached the frontier town of Egypt, at Al-Arish [q.v.], on 10 Dhu ‘l-Hijjah 18/12 December 639 (Ibn Abd al-Hakam, Futuh Misr wa ‘l-Maghrib, ed. C.C. Torrey, New Haven 1922, repr. Baghdad n.d.). Amr’s army was composed of about 4,000 men, mainly horsemen, and carried no siege machines. From al-Årîṣ he headed towards the important port of Pelusium (Farama’), which fell to the Arabs after a one-month siege. Amr’s army, following thereafter the traditional invasion route, headed towards Bilbays, ancient Φαυς and modern El-Kantara, the key town on the way to Misr, which fell into Arab hands after another month of siege [see BỊBAYŠ].

The events that followed are somewhat confusing and there are many conflicting reports on the further march of the Arab army (cf. S. Lane-Poole, A history of Egypt in the Arab Age, London 1991, 2 ff. and especially Hill, op. cit., 34 ff.). It seems that Amr b. al-Årîṣ arrested his march when he arrived near the strong fortress of Babylon, at the edge of the town Misr, old Memphis, at the head of the Delta of the Nile, and appealed to the caliph for reinforcements. About 4,000 men under al-Zubayr arrived in June 640 and joined Amr’s army. In Helopolis, later called ‘Ayn Shams, a battle took place between the Arabs and the Byzantines in July 640, in which the Byzantines suffered a crushing defeat. The fall of Misr followed, and afterwards the Arabs stubbornly besieged the strong fortress of Babylon. Its defenders resisted bravely, but the death of the Emperor Heraclius inflicted a heavy blow on their morale and
on 21 Rabī‘ II 20/9 April 641, they abandoned the fortress and sailed to Alexandria via the river Nile. It seems that Fayyūm was raided after the fall of Babylon and before the conquest of Misr (John of Nikī’s Chronicle, Eng. tr. R.H. Charles, London 1916, 178 ff.). We do not know the exact date when ʿAmr’s army conquered Fayyūm, proceeded towards Bahnašās in middle Egypt, and subdued the entire southern part of Egypt (the Saʿīd). Most probably, the conquest of middle and southern Egypt started immediately after the conquest of Babylon and was accomplished at the time the Arabs were engaged in their last endeavour, i.e. the siege of Alexandria (ca. 641).

According to John of Nikī (Chronicle, 181), following the capture of Misr by the Arabs, the governor of Arcadia, Dometianus, escaped secretly from his capital Fayyūm and went to Nikī; Fayyūm became an easy prey to the Arabs, who slaughtered its defenders. Dometianus was later forced to abandon Nikī, which was then captured. The conquest of the other towns in middle and southern Egypt, i.e. Bahnašās, Ahnas and the others, is only briefly described in al-Baladhūri and John of Nikī (Hill, op. cit., 43 ff.).

There is, nevertheless, an epic romance written by an anonymous author, the Futūh al-Bahnāsā, which in spite of certain legendary elements offers us valuable information. Its author mentions as his main sources al-Wakīlī, al-Tabärī and Ibn Khallikān, and his work contains material which has not been preserved in other sources (the text has not yet been published: French tr. by M.E. Galtier, Fouleul al-Bahnaasā, in Mémoires de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, xxii, Cairo 1900). The Byzantine resistance in Bahnašās, as described in detail in the Futūh al-Bahnāsā, mirrors the general manner in which the warfare between Byzantines and Arabs took place as well as the attitude of the local Coptic population (see J. Jarry, La conquête du Fayyūm par les Musulmans d’après le Futūh al-Bahnaasā, in Annales Islamologiques, ix [1970], 9-20; Christides, Sudanese at the time of the Arab conquest of Egypt, in BZ, lxxv [1982], 10 ff.). The Copts often assisted the Byzantines vigorously, but sometimes sided with the Arabs. In addition, the Futūh al-Bahnāsā reveals that a certain number of the Sudanese tribes, the Beja, Blemmyes and Nubians, rushed from Nubia to the assistance of the Byzantines (Galtier, 60 ff.). In order to check the continuous harassment by the Sudanese, who even after the conquest of the Saʿīd continued their raids, ʿAmr b. al-ʿÅs sent his half-brother ʿAbd al-Kaws b. ʿAbd al-Kays al-Fihrī against them in a punitive expedition (641) (Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam, 169-70, 174). But the restless Sudanese were only stopped by ʿAmr’s successor ʿAbd Allāb b. Saʿīd b. Abī Sarh [q.v.], who concluded with them the famous treaty known as the balt in 652 [see balt].

While ʿAmr was besieging Babylon, he started negotiations with the patriarch and governor of Egypt Cyrus in order to conclude a treaty, but Cyrus was recalled to Constantinople and reprimanded by the Emperor Heraclius for these negotiations. After the failure of these last, ʿAmr continued his march and the Byzantines, following a last engagement in Kayrun, withdrew within the strong walls of Alexandria. The capture of the heavily-fortified Alexandria by the Arabs without any actual resistance by the Byzantines was due to the morale of the latter, which had been severely tried by the sack of Babylon and led to the internal disputes of the Byzantine authorities. Theodore, the Augustal prefect, was absent and Dometianus, who replaced him, was more interested in fighting against Menas, the Prefect of Lower Egypt, than resisting the Arabs. Furthermore, constant riots and the opposition parties of Syrian and Blues in Alexandria, whose main interest was the disturbance of the existing order, created a chaotic situation in this city.

Cyrus, the Melkite patriarch who had returned to Egypt, invested this time with full authority by the Byzantines to negotiate, went to Babylon to conclude a peace treaty with ʿAmr. ʿAmr received him in a friendly way and a final treaty on the surrender of Egypt was signed (see E. Amelineau, Vie Copte de Samuel de Kalamân, in JA, ser. 8, vol. xii [1888], 367; Theophanes, Chronikon, ed. C. de Boor, 338).

The Melkite patriarch and governor of Egypt Cyrus often appears in the Arabic sources under the name of al-Muḥāwīkī [q.v. for a detailed discussion of the problems concerning him and his role]. Before ʿAmr made the final treaty with the representatives of Egypt, he concluded some minor treaties as occasion arose in the various stages of his conquest. The most important local treaty was concluded when ʿAmr sacked the fortress of Babylon; an agreement was reached between him and the Byzantine garrison, according to which the Byzantines left unhurt, leaving behind their military supplies. All the minor treaties eventually merged into a final settlement. The Muslim jurists disagree whether Egypt was taken by force (ṣawmaʿ) or by treaty (ṣulṭān), an important difference since in the former case Egypt would have been considered as spoils of war and its inhabitants would have been deprived of the right of protection (ḥimma). Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam’s brief statement illuminates the problem clearly: “some of Egypt was conquered by saldo and some was ṣawmaʿ. Umar made it all ḥimmma and that has lasted to this day” (for all relevant traditions, see Hill, op. cit., 34 ff.).

Behind the theoretical dispute of the Arab jurists concerning the conquest of Egypt ʿṣawmaʿ or ʿṣulṭān lay the practical problem of how to legitimise any Muslim demands for increasing taxes without violating Islamic law. If Egypt was captured in toto ʿṣawmaʿ, then the whole country would be considered ḍayf [q.v.] and conquered land distributed to the fighting soldiers. The original text of the final treaty of Egypt has not been preserved. Al-Tabārī has reproduced a comprehensive account, while John of Nikī, Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam and the other Arab authors supplement it. Al-Tabārī calls it the treaty of ʿAyn ʿAlām. Cyrus concluded the final treaty with ʿAmr in Babylon and therefore it is incorrect to call it the “Treaty of Alexandria” (J. Gascou, Miscellanea. De Byzance à l’Islam, les impôts en Egypte après la conquête arabe, in JESHO, xxvi [1983], 98-9).

The treaty was concluded between the Byzantines (Rūm) and the Arabs. The Byzantines were the first party representing the Byzantine emperor, the only legal party recognised by the Arabs. It is therefore absurd, as correctly pointed out by Butler, to say that “this is a treaty with the Copts not with the Romans... The people of Misr not the Roman army of occupation, still less the emperor Heraclius were the contracting parties on the other side...” (Lane Poole, 241 ff.; cf. Butler, The Treaty of Misr in Tabārī, Oxford 1913, 24 ff.).

As has been said in the previous section, by the 7th century a mixed race of Hellenes-Egyptians had developed with Arabic and Coptic influences, where there was no distinction between Hellenised Egyptians and Egyptianised Greeks. Thus the first term of the agreement, which was actually a pledge of security
for the defeated (aman) and not an agreement between equal parties, specified that Amr granted his security to all inhabitants of Egypt. (aman) and not an agreement between equal parties, specified that Amr granted his security to all inhabitants of Egypt. (aman) and not an agreement between equal parties, specified that Amr granted his security to all inhabitants of Egypt.

As for the term ṫawm of the seventh section in al-Tabari's extract of the treaty, it does not refer to the Graeco-Egyptian town dwellers, but to the Byzantines who were fresh settlers, army officers, many of barbarian origin, who chose to remain in Egypt after the defeat of the Byzantine fleet in the naval battle of the Delta. However, they were utterly routed by the invading Arab forces demonstrated coordination and unity.

In 645 the Byzantines, taking advantage of the uncertainty after the murder of ʿUmar (644), about which they were well-informed (Theophanes, ed. de Boor, 343) sent an expedition under Manuel against the Muslims of Egypt. This was a blunder by the Emperor Constans II, who was later responsible for the defeat of the Byzantine fleet in the naval battle of Dhi ʿat ʾal-Sawārī (q.v. in Suppl., and see Christides, The naval engagement of Dhi ʿat as-Sawārī A.H. 341/A.D. 655-656. A classical example of naval warfare incompetence, in Baqʿamāt, xii [1985], 1331-45). The Byzantines landed in Alexandria easily, since the Muslims had no fleet, killed the garrison and conquered some town in the Delta. However, they were utterly routed by ʿAmr and a second evacuation took place; see the various Arab traditions in Hill, 39 ff. Manuel's reconquest of Alexandria forced the Muslim conquerors to proceed rapidly to the recruitment of Egyptian sailors and use of Egyptian ships. In fact, these participated in the second full-scale expedition of the Muslims against Libya in ca. 645, five years before the first Muslim raid against Cyprus (Severus, in PO, i, 497 ff.).

Causes of the fall of Egypt:

Certain general conditions, which facilitated the sweeping conquests of the Arabs over the whole Middle East, can also be discerned in the Arab conquest of Egypt; but the latter presents its own peculiarities. A salient characteristic which we meet in the first Arab conquests is the assistance of the nomad Arabs of the conquered lands to the Muslim invaders. This factor has acquired particular importance after recent studies which have convincingly shown that the Byzantines did not establish in Egypt and the other areas of the Eastern frontier a rigid chain of fortifications, but rather, fortified positions in which the nomads held a key position and freedom of movement (M. Sharon, The military reforms of Abū Muslim, their background and consequences, in Studies in Islamic history and civilization, ed. Sharon, Leiden 1986, 108; Ph. Mayr-Peter, The Sasanians and the Limes, in BASOR, cxxxi [1986], 35-47).

The Byzantine hagiographical sources mention repeated raids by Arab nomads against the monasteries of Sinai, but they also report that there were certain Arab tribes allied with the monks. These Bedouin Arabs had settled in various places of Sinai, probably already from the first century A.D. (Cl. Bailey, Bedouin place-names in Sinai: towards understanding a desert map, in Palestine Exploration Fund Qfly., xvi [1984], 42-57, and idem, Dating the arrival of the Bedouin tribes in Sinai and the Negev, in JESHO, xxvii [1985], 20-49). For the Arab tribes which protected the Byzantines in Sinai at the time of Justinian, there is new information derived from the Arabic manuscripts of St. Catherine (ibid., 33; al-Tabarî, Cairo 1326, iii, 107).

In general, although our information is fragmentary, the overall impression is that the nomad Arabs did not play as prominent a role in Arab conquests of Egypt as they did in Syria. Al-Tabari confirms the information of the Byzantine hagiographical works that the Bedouin tribes of Sinai assisted the Byzantines against the invading Arab army, but on the other hand, al-Kalkaşandlı reports the speedy alliance of other Arab tribes with ʿAmr (Nihiyat al-ʿArab, Cairo 1938, 193). Of course, we must also take into consideration that the inefficient payment of the allied Arab tribes of Egypt, as in other areas of the eastern frontier, by the Byzantines on the eve of the Arab conquest may have been a detrimental factor in the Byzantine defence of Egypt (W. E. Kaegi, Heraklia and the Arabs, in The Greek Orthodox Theological Review, xxvii [1982], 116 ff.).

The Byzantines' exhaustion because of their continuous struggle with Persia in the Near East was particularly apparent in Egypt, which was occupied by the Persians just a few years before the Arab conquest. It is true that the Egyptians' dissatisfaction with oppressive Byzantine religious policies against the Monophysites cannot be denied, but this factor has been grossly exaggerated by many scholars who have not taken into consideration the multitude of the rival heresies within the Monophysite movement and the lack of any concerted resistance by all Egyptian Monophysites against the central Orthodox authority. In contrast, little attention has been paid to some Christian leaders, who, whether converted to Islam or not, offered actual assistance to the Arabs, motivated in the first place by personal ambitions. A typical case is Sanutius, appointed by ʿAmr as governor of the province of Rih (Delta), who vigorously helped ʿAmr in his expedition against Libya.

Heavy taxation and corrupt administration were worse in Egypt than in any other of the eastern parts of the Byzantine Empire; but above all, it was the disunity which prevailed in the Egyptian administration after Justinian's reforms and the rivalry between the multitude of authorities that created a chaotic situation there after the conquest.

In contrast, under the leadership of ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ, the invading Arab forces demonstrated coordination and unity. ʿAmr often consulted with the caliph and kept his army informed before any important decisions were made, as he did before the capitulation of
Alexandria. He cautiously counterbalanced the superiority in numbers and equipment of the Byzantine army by applying skilful military tactics. The Byzantines had constructed many well-fortified fortresses in Egypt, of which the most conspicuous was that of Babylon. 'Amr, who did not possess any siege equipment, besieged Babylon patiently for a long time, cutting its supply lines and engaging the Byzantines in a continuous war of attrition.

Most of his army was composed of cavalry, which moved at ease across the terrain of the Egyptian deserts and oases. There were no definite, prepared long-term plans, but the Arab army moved with great flexibility as the occasion arose. The existence of nomads and sedentary people among the ranks of 'Amr's army, the former expert in hit-and-run attacks, and the latter more skilful and patient in the siege of towns, offered the Arabs a great advantage (Hill, The role of the camel and the horse in the early Arab conquests, in War, technology and society in the Middle East, ed. V.J. Parry and M.E. Yapp, London 1975, 39).

We have also to take into consideration that the Arab conquest of Egypt was facilitated by the favourable situation for the Arabs which was created in Constantinople at the most critical moments of their invasion. After the death of Heraclius and of his son Constantius, Constans II, Heraclonas reigned, along with his mother Martina. The policy of Heraclonas and Martina towards the Arabs, in contrast to Heraclius's aggressive strategy, was that of pacification and surrender. They reinstated Cyrus and sent him back with full power to conclude a treaty of surrender with the Arabs (Dionysia Misrou, The will of Heraclius I and the crisis of 641, Thessaloniki 1985, 232 [in Greek]).

Administrative, fiscal and social changes during early Muslim rule until 'Abd al-Malik.

From the conquest until the turn of the 8th century A.D., there were no abrupt and conspicuous changes in the lower levels of the administration. Simultaneously, a dual system of administration was imposed, one for the Muslims and another for the Christians, and an extreme centralisation replaced the loose Byzantine administrative system. The meticulous control of every facet of the administrative and fiscal machinery during this period strongly resembled the Prolemaic one (see H. Cadell, Problèmes relatifs au sel, in Atti dell’ XI Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Milan 1966, 284). But while in Prolemaic times Egypt was an independent entity and no local resources were wasted, the Arabs continued the Byzantine policy of shipment of corn and tribute outside the country, now from Fustat via Suez to Djudda and Medina instead of via the former route Alexandria-Constantinople.

At the top of the new administrative machinery there was now the governor of Egypt, who held the title of wali (σωμβολως, usually called πανεπιστόμως σωμβολως) and was directly responsible to the caliph, or he also held absolute judicial authority. The Arabs continued in Egypt, as well as in their other provinces, the Byzantine tradition of combining administrative and judicial power in the same hands (E. Tyan, Histoire de l'organisation judiciaire en pays d’Islam, Leiden 1960; Aik. Christophopoulou, Τα βυζαντινά δικαστήρια κατά τούς αιώνες Ι-ΙΑ, in Διστοχα κι, [1986], 164).

At the turn of the 7th century A.D., Egypt was subdivided into provinces, a division which continued for centuries. The first (Upper Egypt) included the old Byzantine provinces of Arcadia and Thebais and the latter Augustamnica and Egypt proper. It is noteworthy, nevertheless, that the old Byzantine division of southern Egypt into two provinces bearing the name of Thebais and a third called Arcadia reappeared in later times, i.e. the Upper Sa'id from Aswan to Akhmim, the second Sa'id from Akhmim to Bahnas and the Lower Sa'id from Bahnas to Fustat (see Remondom, Papyri greco d’Appollonis Ano, Paris-Cairo 1953, 21). The governors of these provinces bore the title of amir in Arabic, rendered as ἀμπέλ, ἀμπελας or δόξα in Greek (see J. Maspero-G. Wiet, Maximea pour servir à la géographie de l’Egypte, in Acta Ao, xxxvi [1919], 227 ff.; H.I. Bell, The administration of Egypt under the Umayyad Khilifs, in BZ, xxvii [1929], 278-86; K. Sayyida, Mis’fī ‘aṣr al-wulad, Cairo n.d.; ‘Abd al-Mun‘im Muḥtar, On the survival of the Byzantine administration in Egypt during the first century of the Arab rule, in Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, xxvii [1973], 309-19. There is a certain confusion in this article in the use of titles as, for example, the identification of τάγματα and πάγκαρος, who were different administrators, etc.).

‘Abd Allāh b. Sa‘īd b. Abī Sarḥ, who succeeded the first governor ‘Amr ca. 25/645-6, was responsible for the organisation of the office of finances (dīwān al-kharādh) in Islamic Egypt. The taxation system which was immediately applied after the conquest is not well documented, while for the following period there are still many undecided questions (the main work is still D.C. Dennett’s Conversion and the poll tax in early Islam, Cambridge, Mass. 1959; useful are A. Grohmann’s studies, Probleme der arabischen Papyrusforschung, II, in ArO, v [1933], 273-83, and Zum Steuerwesen Arabischen Aegyptens, in Acta des V. congrès international de papyrologie, Brussels 1938, 123-34; Bell, op. cit.; see also L. Casson, Tax collection problems in early Arab Egypt, in TAPA, lxix [1938], 274-91; ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Dārī, Landlord and peasant in early Islam, in Isl., iv [1979], 97-105; of particular importance are Kossei Morimoto’s studies Land tenure in Egypt during the early Islamic period, in Oriente, xi [1975], 109-53, and idem, The fiscal administration of Egypt in the early Islamic period, Tokyo 1981, in spite of their bibliographical gaps. See a thorough but occasionally severe review by C. Seckel, Arabische Grenzgebiete, in ZfEG, xxxvi [1934], 225-35; ‘Azīz al-Dārī, Land tenure and social transformation in early Islamic Egypt, in Land tenure and social transformation in the Middle East, ed. Tarif Khalidi, Beirut 1984, 131-9, and the arts. FAY', QHANIMA and DARBA; brief but useful remarks are also found in F. Donner, The formation of the Islamic state, in JFS, cv [1986], 283-95).

According to the so-called treaty of ‘Amr, the inhabitants of Egypt were supposed to pay a poll-tax of two dinārs (not including women, children, slaves and beggars); but naturally, this left open the problem of a practical and fair distribution of the tax burden. Meanwhile, most of the Arab conquerors were given no land for cultivation but resided in the amirāt (garrison towns), mainly in Fustat and Alexandria. Cash stipends, āfla‘, were regularly paid to them and their families (see Caetani, Annali, iv, 368-417; A.S. Tritton, Notes on the Muslim system of pensions, in BSOS, xvi [1954], 1702; G.-R. Puin, Der Diwdn von Misr b. al-Hajibât. Ein Beitrag zur frühislamischen Verwaltungsgeschichte, 1970).

Morimoto states that there were only a few early cases of land granted to Muslims, who acquired substantial land estates only after the lst/7th century (Land tenure in Egypt, 112). While there is no doubt that the conditions which prevailed in Egypt after the 1st century accelerated the acquisition of land for the Muslims, the question that has remained unanswered is, who obtained the land abandoned by those who left
Egypt after its conquest and how much of the unclaimed land (mawd) was taken by the community and/or the warriors (mukdtal), with a list of the taxpayers and the tax to be imposed on them. This register was sent to the treasury in Fustat (the bayt al-mal [q. e. ]). Afterwards, the governors sent demand notes (luwzun) defining the amount of money taxes and embole (tax in kind to be paid) [see meina and khmsk]. In addition to these main taxes, a variety of other ones were also imposed (Donner, *Formation*, 287, n. 18). As in Byzantine times, the special grain tax known as ḥebol was regularly applied to the farmers. Part of the ḥebol was to be paid as tax in kind (NIK) which was given not only in cook-bread (mukd) or other produce (mukshurrub), hides, and supplies for the ships, etc.) (PEPF 557, Pap. Rem 94; see A. Grohmann’s remarks in *Aperçu de papyrologie arabe*, in *Études de Papyrologie*, i (1932), 44, 59).

The Egyptians were again asked to offer forced labour services (ṣuyurra) for the construction and repairing of bridges, canals and other public works; and an additional obligation was now their participation in the *kórdos*, naval expeditions against the Byzantines. The frantic efforts by the Arab authorities in Umayyad Egypt to construct ships and to equip them properly with sailors and marines are vividly described in the papyri. The *anir* constantly sent the local authorities threatening letters, demanding simple workers (ṣurya or ḥuyra) and specialised technicians (ṣuqra or sugla) cf. Pap. Lond. 1334; Pap. Apoll. Ant. 29, 5-6). The sailors (*ṣurya*) were recruited from each pagarchy or district in accordance with a well-defined quota system; the pagarchies undertook, moreover, the maintenance (sabian) of the sailors and supplied them with farina (*xéropo*), bread (*xeroum* or *stíxov*) and other staple provisions. They also provided all the equipment of the ships (*apoinoumen* in *Papyrus grecs* 557, Pap. Rem 94; cf. *Papyrus Rem. 26, l. 3: xexyov; l. 33: xexyov). Therefore, Dennett’s statement (*Conversion*, 90) that in early Islamic Egypt “private ownership of land does not seem to have existed” is incorrect.

The artisans who worked in early Islamic Egypt were eagerly protected by the still powerful nobility of the preserved *olxos* (great estates of the nobility). In the Byzantine period, the artisans were free to choose to work either for the state because of the lack of man- power, *leixandria* (Pap. Rem. 26, l. 4).

In this period, conversion to Islam took place on a very limited scale. Since the new converts to Islam were not automatically relieved of the land tax, there were few incentives for the Egyptians to abandon their religion and traditions. It is only after ‘Umar II’s policies of toleration and the generous edict of 100/718, in which he encouraged fiscal relief for the newly-converted Egyptians, that such incentives were introduced.

For the Muslims in Egypt, the most important office after that of the governor of Egypt was that of the police commander. From the time of ‘Amr, a police force, *shurta* [q. v.], was established in Egypt to protect the governor and keep the order in towns (Tyan, *op. cit.*). This police force was actually part of the military; its chief, the *sish al-shutta*, was appointed by the governor until late Umayyad times, but his authority was in fact better established than that of the governor, for whom he acted as deputy when the latter was absent or ill. While theoretically he was under the jurisdiction of the governor, since he was selected from the local aristocracy, the *shurta* had greater local support which could override the whim of all governors. They usually held office longer than the governors and were succeeded by members of their own families, creating powerful dynasties (H. Kennedy, *Central government and provincial elites*, in *BSOAS*, xlv [1981], 35 ff.). While the

The early Islamic taxation system secured the continuation of the Coptic communities in the countryside and the preservation of the status of certain leading families, as is attested from the papyri of Aphroditio and Edfu. The nobility in the village communities, possessing the power of assessment of the taxes and holding important positions, including the post of pagarchus in the administration, exercised great power over the Christian population. Simultaneously, the Egyptian artisans who formed powerful guilds in Byzantine times did not disappear. In Pap. Rem. 75, dated by the editor to ca. 703, we meet a long list of professionals in Apollonopoliis who belong to the guilds of sailors, fishermen, builders, pot makers, etc. Among them there is also a reference (l. 12) to the guild of the salaried farmers (*mukhtarum* *γαργρων*) who worked under contracts. Such salaried farmers and salaried pot makers worked in the great estate of the pagarch Pappas in Apollonopoliis (Pap. Rem. 98). Pappas was not the only wealthy landlord, and references to other great estates appear in Apollonopoliis (see e.g. Pap. Rem. 78). Of course, these great estates were smaller than those of the Byzantine times, but the landlords still possessed their own bakeries, a number of camels, horses and numerous servants (Pap. Rem. 98, 5: *δεκαπενθήκα τον οικί ηλικχα*). Therefore, it seems that the statements (γιαντ (*I.17*), 1979, 27).

These raids against Byzantium (*kórdos*) took place following a stereotyped pattern. Orders were sent by the *anir* to each pagarch to recruit Christian sailors and send them to the meeting points (papnyallov = castra). The sailors were dispatched from their garrisons in Fustat and Alexandria. The marines (*piaxoi*) formed two classes: the *mušadgun* (*μοιχαταέμ*), who were Muslims of Arab origin, and the newly-converted *mawdali* (*μωδαλεί*). An Arabic papyrus informs us that even the quality of bread prepared for the marines (*xekyov*) was better than that of the sailors (*maudaliv*) Yusuf Râjîb, *Lettres nouvelles de Quirra b. Sarrî*, in *JNES* [1901], 173 ff.). Egyptian workers and technicians were also recruited by the Arabs and sent out of the country to participate in the construction of mosques; for example, the P. Lond. 1403 informs us about a recruitment of such labour force, which was sent to Jerusalem for the construction of its mosque.

According to this, at first a specially selected group of prominent citizens of every kûra, the smallest financial district, was selected to prepare the cadaster (*xatér**fari*), with a list of the taxpayers and the tax to be imposed on them. This register was sent to the treasury in Fustat (the bayt al-mal [q. e. ]). Afterwards, the governors sent demand notes (luwzun) defining the amount of money taxes and embole (tax in kind to be paid) [see meina and khmsk]. In addition to these main taxes, a variety of other ones were also imposed (Donner, *Formation*, 287, n. 18). As in Byzantine times, the special grain tax known as ḥebol was regularly applied to the farmers. Part of the ḥebol was to be paid as tax in kind (NIK) which was given not only in cook-bread (mukd) or other produce (mukshurrub), hides, and supplies for the ships, etc.) (PEPF 557, Pap. Rem 94; see A. Grohmann’s remarks in *Aperçu de papyrologie arabe*, in *Études de Papyrologie*, i (1932), 44, 59).

The Egyptians were again asked to offer forced labour services (ṣuyurra) for the construction and repairing of bridges, canals and other public works; and an additional obligation was now their participation in the *kórdos*, naval expeditions against the Byzantines. The frantic efforts by the Arab authorities in Umayyad Egypt to construct ships and to equip them properly with sailors and marines are vividly described in the papyri. The *anir* constantly sent the local authorities threatening letters, demanding simple workers (ṣurya or ḥuyra) and specialised technicians (ṣuqra or sugla) cf. Pap. Lond. 1334; Pap. Apoll. Ant. 29, 5-6). The sailors (*ṣurya*) were recruited from each pagarchy or district in accordance with a well-defined quota system; the pagarchies undertook, moreover, the maintenance (sabian) of the sailors and supplied them with farina (*xéropo*), bread (*xeroum* or *stíxov*) and other staple provisions. They also provided all the equipment of the ships (*apoinoumen* in *Papyrus grecs* 557, Pap. Rem 94; cf. *Papyrus Rem. 26, l. 3: xexyov; l. 33: xexyov). Therefore, Dennett’s statement (*Conversion*, 90) that in early Islamic Egypt “private ownership of land does not seem to have existed” is incorrect.

The artisans who worked in early Islamic Egypt were eagerly protected by the still powerful nobility of the preserved *olxos* (great estates of the nobility). In the Byzantine period, the artisans were free tochoose to work either for the state because of the lack of manpower, *leixandria* (Pap. Rem. 26, l. 4).

In this period, conversion to Islam took place on a very limited scale. Since the new converts to Islam were not automatically relieved of the land tax, there were few incentives for the Egyptians to abandon their religion and traditions. It is only after ‘Umar II’s policies of toleration and the generous edict of 100/718, in which he encouraged fiscal relief for the newly-converted Egyptians, that such incentives were introduced.

For the Muslims in Egypt, the most important office after that of the governor of Egypt was that of the police commander. From the time of ‘Amr, a police force, *shurta* [q. v.], was established in Egypt to protect the governor and keep the order in towns (Tyan, *op. cit.*). This police force was actually part of the military; its chief, the *sish al-shutta*, was appointed by the governor until late Umayyad times, but his authority was in fact better established than that of the governor, for whom he acted as deputy when the latter was absent or ill. While theoretically he was under the jurisdiction of the governor, since he was selected from the local aristocracy, the *shurta* had greater local support which could override the whim of all governors. They usually held office longer than the governors and were succeeded by members of their own families, creating powerful dynasties (H. Kennedy, *Central government and provincial elites*, in *BSOAS*, xlv [1981], 35 ff.). While the...
authority of the sāḥib al-qurta was restricted in Fustāt and the Arab settlements, the enforcement of order in Coptic Egypt, possibly in the hands of the local administrators who, under the authority of the pagarch, could arrest and imprison the culprits (Pap. Rem. 63-69). The duties of the bucelarii as a sort of gendarmerie still continued in the Arab period but were greatly curtailed. While in the Byzantine period the bucelarii often undertook the important task of collecting taxes (see Pap. Oxy. 2480, 1, 29, 35, dating from 565 A.D., preserved by Ibn al-muqaffa' (al-buṣur), such duties were now performed by the mudhājirun Arabs (muḥḍājirūn) and the bucelarii were reduced to doing minor tasks.

The Arab administration had another powerful official who acted as a watchdog, the sāḥib al-bandar or chief of posts and intelligence (see barīt), at whose disposal were the treasury officials (summāt al-amīr) who secured the public safety of the individuals (APEL, vii, nos. 174-5; Donner, op. cit., 286).

Justice for the Muslims was in the hands of the office of the kādī al-kudūt (Chief Judge), and the kādīs (q.v.) acquired great power. As for the Christians, the chief judicial power was in the hands of the bishops, who in the early Umayyad period had retained at least partly some of their old civil administrative functions. According to the legislation of C.1.55, 8, the bishops of the town participated in the supervision of sureties and in a number of other administrative functions. In the Pap. Oxy. XVI 1848 (6th-7th century) there is mention of a bishop advising on behalf of a tax payer. In Pap. Apoll. 46 (703-15 A.D.), a bishop appears participating in a committee of sureties. In the same papyrus there is the mention of ṣanṭītān, i.e. houses for the poor and or sick, which continued to be under the supervision of bishops and the church in the Egyptian towns. Justice was also administered in the Christian communities of Egypt by the pagarch (pāγαρχος) (M.A. Cheira, Le pagarque au Ier siècle P.H. d'après les papyrus d'Aphrodisie, in King Farouk Univ., Bull. of Fac. of Arts, i [1943], 105-18). In Byzantine Egypt after the 3rd century A.D., there appears the administrative unit known as the pagarchia, a subject of some of the which included rural areas, i.e. districts financially administered by pagarchs; these became the kūwār (sing. kūna) in Arabic. In addition to the pagarch there was another administrative officer, the tophar (τωφάρχος) who often replaced him.

While some of the Greek titles of officials found in the papyri of early Islamic Egypt show that certain Byzantine administrative officers continued to function, one should note that the same Byzantine titles frequently denote different functions in the Arab period, something which is often forgotten by scholars who simply accept the Arab adoption of an almost uninterrupted Byzantine administration.

The most conspicuous example of the use of a Greek title for an official whose function was greatly diminished in early Islamic Egypt was that of the bουκάλλαρος. In the late Byzantine times, the bουκάλλαρος of Egypt were a sort of gendarmerie spread over various parts of the country, ready to repel any attacks by the Saracen or the Blemmyes, and simultaneously enforcing law and order in the countryside. Their latter function was often at the disposal of the great landlords, although they remained under the jurisdiction of the public administration. In the early Arab period, the term bουκάλλαρος was restricted to a number of money carriers or messengers (Pap. Rem. 30.1) and nothing remained of their lofty Byzantine status (see Gasco, L'institution des bucelarii, 144 ff.) Thus Bell's theory (The administration of Egypt under the Umayyad Khalifs, 280) that the bucelarii under the Arab period were simply an adaption of the Byzantine bucelarii cannot be accepted. A number of other armed or unarmed messengers carrying old Byzantine titles also appear in many other papyri. It should be noticed that in early Islamic Egypt, above all the various servi armati stood a new genre, that of the muḥḍājirūn (mudhājirūn), while that of barīt and barīn (from Ar. barīd) was also added.

The most impressive innovation at this time was the creation of a new office, that of the "commissioner" of the fugitives, ṣiṣāxov θων φυλωτόν. In contrast to the ponderous administration of the late Byzantine times, this official, cutting through the hierarchy, nullified the power of the pagarchs—who were liable to capital punishment for neglect of their duties towards the fugitives—and being responsible only to the governor, the amīr, checked the proper application of his orders concerning the arrest and return of the fugitives to their homeland. Thus in Inv. nos. 1332, 1333, it is stated that the governor Kurra b. Sharīk (q.v.) sent from Fustāt six guards to Basil, the pagarch of Aphroditopolis, in order to search for fugitives, overriding the latter's authority.

There are numerous references to the fugitives (Greek φυλωτάς, Arabic ʿilāyfa) in the Greek, Arabic and Coptic papyri of early Arab Egypt. The great number of all these fugitives puzzled Bell, who attributed their flight to the perennial dissatisfaction of the Egyptian peasants over their exploitation (The administration of Egypt, 284). Nevertheless, neither his explanations nor the statement of the biased Coptic author, Severus of al-Mashāfī and Alexander II (P.O. v, 64), that men began to flee from place to place because of the harsh rule of Kurra b. Sharīk, sheds light on the actual reasons for the general phenomenon of the flights in various parts of Egypt (for references to the fugitives in the Greek and Arabic papyri, see Cadell, op. cit., 118, n. 1; for the problem of the fugitives, see also N. Abbott, The Kurrā paqepos, 67, 97, and on Kurra b. Sharīk, the part. s.v.). Bell himself and another author associated the phenomenon of the great increase in flights at this time to the allure which Fustāt, the new capital of Egypt, exercised upon the peasants; but in reality, the opposite happened, and the novelty in early Islamic Egypt is the mass flight of town dwellers back to their villages, abandoning Fustāt.

The new capital Fustāt (q.v.) was chosen by the Arabs because of its geographical location, which was more convenient to them than that of the famous city of Alexandria: it stood in a key position between Upper and Lower Egypt and on a convenient route linked with the Red Sea. According to John of Nikiu, the ancient canal connecting Babylon with the Red Sea at al-Kulzum (q.v.) (near modern Suez), which had been silted up, was cleared out by the Muslims and reopened (Chronicle, 195). Thus the corn and tribute previously sent to Constantinople via Alexandria could be shipped by the Muslims through the Red Sea to Quidda and then to Mecca. Of course, such use of the canal must have been limited in scope and impractical, because of the labour involved in keeping it navigable; instead, the traditional camel route continued to be used. Fustāt, established outside the walls of the fortress of Babylon in the early years of the Arab conquest of Egypt, remained mainly a military camp where the Arab clans were grouped in well-defined tribal quarters. The khhīṣat al-al-rūya was located at the centre and the other tribes of the Arabs
developed around it, while a separate quarter outside, 
khittat ahl al-zdhir, was reserved for those who had no
kinsmen (A.R. Guest, The foundation of Fustat and the
Khitat...allar, 177, 18). It can be understood that this new
capital, where 'Amr's mosque was erected and where the religion
of Islam and Arab tribalism were so conspicuous, was
unlikely to lure any great number of Copts in early
Islamic Egypt, thus risking their freedom and aban-
donning their traditional villages.

The problem of fugitives reveals a serious pattern of
socio-economic change, as is pointed out by
Morimoto (The fiscal administration, 120 ff.), and it
does not have simply a legal and fiscal aspect, as
asserted by Gascou (Miscellaneous, 106 ff.). A careful
study of the papyri reveals that there were two
categories of fugitives caused by two different reasons.
In the first category, the peasants' flight was due to
dissatisfaction with their poverty created by over-
taxation, a typical reaction of the Egyptian fellahin
from the Pharaonic period, and continuing in the
Hellenistic and later periods (see A.E. Samuel, The
money economy and the Polieicai peasantry, in Bull. of the
American Soc. of Papyrologists, xxxi [1984], 196). In the
second category, we notice the flight of unskilled
labourers from Fustat or other towns back to their
villages, a unique event in the previous history of
Egypt. It is for them that the most severe punishments
were reserved, and any neglect of the proper
authorities—including the pagarch—to catch fugitive
labourers could even draw capital punishment upon
them.

An Arabic papyrus from Aphroditopolis, dating
from ca. 710 A.D. (P. Sorbonne INV, 2343), written
in obscure style, describes some trade dealings of a
fugitive with the pagarch Basil and the governor
Kurra (Rágib, Lettres nouvelles de Qurra b. Sarik, 178 ff.).
The mild treatment of this fugitive (ṭāhyya) by the
authorities is explained by the fact that he was not a
labourer. By contrast, in Pap. Remond. 9, which
describes the flight of skilled workers from the
shipyards of Fustat back to their villages, the pagarch
is threatened with death if he fails to arrest the
fugitives. This constant recruitment of unskilled and
skilled labourers, who were asked to serve in the
shipyards with their own tools and were considered
as state servants (Pap. Remond. 52, ἰστατῶν δημοσίων ἐν Ἡλληνίδαις) deprived the villages of their most
valuable and skilled manpower. In addition to the
constant state demands for labourers, another
unspecified number of builders was recruited from the
villages and these were sent abroad to help the con-
struction of mosques in other places of the Arab
caliphate. This was not a novelty in Egypt, since in the
Life of St. John of Alexandria (ed. Gelzer, 37), it
stated that the Patriarch of Alexandria had sent one
thousand Egyptian workers for the rebuilding of the
church in Jerusalem; but now the demand for workers
in the newly-established caliphate exceeded by far the
previous requisitions (for the chronic problem of shor-
tage of skilled manpower in late Roman and Byzan-
tine Egypt, see Greek papyri in the collection of New
York University, ed. N. Lewis, i, 1967, no. 25).

The drain of manpower from the villages did not
only create serious economic problems in the Egyp-
tian provinces but also caused social upheavals. The
resettlement of Christian labourers from their village
communities to Fustat and the other towns, to a
large Muslim environment, created great
dissatisfaction and forced them to abandon en masse
the towns and return to the provinces. In order to deal
with this serious problem, the state not only created
the office of the commissioner of the fugitives, as
noted above, but also ordered the issue of passports
for all Egyptians who travelled (PEPF, 601-3). The
problem of the fugitives is also related to the taxation
of the monks. The financial burdens of the Coptic
church until the mid-Umayyad period were somewhat
heavier than in the previous Byzantine period. From
Severus's History of the Patriarchs of the Egyptian Church,
which covers the period from Benjamin I (622-61) to
that of Michael IV (1092-1102), as well as from a
number of Greek papyri, we learn that tax-exempt
monasteries outnumbered by far those which paid
taxes (Morimoto, Land tenure in Egypt during the early
Islamic period, 121). Certainly, at the beginning of
Arab rule, the monks were exempt from the poll-tax
which was imposed on them later, after a great
number of peasants had fled to them in order to avoid
the burden of taxes.

The later period up to 750 A.D.

It seems that it was at the time of 'Abd al-Malik
that the monks, who hitherto paid no poll-tax, were
obliged to pay this tax regularly. Meanwhile, the
governor of Fustat, 'Abd al-'Aziz, applied stricter
financial controls in the countryside (Eutychius,
Annales, 41; Dennett, 81). At the same time, another
change was completed; the Christian designs and inscriptions on coins were
replaced with purely epigraphic designs and Qur'anic
inscriptions. Actually, there was a transitional period
preceded by minor alterations in the Byzantine coins,
but it was in 'Abd al-Malik's time that the great
reform was completed. See P. Grierson, The monetary
reforms of 'Abd al-Malik, in JESHO, iii [1960], 241-24;
N. M. Lowick, Early Arab figure types, in The Numismatic
Circular, ixviii/3 [1970]; R. J. Hebert, The early coinage
of Bilād ash-Shām, in Proc. of the 4th International
Congress of Bilād al-Shām, Amman 1985, Amman 1987,
133-54.

'Abd al-Malik's first important changes were fol-
lowed by some sweeping further ones which cannot be
easily traced. Christians could no longer become
higher officials, the language of the administration
was changed from Greek to Arabic, and Muslims
replaced the Christian notables who assessed the taxes
(J. Gascou-K.A. Worp, Problèmes de documentation
apollonopolitique, in Zeitschr. f. Papyrologie, xlix [1982],
83-95; Frantz-Murphy, op. cit., 131 ff.). One of the most
sweeping changes which took place at the end of
Umayyad Egypt, in order to increase the revenue of
Egypt by any means, was the new status acquired by
the director of finances ('āmil), who became responsible
directly to the caliph in Damascus. For this
purpose, a trusted and efficient person, 'Ubayd Allah b.
al-Habhab, was appointed in this position (ca.
106/724) by the caliph Hishām (for a brilliant presen-
tation of his personality and activities, see Abbott,
A new papyrus and a review of the administration of
'Ubaid Allah b. al-Habhab, in Arabic and Islamic studies in honor
of Hamilton A. R. Gibb, ed. G. Makkidi, Leiden 1965,
21-35, who somewhat underplays the bad con-
sequences of his policies in Egypt caused by his financial
system). 'Ubayd Allah immediately ordered a new
land survey, followed by an abrupt increase of taxa-
tion. According to the Patriarch Severus, the new
measures of 'Ubayd Allah doubled the revenue in
Egypt (PO, v, 86). The tax rise caused immediately
the first Coptic revolt in 1077-25 (al-Kindi, Wu'dt
Misr, ed. Guest, 73; al-Makrizi, Khitat, ed. Cairo, i,
79, ii, 492). 'Ubayd Allah in 109/727-8 took another
drastic action which greatly contributed to the
arabisation and islamisation of Egypt, i.e. he settled 3,000 Arabs from the tribe of Kays near Bilbays in the Eastern Delta and transferred their Arab-Muslim registration from the diwan of Syria to that of Egypt. By the end of the Umayyad period, Fustat changed from a military town into a prosperous active city. While initially the peasant Copts strove to abandon Fustat and return to their villages, the growth of the city now attracted many adventurous Christian merchants, artisans and newly-converted Egyptians (masādī). In 114/732 ‘Ubayd Allāh at another stroke brought 5,000 Arabs, again from the Kays group, and settled them in the Hawf, to the northeast of Fustat, a turbulent area, to outbalance the power of the Copts who lived there (al-Kindi, 76).

In spite of the rapid arabisation of Egypt in the last quarter of the Umayyad period in Egypt, it should be noted that the Coptic language continued to be used by a number of Egyptians as late as the 3rd-5th/9th-11th centuries. Thus in some Arabic contracts of the period, most of which come from Fayyūm, it is stated that certain Egyptians, Christians and/or recent converts to Islam, did not know even oral Arabic and the contracts were read and explained to them in the ‘foreign language’; i.e. Egyptian (Frantz-Murphy, A comparison of the Arabic and earlier Egyptian contract for-

The most significant events were the attempted ‘Alid rebellion of 145/763, which was frustrated by the governor Yazīd b. Hātim in its early stages, and the more wide-ranging revolt of 168/785 against the governor of Muṣṭaf, whose evil reputation as governor of the Dżazira is well known from the Chroni-
cle of the Pseudo-Dionysus of Tall-Mahrī. This revolt united the discontented Arabs of the Hawf behind Dhiyā b. Muṣṭaf, a descendant of the Umayyad ‘Abd Allah b. Dhu ‘Aqīl (c. 777). The beginning of that period when the āṣab al-shurta refused to support Muṣṭaf and he was killed by the rebels. It was left to his sāhib al-shurta ‘Amr al-Ma‘āfīrī to restore order. This period also saw continuing uprisings of Coptic peasants, protesting against fiscal actions.

In the late 2nd/8th century, however, this system came under increasing pressure from Baghdad, anxious to extract ever-increasing sums of money from the province. This resulted in a variety of measures such as appointing special financial investigators like ‘Umar b. Mīhrān in 176/792 and the summoning of the governor to Baghdad to present the accounts in person, as happened in 183/799 and 185/801, but inevitably much of the taxation was never recovered and after the fall of the Barnakids in 186/803 these attempts at fiscal discipline seem to have been relaxed.

As elsewhere the Muslim polity was split in two by the civil war which followed the death of Hārin al-Raḥīd in 193/809 marked the end of the early Islamic polity. The collapse of central government led to a battle for power within the Muslim community and laid the country open to outside adventurers. Shortly before Hārin’s death, a detachment of Kūrāsānī troops under al-Sari b. al-Hakam arrived in the country. They seized power in Fustat in 200/815, destroying the local militia under the control of the wudjaḥ, but they were opposed in the north of the country by a local leader, ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Džarawī. To complicate matters further, Alexandria was taken over by refugees from al-Andalus who had been driven out by the Umayyad amīr al-Hakam [q.v.]. It was not until 211/826 that ‘Abd Allāh b. Tāhir [q.v.] finally returned the country to ‘Abbasīd rule: the Andalusīs were expelled and went to settle in Crete [see ʿarabītijj] and compromises were made with the other leaders, al-Sari’s son ‘Ubayd Allāh being settled in Sāmārā with a large cash payment.

The civil war profoundly affected Muslim Egypt. The power of the local wudjaḥ was destroyed, the process being completed when Arabs were dropped from the diwan and so ceased to receive the ‘ādī. Power lay with a succession of military figures, because of the crisis in their military components. These men, one of Turkish or Armenian origin, served as deputies for important figures at the court in Sāmārā, lacking in prestige and enjoying only short periods in office. The long-


2 From the ‘Abbāsīds to the Fāujīms 750-969.

Mīsr at the time of the ‘Abbāsid take-over in 132/750 was a country in which Islam and Arab culture were still confined to the ruling élite, the vast majority of the population still being Coptic Christians. Fustat was the capital and centre of the Arab population, with the mosque of ‘Amr being the main place of worship. The leaders of Arab society were the group known as the wudjaḥ, the élite. They were mostly descended from families who had settled in Egypt after the original Muslim conquest and they occupied a privileged position, forming the local, inefficient militia which constituted the only standing military force in the country, and being paid ‘ādī [q.v.] accordingly. The sāhib al-shurta [see sharīa] was usually chosen from their ranks. There also seems to have been an urban Muslim population at Alexandria who may have formed their own military force. In addition there were Arab tribes, notably in the Hawf deserts to the east and west of the Nile Delta.

The history of Mīsr in this period can be divided into a number of distinct phases. The first, which lasted until the death of Hārin al-Raḥīd, in 193/809, was essentially a continuation of the Umayyad pattern, with governors sent from Baghdād rather than Damascus, and there seems to have been little change in the population or political structure and no settlement of ‘Abbāsīd supporters from the East. The political history of the period was marked by frequent changes of governor and sporadic rebellions. Of the governors, only Yazīd b. Hātim al-Muḥallabī (142-52/759-69) [see muḥallabīs] remained in office for more than a few years and none were able to attain any independent status; in the twelve years 170 to 182 (787-99) there were sixteen changes of governor. Continuity was provided by the sāhib al-shurta, who were effectively deputy governors.

The most significant events were the attempted ‘Alid rebellion of 145/763, which was frustrated by the governor Yazīd b. Hātim in its early stages, and the more wide-ranging revolt of 168/785 against the governor of Muṣṭaf, whose evil reputation as governor of the Dżazira is well known from the Chroni-
cle of the Pseudo-Dionysus of Tall-Mahrī. This revolt united the discontented Arabs of the Hawf behind Dhiyā b. Muṣṭaf, a descendant of the Umayyad ‘Abd Allah b. Dhu ‘Aqīl (c. 777). The beginning of that period when the āṣab al-shurta refused to support Muṣṭaf and he was killed by the rebels. It was left to his sāhib al-shurta ‘Amr al-Ma‘āfīrī to restore order. This period also saw continuing uprisings of Coptic peasants, protesting against fiscal actions.

In the late 2nd/8th century, however, this system came under increasing pressure from Baghdad, anxious to extract ever-increasing sums of money from the province. This resulted in a variety of measures such as appointing special financial investigators like ‘Umar b. Mīhrān in 176/792 and the summoning of the governor to Baghdad to present the accounts in person, as happened in 183/799 and 185/801, but inevitably much of the taxation was never recovered and after the fall of the Barnakids in 186/803 these attempts at fiscal discipline seem to have been relaxed.

As elsewhere the Muslim polity was split in two by the civil war which followed the death of Hārin al-Raḥīd in 193/809 marked the end of the early Islamic polity. The collapse of central government led to a battle for power within the Muslim community and laid the country open to outside adventurers. Shortly before Hārin’s death, a detachment of Kūrāsānī troops under al-Sari b. al-Hakam arrived in the country. They seized power in Fustat in 200/815, destroying the local militia under the control of the wudjaḥ, but they were opposed in the north of the country by a local leader, ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Džarawī. To complicate matters further, Alexandria was taken over by refugees from al-Andalus who had been driven out by the Umayyad amīr al-Hakam [q.v.]. It was not until 211/826 that ‘Abd Allāh b. Tāhir [q.v.] finally returned the country to ‘Abbasīd rule: the Andalusīs were expelled and went to settle in Crete [see ʿarabītijj] and compromises were made with the other leaders, al-Sari’s son ‘Ubayd Allāh being settled in Sāmārā with a large cash payment.

The civil war profoundly affected Muslim Egypt. The power of the local wudjaḥ was destroyed, the process being completed when Arabs were dropped from the diwan and so ceased to receive the ‘ādī. Power lay with a succession of military figures, because of the crisis in their military components. These men, one of Turkish or Armenian origin, served as deputies for important figures at the court in Sāmārā, lacking in prestige and enjoying only short periods in office. The long-
term result was that Egypt no longer had a native Muslim elite and this wealthy country was in future ruled by groups from outside, either Turks from 'Irāk and further east, or Berbers from the west. It is probable that the governors who followed ʿAbd Allāh b. Tahir ensured that Egypt became firmly incorporated into the highly centralised middle ʿAbbāsids state. With no local militia to demand a share, revenue could be despatched straight to the capital. The financial administrators, like the hated and ruthless Ibn al-Mudabbir [q. v.], became key figures in local politics. This fiscal centralisation carried within it the seeds of its own decline, and in Egypt as elsewhere the problem of the government in Sāmarrā gave ambitious governors the chance to keep the revenues for themselves and to use them to build up their own military power. It was in this way that Ahmad b. Tulūn, originally deputy governor for his uncle, who remained in Sāmarrā, assumed authority. The rule of Ahmad b. Tulūn (254-70/868-84 [q. v.]) was in the main a period of peace and prosperity, if only because revenues which had previously been paid to the caliphs were now retained in the country. Ibn Tulūn recruited a new army, mostly comprised of Greeks and black slaves with which to maintain his power. In order to house them he constructed a new settlement, most of which was farther south of the old city of Fustat called al-Katārī, with its own congregational mosque, known to this day as the mosque of Ibn Tulūn, and governor's palace.

His rule saw the beginning of Egyptian involvement in Syrian affairs. There were a number of reasons for this continuous preoccupation, among them the need to ensure alternative food supplies in case of a failure of the Nile, which could prove dangerous, and also the problem of security, since Egypt could be invaded from Palestine if that were to be in hostile hands. There was also the attraction of the Byzantine frontier, especially for Ibn Tulūn who took over responsibility for defence from the feeble ʿAbbāsids caliph, thereby giving his régime both prestige and legitimacy. This preoccupation with Syria was to be one of the major issues in Egyptian history as long as the country remained independent under its own rulers. There were two possible policies. One was the advanced policy espoused by Ibn Tulūn which held that the frontiers of Egypt lay at the Taurus and the Euphrates and that Aleppo, Antioch and all northern Syria should be under Egyptian control. The alternative was the more modest policy of the Ikhshīdīs in the next century, whose ambitions, were restricted to ruling Palestine and Damascus and to remaining on friendly terms with the rulers of northern Syria. Both Fāṭimid and Mamlukīs were to pursue one or other of these policies.

Neither Ibn Tulūn and his son Khumārāwāyih nor the Ikhshīdīs attempted to break away from the ʿAbbāsids structure. They retained a markedly personal and financial independence, but allowed a constitutional dependence which gave their rule legitimacy. Both Ibn Tulūn in 269/882 and Muhammad b. Tughdī [q. v.] in 333/944 tried, without success, to persuade the ʿAbbāsids caliphs of the day to come and establish themselves in Fustāṭ.

Tulūnid power ended with the occupation of the country by an ʿAbbāsids army in 292/905, and the country was to remain a province of the caliphate until 323/935. This spell of ʿAbbāsids rule was not particularly effective. Despite sporadic attempts, it seems that very little revenue was forwarded to Bagdad. This period saw the beginning of two new developments. The first was the Fāṭimid seizure of power in 297/909, which meant that Egypt became a frontier province. The Ikhshīdīs had ruled Ḫirīṣiyā as independent sovereigns before, but they had no pretensions to expand their influence to the East. The Fāṭimidis claimed to be the rightful rulers of the whole Muslim world and made no secret of their determination to take Egypt as the next stage of their progress. In 301-2/913-15 and 307-9/921-2 there were serious Fāṭimid attacks, which entailed the sending of forces from ʿIrāk and Syria which, except in the case of the threat was repelled, it meant that Egypt was more of a liability than asset to the caliphate, and the ʿAbbāsids were prepared to allow it to pass into the hands of anyone who could keep the Fāṭimids out (see further on these attacks, FĀTIMIDS).

The second important development was increasing immigration from ʿIrāk. The 4th/10th century saw a prolonged economic and political crisis in ʿIrāk and many felt that the calmer conditions of Egypt offered more opportunities. Among these were professional bureaucrats, like the Madhara family [see AL-MADHARA], the collapsing ʿAbbāsids administration had little use for their skills, but these were much appreciated in Egypt. The migration of these people was gradual but steady, and it led to the emergence of a Muslim civilian elite in Egypt, which was still far from achieving its potential as a great power. Ikhshīdī rule was conservative, more concerned with securing what it held and keen to maintain good relations with potential rivals like the Ham-dānīs [q. v.], who seem to have added new quarters to the capital city. Under the rule of the black eunuch Kāfir [q. v.], who achieved effective power after Ibn Tughdī's death in 334/946 and remained as ruler, first in the name of Ibn Tughdī's son Unūdūr and later in his own right until his death in 357/968, the Egyptian court became something of a culture centre with his patronage of the poet al-Mutanabbi [q. v.] and others.

On the eve of the Fāṭimid conquest, Muslim Egypt was still far from achieving its potential as a great power. Ikhshīdī rule was conservative, more concerned with securing what it held and keen to maintain good relations with potential rivals like the Ham-dānīs [q. v.] in northern Syria if possible. The dynasty had no distinctive ideology and no significant body of supporters. Compared with Egypt at the time of the ʿAbbāsids and the Mamluks, the number of Muslims in the population had certainly increased but they were still not a majority in the country. The early Muslim elite had disappeared and a new one was only slowly forming and the economy was developing. All
the potential was there for Egypt to take its rightful place among the Muslim powers.


(H. Kennedy)

3. The Fatimid period 969-1171.

The political and economic situation in Egypt following the death of Kâfûr was so chaotic that the leading citizens of al-Fustât took the decision to recognize as the ruler of North Africa, despite his Ismâ’îlî persuasion. Encountering no resistance, the army of the Fatimid general Djawhar [q.v.] occupied the Nile Delta in the spring of 338/969; in 3aḥbân 338/July 969, al-Fustât capitulated, in return for a guarantee of security (amân) which stipulated the reform of the monetary system, the restoration of public safety—in particular, protection of the pilgrim routes—the resumption of Holy War against the infidels and toleration of the Sunnî cult (al-Mâkrlzî, Itti’dz, i, 103-6).

To the north-east of al-Fustât, Djawhar founded a garrison town which, after the example of the Fatimid residence near al-Kayrawân, was called al-Mansûriyya; it was only in Ramâdân 362/June 973, when the caliph al-Mu’izz li-dîn Allâh [q.v.] had just established it as his headquarters that it was re-named al-Kâhîm [q.v.], “the Victorious”. In its capacity as “a place of exile” (dâr al-hâgra) of the Prophet’s legitimate successor, the town of Cairo was the exclusive property of the Fatimid caliph, of his court, his administration and his army; the new al-Azhar mosque founded by Djawhar was the centre of Ismâ’îlîm, while the town of al-Fustât, with the old mosque of ʿAmr, remained the citadel of Sunni orthodoxy.

The majority of the rural population of Egypt was still Christian and Coptic-speaking, Christian clerks (kuttâb) occupied the majority of administrative posts; Christian and Jewish officials made a career in the central administration, especially during the reign of the caliph al-ʿAzîz bi-lhâfl (356-86/975-96 [q.v.]). An attempt by the caliph al-Hâkîm bi-amr Allâh (386- 411/996-1021 [q.v.]) to purge the ranks of the civil service and to replace the Christian kuttâb with Muslims was doomed to failure.

Throughout his reign, the caliph al-Hâkîm was at pains to put into effect the discriminatory regulations attributed by Islamic tradition to the caliph ʿUmar I, according to which non-Muslims were required to wear distinctive clothing and signs (belts, black turbans, small crosses, etc.) [see ʿafrî]. These measures, their severity of which has been con- siderably exaggerated by Christian and Sunni authors, seem to have been effected only in a very liberal manner, judging by the numerous renewals of edicts relating to the subject. Between 398 and 410/1009-19, al-Hâkîm ordered the pillaging and destruction of a number of churches, monasteries and synagogues, evidently with the object of furthering his troops (Yahyâ al-Annâkî, ed. Cheikh, 204, i 9 ff. and 231, i 13) and of restoring mosques which had fallen into ruins (al-Musabbihî, quoted by al-Makrlzî, Itti’dz, ii, 96, ii 11 ff.; idem, Khitat, ii, 295, ii 16-20). But this policy was abandoned by al-Hâkîm himself and, under his successors, the Christians regained their former influence (cf. H. Halin, Der Treuhänder Gottes, Die Eidichte des Kaiûf al-Hâkîm, in Isl., ibii [1986], 11-72).

The Sunnîs were not inconvenienced by the Ismâ’îlî regime, even though the guarantees of the amân of Djawhar were not all observed. In particular, the obligatory introduction of the specifically Shi’i formula of the call to prayer [see ʿafrî] with the supple- mental phrase “Let us go to the best of works” (baya’ ʿalâ khatr al-amâd), the prohibition of prayers traditionally offered during the nights of Ramadan (tanâwît), and the Ismâ’îlî method of determining the end of the fast of Ramâdân by calculation (ʿaddad) and not by observation (nâya) of the moon, provoked con- stant tension between Ismâ’îlîs and Sunnîs. Al-Hâkîm temporarily pursued a policy of reconciliation be- tween the Islamic persuasions, guaranteeing to the Sunnîs, by two edicts of toleration (397/1006 and 399/1008) the practice of the fast of Ramâdân and, in accordance with the amân of Djawhar (Idris, ʿUyûn, vi, 293; Yahyâ al-Anţâkî, ed. Cheikh, 195; al- Makrlzî, Itti’dz, ii, 78).

The Fatimids never attempted the forcible imposi- tion of the Ismâ’îlî faith on their subjects, but they preached it systematically in all the provinces of the empire. Alongside every judge (âdîf) responsible for the exoteric (bâtin) sense of the ʿâlma, there was a mis- sionary (dâfî) who initiated novices in the secrets of the esoteric (bâtin) sense reserved for Ismâ’îlîs alone; the “sessions of wisdom” (maqâlîs al-ḥikma, see maqâlî, ii) were accessible to everyone. However, the success of Ismâ’îlî propaganda seems to have been quite ephemeral; after the fall of the Fatimid dynasty, Ismâ’îlism rapidly disappeared.

The claim of the Fatimid caliph to universal sovereignty was soon confronted with the reality of the international political situation. Fatimid power proved too weak to overthrow the ʿAbbâsîd caliphate of Baghdâd, as it was likewise incapable of maintain- ing long-term control of North Africa and Sicily. Nevertheless, under the caliphs al-ʿAzîz, al-Hâkîm, al-Ẓâhir bi-dîn Allâh (414/1021-36) and al-Mustansîr (427- 87/1036-94 [q.v.]) Egypt played the role of a major Mediterranean power which competed successfully with the Byzantine empire on land and at sea, in southern Italy as well as in northern Syria. The Fatimids resisted repeated attempts on the part of the Byzantines to recover control of Syria (from 354/965 onward); in 429/1038 a thirty-year treaty was con- cluded and this was renewed in 440/1050. Although North Africa succeeded, from 443/1050 onward in withdrawing from Fatimid authority in favour of the Zirîds [q.v.], Egypt maintained control of the Red Sea. The Holy Cities were under the domination of the dynasty since its inception, being dependent on deliveries of Egyptian corn. Just as in the period of the Eastern Roman Empire the land of the Nile had fed Constanti- nople, it now fed Mecca and Medina. Fur- thermore, there were in Upper Egypt major religious endowments (masâkîn) in favour of religious institutions of the Holy Cities, and the caliph of Cairo had sup- planted his counterpart in Baghdâd as protector of the Holy Places and as the one responsible for the rites of pilgrimage.

From 439/1047 onward, the Fatimids also
dominated the Yemen in support of a dynasty of Isma‘īlī missionaries, the Sulayhids [q.v.], in such a way that they controlled all trade between the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean via the Red Sea. Egypt thus became the pivot of international commerce. After land-tax (khardaj), the revenues derived from customs fees levied on spices and luxury articles emanating from India and the Far East constituted the most important element of the budget of the Fāṭimid state. In addition, Egypt controlled the supply of Sudanic gold and exported rare raw materials, which were in great demand in Europe, such as alum, and products of high quality, for example woolen fabrics (Upper Egypt) and linen (Dimyāt, Tinnis), brocades and items of precious glassware which were subsequently to be found in great quantity in the museums and church-owned treasures of Europe. An eye-witness of the prosperity of Egypt is the Persian Isma‘īlī missionary (dā'ī) Nāṣr-i Khūraw [q.v.], who visited Cairo in 439/1047 and has left us a description of the town at the height of its splendour (Safar-nāma, ed. Ch. Schefer, Paris 1881, repr. 1970, tr. W. M. Thackston Jr., Nusret-ı Khosrow’s Book of Travels, New York 1986).

The dominant position of Egypt in international commerce led to an influx of European traders. As early as the 6th/12th century, the sea-routes (rather than the land roads) were in great demand in Europe, such as in Syria and in Palestine. The Byzantine emperor, during the trade wars, had imported huge amounts of cloth from the Levant, which were in great demand in Europe, and of commander-in-chief of the armies (amīr al-dīvān). The two military dictators attracted a large number of Armenians Christians, accompanied by their clergy, who augmented the influence of the Armenian church to the detriment of the Coptic church; new military units composed of Armenians were mobilized. A whole series of reforms relating to the treasury, the monetary system and the administration brought a final phase of stability to the Fāṭimid régime, whose religious aura had long since been extinguished, and gave Egypt a new period of internal peace and economic prosperity. With Badr's control, the revenues of land-tax (kharrād) increased from 2,800,000 dinārs in 463/1070-1 to 3,100,000 in 478/1085-6 (al-Makhzūmī, Minhājdī, quoted by al-Makrizī, Khitaṭ, ed. Wiet, ii, 68) and, under the government of his son al-Afdal, they even reached a total of 5,000,000 dinārs (Ibn Muyassar, quoted by al-Makrizī, Khitaṭ, ed. Wiet, ii, 309). In the period of Badr al-Djamal, which saw the re-organisation of the provinces of Egypt, a division which has largely subsisted into the modern age. The former districts (kuwār, sing. kūrā), corresponding to the pagarchies of the Byzantine period which, according to al-Kuḍāyī, were in number under the Fāṭimids (al-Makrizī, Khitaṭ, ed. Wiet, i, 309-11; Maspero-Wiet, Matières, 175 f.) were replaced by 23 provinces (a’māl, sing. ‘amal) of much greater size, 9 in Upper Egypt and 14 in the Delta (Abū Sālih, ed. tr. Evetts, The churches and monasteries of Egypt, Oxford 1895, 17-19, Arabic text 10-12; Maspero-Wiet, Matières, 187 f.; Tünhberg Atlas des vorderen Orienten, map B vii 13 “Asyyper unter den Fatimiden”). According to al-Masubabī (d. 420f1029), quoted by al-Makrizī (Khitaṭ, ed. Wiet, ii, 309), a further reform of the provinces of Egypt numbered 2,395, and those of the Delta 1,439.

The Saljūk invasion of Syria, from 462/1069-70 onward, and the establishment of Crusader principalities along the Syrian coast and in Palestine (1098/99) deprived Egypt of its Syrian provinces and its natural defensive bulwark. In 526/1132, a religious schism caused the defection of the Sulayhids in the Yemen; from 462/1070 onward (and finally in 473/1081) Mecca was subjected to the control of the Saljūkids and recognised the sovereignty of the ʿAbbāsīd caliph. The Fāṭimid state was thus confined to the natural frontiers of Egypt and experienced a rapid diminution of its power. Following the assassination of the dictator al-Afdal on the orders of the caliph al-ʿAmir (515/1121 [q.v.]), the land was rent by internal disorders; ministers, governors and generals competed for power, and for the first time in the period of the caliph al-Ẓafir (544-570/1150-85) Egypt was the object of the ambitions of its Christian and Muslim neighbours. The Byzantine emperor Manuel negotiated with the Christian king of Jerusalem an agreement allowing for the joint occupation of Egypt, a project which was not however realised; on three occasions, Amalric, King of Jerusalem, intervened in Egypt with a Crusader army to prevent the seizure of the country by the amīr of Aleppo Nūr al-Dīn [q.v.]." (1162, 1164, 1167); during this period, Egypt was nothing more than a Frankish protectorate. But when the King appeared in Egypt for the fourth time, with the object of occupying the land definitively, the Syrians gained the upper hand; in 564/1169 the general ʿShirḵāḥ entered Cairo at the head of a Syrian army and appointed himself vizier of the Fāṭimid caliph. After his sudden death, which took place on 22 Djuʿādād II 564/23 March 1169, his nephew ʿṢalāḥ al-Dīn Yūsuf b. Ayyūb [q.v.] succeeded him as vizier; it was he who, on 7 Muḥarram 567/10 September 1171, deposed the last Fāṭimid caliph al-ʿAbbāsīd [q.v.], who was then nine years old, and proclaimed the khūṭba in the name of the ʿAbbāsid caliph al-Mustāsīd. The Isma‘īlī call to prayer was abolished, the mosques were reopened, and Sunniism restored throughout the land.

Among the sources of information relating to Egypt in the Fāṭimid period, the most important are the chronicles of the court. Although none of these have
survived in other than fragmentary form, substantial quotations from the works of Ibn Zulak (d. 387/997), al-Mubaddil (d. 420/1029), and his continuator, Michael of Tinnis (up to 437/1046). The Fāṭimid official al-Kudād (d. 454/1062) was the first to describe the national geography of Egypt; his Khiṭat were the model and the principal source of material for the work of the same title by al-Makrizī (d. 583/1189); although surviving only in fragmentary form, the Mīnḥād is an invaluable source of information concerning the administration, agriculture and fiscal system of Egypt in the 6th/12th century.


The most radical innovation effected by Sālah al-Dīn was the introduction of the system of the ikṭār, [q.v.], which was established in Syria since the Saljuq period. In 572/1176, the sultan ordered a new rūk (a term probably of demotic origin: rūḥ “redistribution of land”), a kind of cadastral revision, of which the object was to measure the surface area of all the lands in Egypt, to assess their value in terms of kharādā, and to distribute them to officers and soldiers as ḫidā, as a substitute for salaries. The system of ḥabāla of the Fāṭimid period, which was totally abolished: the civilian tax farmer (mukābīl), paying to the treasury a proportion of the kharādā levied on his concession, was replaced by the military mukābīl, who retained the entire kharādā of his ḫidā, as compensation for his military service and for the equipment that he provided.

The rūk of Sālah al-Dīn was put into effect in 577/1181 (Halm, Aṣyṣyem, i, 14 ff.); according to the accounts (Mautagaddātul) of his vizier, al-Kādī al-ʾAdīl (q.v.), the value in kharādā of land ceded as ḫidā in that year amounted to 3,670,500 dinār (al-Mākridī, Khiṭat, ed. Wiet, ii, 17 ed. Bulāk, i, 82).

The division of the provinces of Egypt established by the Fāṭimidādīs was retained by the Ayyūbīdīs. The manual of administration genre is represented for the first time in the Khīṭat, which was the principal source of material for the works of the same title by al-Makrīzī and his continuator, Michael of Tinnis (up to 437/1046). The Fāṭimid official al-Kudād (d. 454/1062) was the first to describe the national geography of Egypt; his Khiṭat were the model and the principal source of material for the work of the same title by al-Makrīzī (d. 583/1189); although surviving only in fragmentary form, the Mīnḥād is an invaluable source of information concerning the administration, agriculture and fiscal system of Egypt in the 6th/12th century.


The army of cavalry mobilised by Sālah al-Dīn was composed of free mercenaries who were, for the most part, of Kurdish origin like the sultan himself. The Sultan al-Malik al-Šalih began purchasing young Turkish slaves who were quartered in barracks on the island of Rawda to undergo military training and to serve as elite troops. These were the military slaves (mamlūk, sing mamlak, “property”) who, in 650/1252, put an end to the dynasty of the Ayyūbīdīs [see MAMLUKS and 5. below].

Like the Fāṭimidādīs, the Ayyūbīdīs controlled commerce between the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean. However, the presence of the Crusaders in Palestine and Transjordan threatened the naval routes of the Red Sea as well as the routes of pilgrimage. This led to the prosperity of the anchorage of ʾAyllah (q.v.) on the coast of the Red Sea (opposite Djudda), which was linked to Egypt by a track crossing the desert and ending, in the Nile Valley, first at Aswān and later at Khītā. In 578/1183, the Andalusian pilgrim Ibn Djaburay used this much-frequented route and left a detailed description (Rihba, ed. Wright, 66-9, tr. Gaudefrey-Demombynes, 75-8).

Commercial relations between Egypt and the West increased still further in the Ayyūbīdī period. Sālah al-Dīn conceded to the Venetian Doge Sebastiano Zani (1172-8) the right to open a fandouk in Alexandria; in 1177, he concluded a commercial treaty with the republics of Genoa which was henceforward represented in Alexandria by a consul; and in 1207, al-Šalih al-ʾAdīl negotiated a treaty with the city of Pisa. But in 615-18/1221-23 the three Italian republics
supported the Crusade of Damietta which had the object of conquering Egypt and imposing direct control on trade between the Red Sea and the Mediterranean, the failure of the enterprise put an end to these projects.

One of the most important sources of the period, the Mutadagididiti ("News") of al-Kâdi al-Fâdîl (d. 596/1200), survives only in the form of quotations in the Kitâb of al-Makrizî (which are thus our principal source). Besides the above-mentioned account by Ibn Dhibyar, there exists a description of Egypt written by the Baghdâd doctor 'Abd al-Latif (ca. 1200). The manual of administration genre is represented by the Kauâinîn al-tauâinîn of the official of Copric origin Ibn Mamamî (d. 606/1209) who dedicated his book to the Sultan al-Malik al-Âzîz (589-96/1193-8). The Taârîkh al-Fayôam of al-Nâbulusî gives us a complete list of the villages of this province with a detailed account of their crops and the duties levied on them in 641/1243-4.


Ingeniously, the 9th/15th century Egyptian jurist and historian Abu Hâmid al-Kudûsi (d. 888/1483) summarises the status of Egypt within the contemporary world as it had evolved in the by then two centuries of Mamlûk rule. Egypt is the "heartland" (byade) of Islam and the legitimate "Seat of the imâmate" (al-Fadâ'il al-bâhira fi maâhid Misr wa l-Khârûf, Cairo 1969, 80, 185). In this brief and rather casual statement the author implicitly summarises three important developments in the history of the country that are all to be connected with the establishment of Mamlûk sway in the mid-7th/13th century.

(1) Egypt rose to become, at the expense of Syria, the unsatisfied hegemonial power in the Near East. The gradual shift of gravity from Syria to Egypt, discernible already in the changing territorial designs of the Crusaders from Jerusalem to Damietta, culminated in the marginalisation of Syria in the aftermath of the Mongol invasion to the Middle East in 656-8/1258-60. Northern Syria became the fortified fringe of the Cairo-based new polity. The remaining Ayûbid domains were either subjugated or assimilated to Mamlûk rule. The Syrian Desert now became a border almost in the modern sense of the word, so that, in effect, the world that had hitherto been closely connected: Irâk and the Levant. In Arabia, Egypt resumed, in the two-and-a-half centuries of Mamlûk rule, its traditional protectorate over the Holy Cities. After century-long immobility an active expansionist Egyptian policy was resumed both to the west, against the Bedouins of Barka, and especially to the south, into Nubia.

(2) Egypt established itself, much more than Syria with more diverse cultural elites, as the bulwark of orthodox cultural and religious conservatism. The acute consciousness of having been spared the catastrophe of Mongol pagan domination that was reflected in numerous popular sayings and tales, nurtured the conviction that it was Egypt's hallowed rule and obligation to preserve the bases of Sunni public order as well as the traditional religious culture in its Arab garb. Anti-sectarian sentiment and moral rigorism, visible in a rich anti-bida' literature, stood in sharp contrast to the continuing exuberant frolic, levity and pageantry of popular culture of both rural and urban Egypt. A keen sense of history, and of historical responsibility, manifested itself, during the first half-century of Mamlûk rule between 1250 and 1300, there remained a glaring deficit of conventional power, this problem was nevertheless far more pressing for the Mamlûks, who came as nobodies from the Euruasian steppes via the slave markets of Syria, Cairo and Alexandria into the highest echelons of government. They did not obtain this political ascendency as members of a homogeneous nomadic clan or confederation led by valiant or even charismatic leaders, as had been the case with Toghrîl Beg or Salâh al-Dîn al-Ayûbî [q. v.]. They came rather to the Middle East as individuals with the social stigma of slavedom and a pagan birth.

After the Mamlûks had established their domination, they put forward these tokens of their original social inferiority as signs of military nobility; their pagan Turkish names were preserved as symbols of their élite status and also as a means to demonstrate the social apartheid between themselves and the autochthonous Arab-speaking Egyptian populace. For the surrounding world, however, at least in the critical first half-century of Mamlûk rule between 1250 and 1300, there remained a glaring deficit of conventional, i.e. Islamic, legitimisation for government. The separation most of all, in the modern sense, of the preceding Ayûbîd (and Saljûq) dynasties, the adoption of the regnal (Malîk) titles by the Mamlûk sultans, and the demonstrative take-over of the tradi-
nential nobile officium of warden of the Holy Sites in the Hidjaz, were designed to reduce this deficit of standing among fellow Muslim rulers. The re-instalment of a fugitive Adbbāsīd scion as caliph under the tutelage and increasingly arbitrary disposition of the Mamlūk sultan was even more effective. By this action, legitimacy was acquired by the Mamlūk sultan and at the same time demonstrated to be of little relevance in the categories of effective power. The most important means, though, towards gaining and securing recognition against all the prejudice and feelings of superiority among the established Islamic dynasties of the time was the stupendous Mamlūk success on the battlefield. Bravely and, as contemporary authors noted with awe and admiration, unselfishly these alien barbarians stood up to protect the defenseless nāʾiryya of Egypt and Syria against the pagan foe. Even later authors such as Ibn Khaldūn (d. 808/1406 [p.e.]) invoke the unique blend of "nomadic virtues and the firm resolve of true Muslim believers" among the Mamlūks. They spared the Egyptians the tragic fate which fellow-Muslims in so many other countries had suffered under the Mongol yoke. The capacity of the Mamlūks for extinguishing the last traces of the Frankish-Christian presence in Syria and Palestine was a significant factor in the spiritual and political ascendency of the new Mamlūk establishment of Mamlūk rule over Egypt: Sultan Ayyūbīd has just demonstrated their superb martial aptitude. It was the hardy Mamlūk praetorians of al-Malik al-Muʾāsir, loyal to him personally and not to the Ayyūbīd dynasty at large that was divided into rival factions ever since Salāḥ al-Dīn's death.

From this moment on, the Mamlūks were no longer solely servants to a Muslim ruler with an undisputed sovereignty in their own right. The recruiting modalities of the new ruling caste were to remain the same: Mamlūk sultans and amīrs imported, trained, and affranchised (mamlūk) military slaves as had been the case under al-Malik al-Salih. From Mamlūk ranks alone, sultans and the key military and also administrative personnel were supposed to be chosen. Tensions were inevitable (and proved concomitant to Mamlūk history at least to the early 9th/15th century) between, first, the dynastic tradition inherited from the Ayyūbīds and copied by successful Mamlūk sultans, and second, the intrinsically Mamlūk principles of the ever-renewed selection of the most able candidates for high and highest offices from genuine Mamlūks, i.e. first generation aliens who had been born pagan, then been brought to Egypt, trained in the chivalrous arts, Islamised, and finally released into the exclusivity of a Mamlūk career.

Mamlūk sway in its earliest phase immediately after the killing of Turāngāḥ was more than precarious. No-one proved prepared, nor was really willing, to take over the reins of government. As an interim ruler, homage as sultan was paid to al-Salih's energetic and pragmatic widow Ṣhadqāt al-Durr [q.v.]. Under the pressure of the Syrian Ayyūbīds who felt surrounded by a network of dead or unproven threat, the Longūya'Ayyūbīd achievement enhanced their claim to be full heirs to the Abbasid scion as caliph under the tutelage of the dawla tūrkiyya. Only by stating that Egypt was the proper domain of the 'Abbadīd caliph al-Mustaṣsim bi'llah could Aybak bring his own army to pay fealty to him. Soon Aybak, at least pro forma, was even forced to step aside and to give way to an Ayyūbīd figurehead as sultan. Thus the continuing general demand, both inside and outside of Egypt, for a fully legitimised government after the sudden disappearance of the house of Ayyūb was from the country, was satisfied.

The first decade of Mamlūk rule over Egypt is a story of inter-factional strife and of unrelenting, if in the long run futile, attempts on the part of al-Malik al-Nāṣir Yusuf II of Aleppo (and by now also of Damascus) to conquer Egypt. The leader of the mighty Bahriyya regiment, al-Fāris Aḥkām, whose men had contracted an ominous reputation as a brutal marauding gang of soldiers assailing the population of Cairo, was killed, at Aybak's instigation, by the Khāražm Mamlūk Kutuz. Aḥkām's comrades were either caught or they managed to flee the country, among them Baybars al-Bundukdārī, the famous future al-Malik al-Zahir and real founder of the Mamlūk polity [see Baybars i]. Changing sides and protectors (Damascus, Karak) several times, Baybars and his men proved a wily, courageous and unscrupulous free-lance contingent, reminiscent of the equally irregular Khāražmīan and Kurdish contingents filling the chronicles of the period with their actions. Baybars' support was feared and coveted at the same time by the diverse Ayyūbīd rulers of Syria.

The Mongol advance to ʿIrāk and the Fertile Crescent, the fall of Baghdad and of the 'Abbadīd caliphate, and the imminent destruction of Syria, however, facilitated the closing of ranks between the rival Mamlūk groups. Kuṭūz [q.v.], the energetic and uncompromising new Mamlūk sultan in Cairo, accepted Baybars and his companions with their legendary repute of military prowess back into the
Egyption Mamluk army. The Mongol envoys, demanding Kutuz's surrender, were executed. In the famous battle of 'Ayn Qâlût (25 Ramadan 658/3 September 1260 [q.v.]) in Palestine, the united Mamluk army, led by Kutuz and Baybars, won the day against the Mongols, commanded by Hulâgû's general Kêtboghâ Noyon. As a result, Damascus was liberated where already a Mongol viceroy had been installed. The Mongol invasion of Egypt was once and for all avowed.

Yet more than the Mamlûks exploits in the streets of al-Manšûra, ten years earlier, the victory of 'Ayn Qâlût became the symbol of Mamlûk strength, resilience, and sacrificial spirit. Even a monument was erected on the site of the successful battle to commemorate this historic event. Even though this victory meant only a first respite for the new lords of Egypt and Syria—many more Mongol attacks on Syria were to follow until 713/1313—the psychological effect of this triumph was enormous. The familiarity of the Mamlûks' cavalry with the fighting techniques of the Mongols certainly had influenced the outcome of this first Mamlûk-Mongol showdown. Contemporary chroniclers such as the Syrian Abû Şâma clearly saw the connection: "It is verily remarkable that the Tatars were broken and destroyed by their own kinsmen, the Turks."

(Al-Dhayl 'al-rawdatayn, q.d., Beirut 1974, 208.) Mamlûk-Mongol relations were, for this very reason, bound to be contradictory on the emotional level. The Mongol arch-enemy was at the same time a model. The Mongol military success was to be a constant source of inspiration for the early Mamlûks. Mongol habits and even institutions (courtly ceremony, application of the yâzû for inter-Mamlûk matters) were emulated. In the Egyptian perspective, this split attitude is lucidly reflected. A historian like Ibn Aybak al-Dawâdârî (died after 736/1336), in his volume on the Ayyûbids and on Cînghiz Khân, reports thrilling legends on the ethonogenesis of the Mongols and of the Turks, stories that had found their way from East and Central Asia through northwestern Persia to Egypt. Yet at the same time, in the context of these traditions, he makes a point of stressing, both symbolically and in the narrative itself, that the grand scheme of the Mongol conqueror for universal rule found its limits in the west: Egypt and the Maghrib were destined not to succumb to the otherwise indomitable Mongol conquering armies.

Kutuz could not harvest the fruits of his secular victory. Baybars, who saw in him last but not least the murderer of Aḵtây, the former chief of his own regiment, arranged—in collusion with a few other malcontents, among them Kutuz's sword-bearer—the assassination of the sultan, perhaps, again, in order to avoid similar action against himself. The exact circumstances of this dastardly deed cannot easily be reconstructed. Very few contemporary eyewitness accounts have been handed down for the Mongol conquests, to obliterate its traces, including—in a very literal sense—even the grave of Kutuz. Baybars was now given homage as the new sultan, although initially, as it seems, only in partnership with the magnificent amir al-Fâris Aḵtây al-Mustârâbî, who had paved the way for Baybars to receive the bay'a of the assembled amirs. For most of them, they were deeply estranged by the brutal killing of the hero of 'Ayn Qâlût and most resentful towards the murderer. In this context, the argument preferred by the 9th/14th-century chronicler al-Shâfi'î b. 'All is interesting. It says that in the absence of a son of Kutuz, Baybars was to succeed in the throne by virtue of his (allegedly) being the regicide, because this was "the tradition of the Turks (tâdat al-Turk)" (Husn al-manâšîb al-sirrûya al-muntazâ'a min al-šûra al-zâhiyya, al-Riyûd 1976, 32, 155). Also, on the occasion of the murder of Sultan al-Abâs, Khalîfâ in 693/1293 this principle is alluded by contemporary observers.

It was during Baybars' sultanate from 658/1260 to 676/1277 that the Mamlûk polity began to assert itself. The institutional foundations of the new centralized state were laid. The insecure frontiers to the north-east gradually secured by 2nd- and 3rd-century Frankish-Christian dominions in the Syrian and Palestinian coasts shrank under the relentless military as well as diplomatic pressure of the sultan. The internal opposition to Baybars, both by Mamlûk rivals (who fill the chronicles on the occasion of their detention, release from jail, or execution) and the Ayyûbid princes in Syria, had to be reconciled with the new order or to be suppressed by force. Whereas al-Malik al-Mughîth of Karâk, Baybars' former host, was deprived of his realm and life by cunning and treachery, much to the wrath of contemporary witnesses, the Ayyûbids of Hîmîs died out and their principality fell to the Mamlûks. Hamât remained a special case. Ever since the inception of the Ayyûbid confederacy, the rulers of Hamât had sided with their mighty cousins on the Nile, often against the interests of the Ayyûbids themselves. Damascus and Aleppo. This loyalty to Egypt was also conferred upon the Mamlûks. At 'Ayn Qâlût and in the numerous later encounters between Mamlûks and Mongols, the contingent of Hamât played an important and consistently loyal role. The razzias into the land of Lesser Armenia (bilâd Sîrî in the Arabic sources) in the second half of the 7th/13th century were largely the responsibility of the Ayyûbids of Hamât, who contrived to secure their semi-independence well into the 8th/14th century. One of the last Ayyûbids of Hamât was the famed historian and geographer Abu 'l-Fida'î (d. 732/1331 [q.v.]); he even bore the prestigious title of sultan as proof of the standing and respect which the Egyptian sultan paid to his house. Shortly after Abu 'l-Fida'î's death, Hamât lost its independence and became a province under the control of a Mamlûk governor.

The installation of an 'Abbâsid refugee as caliph in Cairo in 659/1261 has already been mentioned (on this subject, see now the comprehensive article by P.M. Holt, Some observations on the 'Abbâsid caliphate of Cairo, in BSOAS, xlvii [1984], 501-7). The first "shadow" caliph with the throne name of al-Mustanṣâr proved insufficiently acceptable to Baybars' hegemonial claims. After a rule of only a few weeks he was despatched, together with some other princes whose kingdoms had been conquered by the Mongols, to 'Irâk in order to recover the lands of his ancestors. He perished in an encounter with a Mongol army even before he could reach Baghdad. When a second 'Abbâsid claimant turned up and was installed as the caliph al-Hâkim bi-amr Allâh, Baybars made sure that his own superior status as sultan was not imperilled. Until the end of the Mamlûk sultanate in 923/1517, al-Hâkim's descendants were to reign as figureheads at the discretion of the Mamlûk ruler. Their public functions were strictly ceremonial, their political power nil. The caliph had hardly more prestige than the four supreme kâdîs of the orthodox maghâbih, as contemporary critics remarked. He was accompanied by the sultan during his campaigns as the regent and legitimator alike. From 700/1300 onwards the caliphs publicly legitimated the newly-elected sultan by their presence and by a diploma of investiture. They stood on slippery ground. They could easily be
dragged into inter-Mamluk controversies about the apt candidate for the vacant sultanate. As symbols of the Islamic umma they also proved indispensable allies to the sultan in his dealings with foreign powers. The continuing prestige of their lofty office enhanced also the repute of their Egyptian hosts and protectors. Muslim rulers in India, South Arabia and Upper Mesopotamia solicited their own official investiture by the caliphs, as if one still wrote in the year 1220 when the "Abbasids had managed to assert their political independence in 'Irāq. Also, in Baybars' strategic alliance with the Khān Berke [q.v.] of the Golden Horde against the Il-Khān of Persia in 661/1263, the recently-installed caliph al-Hākim played a crucial role.

Whereas in the early phase of Mamluk history, the sultan continued to perform the bay'a [q.v.] to the caliph as head of the Muslim community, this established ritual of pre-Mamluk times was abandoned by the mid-8th/14th century. From now on it was the caliph who paid homage to the Mamluk sovereign. Political theorists of the period such as Ibn Djamā'sā (d. 733/1333 [q.v.]) (but also jurists beyond the Egyptian and Syrian borders) accepted the absorption of the functions and prerogatives of the caliph by the sultanate as a necessary given fact, for it was the sultan who had proven himself the sole and effective vanguard and defender of the umma against its deadly enemies.

In 815/1412 a shadow caliph, al-Musta'in, was even to assume the sultanate. The political context of this episode of a few months was exceptional. Barkūk's son and successor, al-Malik al-Nasir Faraḍj, had been deposed. The succession of the caliph to the office of sultan (according to the rules of the Mamluk polity, a non-Mamluk, "non-Turk", was barred from this office) may have appeared as an acceptable makeshift solution in an otherwise deadlocked situation: al-Musta'in was not entangled in the deep factional strife and ethnic rivalries (Turks/Kipcaks vs. Circassians/Ashkaz) among the Mamluk oligarchs of these days in the early 9th/15th century. Once, however, the strong man—in this case al-Mu'ayyad Shaykh (815-24/1412-21 [q.v.])—had secured his leadership among the grandees, the sultan al-Musta'in was instantaneously removed. He even lost ignominiously the office of caliph; it was granted to his brother. By this time, the dividing lines between sultanate and caliphate had long since been blurred in favour of the sultanate. When the Ottomans conquered Cairo in 923/1517, they took with them the last "Abbaṣid caliph to Istanbul, where his traces were lost. The merger of the functions of māmān-caliph and sultan both in political practice and theory that can be observed in Mamluk times may well be seen as a model for the formation of the idea (and ideal) of the Ottoman sultan-caliph as it emerges at the latest by the 18th century.

The main stage of Mamluk policy in the second half of the 7th/13th century was Syria. Egypt remained in the quiet shadow of the violent events that characterised the history of the Middle East between the Mongols' arrival in the region and the final pacification of Syria after the extinction of the last Crusaders in the Levant and the conclusion of a first treaty between Mamluks and Mongols in 729/1323. Syria was downgraded to serve as Egypt's glacis and dependent territory.

This tranquility, as well as the shrinking menace from the outside, made it possible for the first Mamluk rulers to consolidate their regime in Egypt. Reminding us of Hārūn al-Rashīd, Baybars is also credited with incognito nocturnal walks through the streets of his capital when the world believed him to be campaigning in Syria; it was his aim to remain judicially informed about malcontent groups and their concerns and to check the efficacy of his political measures. The frontiers of Egypt were gradually pushed west and south. When the unfortunate Crusader king Louis IX sailed to Tunis in 688-9/1290-1 and the local Ḥafsid ruler asked for help from the Mamluks, initial preparations were made to establish support lines for an Egyptian army marching westward. In the Nubian kingdom [see 980], inter-dynastic troubles gave Baybars a chance to intervene and to subjugate the lands at the second cataract of the Nile to vassal status. From now on, one reads in the chronicles of the time the proud formula of the Mamluk realm as stretching from the Euphrates (the common border with the Il-Khānate) to Dunkula (Dongola).

To forestall any repetition of the twice-successful Frankish invasion of Egypt from the north by the sea and the river Nile, the harbour of Damietta was blocked and the control over the thughār at the Mediterranean coast, notably the important trading centre of Alexandria, increased. The Mamluk capital was adorned with the spoils of the successful campaigns of the 8th/14th century. The fortress of Yāfā (captured by the Mamluks in 666/1266) was used in Baybars' own splendid mosque in the quarter of al-Husayniyya. And after 'Akkā, the seat of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, had finally been captured by the Mamluks under al-Aṣghar Khalil, the son of Baybars' de facto successor al-Manṣūr Kālawīn, in 690/1291, the ornate Gothic portal of the cathedral of the city was carried as a trophy to the heart of Cairo, 690/1291, the ornate Gothic portal of the cathedral of the city was carried as a trophy to the heart of Cairo.
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the lucrative membership in the halka was little more than a sinecure. Under Kalawun, offices that had been traditionally held by civilians (like the vizierate) were for the first time definitively entrusted to officers. The nakabalat, the bearer of the kalā'ija, the typical Mamluk headgear, took over the functions of the mu'ta'ammim ‘turban bearer’, the civil (or religious) official, as contemporary observers metonymically described this momentous change. Otherwise, Kalawun took his duty for an Islamic ruler very seriously. His reign saw the persecution of Christians, but also the erection of his famous hospital, al-himāristān al-mansūrī, on the ruins of one of the Fatimid palaces right in the centre of Cairo.

Like Baybars and so many of his successors in the sultanate also, Kalawun had to face a rebellion of the strong man of Damascus upon his accession to power. Yet whereas in early Mamluk history such insubordination of the Syrian governor was also designed to achieve the restitution of Syria as a separate polity, this was decidedly different in later years. The unity of the Mamluk state was no longer questioned. In the 8th/14th and 9th/15th centuries successful Syrian insurgencies coveted the sultanate of Cairo for themselves. Al-Mu'ayyad Shaykh is the most famous example. It was only under the Ottoman successors to the Mamluks that Syria re-emerged as a separate territorial unit.

The decade following the assassination of al-Ashraf Khalīl by the ambitious (and cultured) amir Baydārā in the hunting grounds of Dājza in winter 693/1293 ushered in a period of unrest and peril for the young Mamluk state. The conversion of the li-Khān Ghāzān Khān [q. v.] to Islam (694/1295) increased rather than reduced the pressure by the Mongols on the Mamluk frontier. New justifications for an assault on the old enemy, now consistent with the gharnā', were sought and found. In 699/1299-1300 Syria was invaded and Damascenes taken by Ghāzān’s forces. The defection of the Mamluk governor of Damascus to the Mongols had paved their way to this triumph. Yet the Mongol hold on Syria proved untenable. After several battles strewn around the year 702/1303, they finally gave up their intentions.

Also, inside the Mamluk domains there was sedition and unrest in this critical period, much of it of a socio-religious nature. After Baybars, upon his accession in 658/1260, had faced urban riots in Cairo by people of inferior social status (peddlars, pages and negroes) who had shouted the name of ‘Ali, the scene now moved to Upper Egypt. In 679/1280-81 a Fātimid-Ismā'īlī contender rebelled, for a last time, in ḍaru against the government in Cairo. He had the backing of the unruly Bedouins of the region, who were enjoying more and more freedom of action as a consequence of the gradual ‘méditerranéisation’ (J.-Cl. Garcin) of Egypt, i.e. the abandonment of the old trade route Kusā-Ayjdāb, the demise of the river port of al-Fustāt, and the ensuing provincialisation of central and southern Egypt. At the same period, around the turn of the 8th/14th century, radical Shī'is defied Mamluk authority in Mount Lebanon. Only in 699-701/1271 had the last Syrian fortresses of the once indomitable Assassins been taken by Baybars.

Against such heretics, the Mamluk religious policies were clear and unequivocal. Both the Mamluk governing caste, and the religious leaders whom the Mamluks authorised, tried to control as civil and native spokesmen for their own designs, declared the battle against the našshid the prime duty of all those responsible in the state—ummārā and ‘ulāmā—once the external menace exercised by Christian and Mongol infidels had been contained. The historian al-‘Akrīrī (d. 800/1422 [q. v.]) pronounced that in his own days all vestiges of the Shī'as had been effaced from the Egyptian lands. The public execution of the Imāmī theologian Ibn Makki al-‘Amlī, the "first martyr" of the Twelver Shī'as, in Damascus in 786/1384 at Sultan Barkūk’s order, attests to this uncompromising attitude. Nevertheless, the antireligious Mamluk policy was not free from contradictions. The pugnacious and upright Hanbalī scholar Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328 [q. v.]), e.g., was at the same time appreciated as a popular tribune against the temptations of heresy and persecuted because of his diatribes against the corrupt and timid religious establishment in Egypt and Syria. Ibn Taymiyya’s attacks were in considerable measure directed against the ubiquitous illicit popular religious practices and the pervasive Sūfi spirit to which the Mamluk rulers of the country proved also susceptible. He contemptuously degraded the mystics as “...a but a class of lazy people whose lives were spent in idleness but rewarded with generous monthly salaries from waqfī” (Leonor Fernandes, The evolution of a Sūfī institution in Mamluk Egypt: the Khānāqāh, Berlin 1988, 98). The veneration of holy men (mu’ta’akfin) as well as the lavish support granted to the nascent Sūfī orders was characteristic of the nonconformist approach the Mamluks tended to take for themselves towards religion, especially in the first years of Mamluk history. Vestiges of the shamanistic tradition in which they had grown up as children before their arrival in Egypt, and perhaps also their personal uprootedness in a remote and foreign country, may well have prompted their attachment to strong religious personalities, particularly if these came from the “old country”, i.e. the Turkish-speaking lands to the north. Baybars’ scandalously uncritical loyalty to the criminal Shaykh Khadīr al-Mihrānī has puzzled contemporary witnesses and modern historians alike.

The period of crisis after the premature death of al-Ashraf Khalīl also saw the temporary institutionalisation of the dynastic principle of succession to the sultanate. al-Aghār Khalīl was followed to the throne by his young brother al-Malik al-Nāṣir Muhammad, born in 684/1285. After the bleak and brief sultanates of al-‘Adil Kīthbūhā (during his rule a dramatic famine struck Egypt with all the concomitant hardship and popular discontent) and al-Mansūr Lāḏīn [q. v.] (he was killed because he had imputably provoked the apprehensions of some of the key magnates of the state), al-Malik al-Nāṣir was reinstated (698/1299). Once more he had to abdicate (in 708/1309 to give way to the cultured sultan Baybars II al-Dhāshēnkīr) before he could finally establish himself as autocrat during his long third reign (709-41/1310-41). In the office of sultan at least, one continued to tolerate an exception to the Mamluk principle of the perpetual renewal and rejuvenation of the élite from the outside. The non-Mamluk, pre-Mamluk, element of the dynastic charisma still prevailed.

At this juncture, one should mention that never again would a “non-Mamlūk” sultan claim general recognition within the Mamluk ruling caste with so little opposition as was the case with al-Malik al-Nāṣir Muhammad. He carefully presented himself as a scion of genuine Kipcak background. He had been raised together with the élite corps of his father. As if to compensate for his “illegitimate” standing within the Mamluk military aristocracy, he imported more Mamluks for himself than any other sultan before or
after him. All the necessary facilities and means were provided for his royal Mamluks (mamluk sultdniyyd) in order to guarantee the excellence of their training.

The third sultanate of al-Malik al-Nasir Muhammad appears as the apogee of Mamluk history altogether. The twenty years’ crisis of the state between 693/1293 and 713/1313 (the year of the last Il-Khanid attack on Mamluk Syria) had been successfully mastered. The Mamluk borders were secured. In 729/1328, with the help of the long-distance merchant Madjd al-Din al-Sallami, a treaty was concluded between the Mamluks and the Il-Khan AbÚ Sa’d (q.v.). Both sides had come to realise (the Mamluks as early as 675/1277 when Baybars launched his costly and, in the long run, futile invasion into Anatolia) that no permanent territorial gains from their neighbour were feasible. Al-Malik al-Nasir, instead, systematically extended Egyptian influence into Arabis. Not only the Ši‘arís of Medina and of Mecca but also the Rasüllî lords of Yaman were forced to accept Mamluk suzerainty. Mamluk detachments were stationed in strategic locations in the peninsula. Three times al-Malik al-Nasir personally performed the pilgrimage to the Hijdp, thus demonstrating the stability of his régime. It was during his rule that the office of plenipotentiary deputy sultan was abolished, another indication of his absolute power.

In Egypt itself, al-Malik al-Nasir’s policies of increasing the position of the active Mamluk élite and also of securing for himself an adequate share in the riches of the country were equally successful. In the so-called al-nakt al-nâsirî of 715/1315-16 he achieved what his predecessor Ladjin had tried in vain to do. He halâka soldiers and officers lost most of their feudal land in this new cadastral scheme. It was transformed into iktd*s for the royal Mamluks or reverted to the royal fisc, whose share in the aggregate agricultural yield of Egypt rose from one-sixth to fivetwelfths. The feudal lands granted to the new beneficiaries were, however, consistently divided up into comparatively small lots (not more than a few nearby farming villages at most; often condominia with more than one other muqta’) and distributed all over Egypt in order to prevent the formation of a rural aristocracy and of a territorial basis for political opponents. Thus the governor (wâlid) of the Delta province of al-Dákhalîyya had his official iktha’s in Bahnasa in Middle Egypt and in Ushmunayn even further south. The province of Manfalût and most of the environment of Cairo were under direct control of the sultan.

There was much anger among all those groups that had been displaced or at least harmed by al-Malik al-Nasir’s large-scale redistribution of land. In order to divert this wrath, violent anti-Christian campaigns were kindled. Copts [see AL-KIBT] had always played a key role in the central bureaucracy and could thus be shrewdly presented as responsible for whatever distress had happened in this situation. With the applause of the frustrated Muslim majority, the discriminating sumptuary regulations were enforced against Christians, Jews and Samaritans in these years. It was during this period of economic suffocation and general persecution that a large percentage of the Coptic families, who for centuries had remained faithful to their religious belief, finally succumbed and adopted Islam. The disappearance of Coptic identity within Coptic society was a symbolic phenomenon. Thus at this time, first of all, second-generation Coptic converts to Islam, thanks to their professional experience in the administration of the arable and irrigated lands had always been favourite candidates for the superintendence of the army bureau (where the iktha’s were registered and resigned) of the royal fisc, now two of the most powerful, responsible and vulnerable positions in the state, could easily find themselves victims too to this spirit of religious intolerance. When the financial expectations of the mighty beneficiaries could not be met, for whatever reasons, the sultan could present them as the facile culprits who—owing to their suspect religious background—could not count on any corporate help. Some of them were brutally sacrificed to the mob in these years.

With the new affluence in the pryv budget of the sultan and with the diminishing expenditure for military campaigns, more funds could be invested into the amelioration of the economic infrastructure of Egypt. Large sums were spent for the repair of irrigation works. New canals were dug both in the Delta and in Cairo where al-khâlîd al-nâsirî created a water-way to Sirûkûs, the site of al-Malik al-Nasir’s new Khânakah, and opened new lands for cultivation. The agricultural production of Egypt, the internal and external trade, both with Syria and with abroad, and also the population, grew rapidly during this period. In retrospect, it was to turn into the golden years of Mamluk Egypt. It was also the time when al-Malik al-Nasir mainly, yet not exclusively, in Cairo, have left impressive traces of this era. To secure the supply of the citadel with water, new aqueducts were built. On the Cairo citadel, his majestic new mosque with tiles from Persian workshops and more than a hundred columns, all of a different provenance, attests to his imperial designs. A contemporary eulogist went so far as to hail him as another Salah al-Din, as the future conqueror of Bagdad, chosen to redeem the injustice wrought upon Islam by the vile Mongol foe. Certainly, one must not interpret this encomium as a reflexion of the sober political judgement of the sultan himself, who in these very years was probably relieved to conclude the peace treaty with Persia. It rather mirrors the esteem in which he was revered in Egypt thanks to his personal achievement and the propitious conditions surrounding him. Towards the end of his rule, this blissful image began to wane. When, full of distrust, he put his mighty, most successful and most popular Syrian governor Tankiz under surveillance, this blissful image began to wane. When, full of distrust, he put his mighty, most successful and most popular Syrian governor Tankiz under surveillance, then detained and finally killed him, contemporaries were shocked. They keenly sensed that an exceptionally prosperous and happy chapter of the history of Egypt was coming to a swift end. In rapid sequence now, eight sons, two grandsons, and two great-grandsons of al-Malik al-Nasir Muhammad followed on the throne (from 741/1341 to 784/1382 or 792/1392 respectively). Many of them were under age and never ruled effectively. For the most part they were mere toys in the hands of powerful generals like Kâsûn, Argûn al-Allî, Sarghis-mîn, Yalbughâ or Mintash, although endowed with opulent allodial and feudal holdings, especially in the vicinity of the capital and in the far south. 14.5% of the tax yield of the province of Kûs, 12% of Ushmûnayn, 39% of dawdat al-Khdira, 22% of Kalyûb and as much as 10% of the huge province of al-Qhariyya, were the personal fiefs of the sons and brothers of the ruling sultan alone, according to data from the year 777/1376. Popular opinion still held the progeny of al-Malik al-Nasir in high esteem, as we can learn from Khalîl b. Aybak al-Šâfî, the invaluable—although hardly exploited—main source for this period (cf. al-
Only al-Malik al-Nasir Hasan (who ruled twice, the first time during the horrible first visitation of the plague to Egypt in 747-50/1347-49) seems to have shared the capacities and instincts of his father. His political philosophy was, however, pronouncedly different. Hasan disdained the Mamluk ambience and perhaps, the whole Mamluk system. He solemnly renounced his Turkish name Kumārī (to be found often in the bibliographical dictionaries of the time as a Mamluk name) and raised consistently non-Mamluk groups, especially awlād al-nās and eunuchs, to high and highest posts in the state. Also, women were among the chief beneficiaries of his policies. As has recently been remarked, it was not by chance that during his reign no rebel appeared in Syria. The key positions in the realm were in non-Mamluk hands. Yet sultan Hasan thus jeopardised the whole Mamluk system. It should be seen in this context that Yalbughā al-Umarī, one of Hasan’s favourites, killed his own master, breaking a hitherto carefully-protected taboo. Under Yalbughā’s effective rule (his regency lasted until 768/1366, when sultan al-Āṣārī Shāh-bān, with the support of discontented Mamluks, took a vigorous hand in politics himself) the (re-) Mamluk system and military state and military rapid progress. Hasan is best known for the magnifi cent madrasa beneath the Cairo citadel, one of the most lavish monuments of Mamluk architecture. It contained separate iwāns for the four orthodox madhdhib. Even though, ever since the Ayyūbid era, nominally equal status was granted to all four schools, it was the Hanafi madhdhib of the Turks (this term means ‘white military slaves’) of the four that had in the Mamluk period, i.e. it encompasses also Circassians) that received privileged support by the Mamluk patrons of pious and scholarly endowments. With this policy of favouritism towards their Hanafi brethren, the Mamluk sultans and amirs tried to build up a counterpoise to the inflammatory and self-assured local Shafi’ī ‘ulamā’ with their widespread and investetate anti-Mamluk bias. In this respect also, Hasan seems to have had his own ideas. Correspondingly, the Arab authors of the time liked him; he seemed to combine the necessary political craftsmanship with an understanding for the needs and sensitivities of the Egyptian populace. Hasan had even studied theology and tasfīr; he had had a chance to do so when he was kept in prison by his adversaries for some time.

The second half of the 8th/14th century remained a comparatively peaceful period for Egypt and for the Mamluk state as a whole in their relations with foreign powers. The increasing turmoil in the Il-Khanate and its successor states further reduced the pressure on the Mamluk borders. In 776/1374 the kingdom of Cilician Armenia fell to the Mamluks. Its last king, Leon V, was taken to Cairo where he was kept in honourable captivity until Barkūk’s accession in 784/1382, when he was released to Europe. A few years earlier, however, in 767/1365, a dramatic incident happened that for a moment seemed to imperil the achievements of the first Mamluk sultans in their campaigns against the Christians of the Levant. King Peter I of Lusignan, the ruler of Cyprus and titular king of Jerusalem, sacked Alexandria with his fleet. Chaos ensued in the city, thousands of prisoners were taken, and many inhabitants perished. The Mamluk authorities, both Yalbughā and his governor Ibn ʿArrām, had proved totally unprepared for such an attack. Even though the Cypriots withdrew after only a week “like thieves in the night”, as the disturbed witnesses bitterly remarked, this invasion profoundly shocked the contemporaries. For, once more, the preordained course of history, the inevitable triumph of Islam over Christianity, seemed upset. Abu l-Kāsim al-Nuwayrī al-Iskandarānī (d. after 775/1374), in his voluminous treatise compiled around this event, is guided by the urge to make understandable to himself and to his avid readers how such a catastrophe could have happened. Cyprus was to pay a high price for this short-lived victory. Ever since this humiliating experience the Mamluks had schemed for revenge. Sultan Barsbay, in 829/1426, eventually invaded the island, took King Janus captive home to Cairo, and made Cyprus a vassal to the Mamluks.

A far greater threat to the external and internal stability of the Mamluk domains was, once more, to come from the east with the advent of the Central Asian conqueror Timūr [q.v.] to Syria in the autumn of 803/1400. Timūr took Aleppo, Hamā and even Damascus without any major resistance. Fear and hatred against the ʿaṣārī spread in Cairo in the aftermath of this defeat (Ibn Taghrībirdī, Nuḏūm, xii, 253. The great historian Ibn Khalūdīn, who served the Mamluks in Cairo as Mālīkī supreme kādi and coined the famous dictum of the blessing which Mamlūk sufficed for the first time in history to prevent Timūr in his camp outside Damascus yet could do little more than plead for clemency. The ʿulamāʾ of the city had already paid fealty to Timūr. That Timūr did not compound his victory by marching further to Egypt but rather withdrew from Syria to fight and defeat the Ottomans in Central Anatolia, was not because of the merit of the Mamluks. This benign turn of events notwithstanding, the results of Timūr’s invasion were comparable to those of Zahir Barkuk’s achievement was considerable. He had granted to Timūr’s arch-enemy Ahmad b. Uways, the Circassian atibāk al-ʿasārī of the Kalawwānī child sultan al-Malik al-Sāliḥ Ḥājjī, had wrested the sultanate from his nominal lord. To be sure, heavy opposition from Kalawwānī loyalists and the defection of the Syrian governors forced Barkūk to abscond soon after his coup and to allow Ḥājjī to return to the throne, this time with the new and programmatic regnal title al-Malik al-Mansūr, “the one God has led to victory”. Yet in 792/1390 al-Malik al-Zahir Barkūk had finally asserted himself. The powerful coalition of his adversaries was brutally broken up; some of the most horrible incidents of torturing and execution in Mamluk history, a period so rich in such sinister occurrences, happened during this fierce civil war on both sides. Ḥājjī was deposed again, this time for good. He was to live until the year 814/1412 in respectful though humble confinement on the Cairo citadel, not unlike the Abbasids shadow caliph.

But other factors, notably the hospitality granted to Timūr’s arch-enemy Ahmad b. Uways, the Qajālīyirid ruler of Baghdad, in Cairo, it was the evident weakness and discord of the Mamluk leadership that had invited Timūr to attack Syria. In 784/1382 Barkūk [q.v.], the Circassian atibāk al-vaṣīrī of the Kalawwānī child sultan al-Malik al-Sāliḥ Ḥājjī, had wrested the sultanate from his nominal lord. To be sure, heavy opposition from Kalawwānī loyalists and the defection of the Syrian governors forced Barkūk to abscond soon after his coup and to allow Ḥājjī to return to the throne, this time with the new and programmatic regnal title al-Malik al-Mansūr, “the one God has led to victory”. Yet in 792/1390 al-Malik al-Zahir Barkūk had finally asserted himself. The powerful coalition of his adversaries was brutally broken up; some of the most horrible incidents of torturing and execution in Mamluk history, a period so rich in such sinister occurrences, happened during this fierce civil war on both sides. Ḥājjī was deposed again, this time for good. He was to live until the year 814/1412 in respectful though humble confinement on the Cairo citadel, not unlike the ‘Abbāsid shadow caliph.

Barkūk’s achievements, however, were few. He had faced and defeated the largest and best equipped coalition of Mamluk rebels ever. Upon this experience he decided to build for himself a powerful household of his own Mamluks, on whose loyalty he could...
absolutely rely. It was from this Zahiriyah household that all future sultans were recruited, either directly or indirectly as mamlucks or Zahiriyah mamluks, or, in the last decades of Mamluk history, as mamluks of mamluks of mamluks of Barkuk. In a specifically Mamluk metaphorical sense, Barkuk can so be defined as the founding "father" of the Circassian sultanate.

The contemporaries realised that a momentous change took place with Barkuk's seizure of power. The chronicles of the time—and modern historians in their suit—can hardly draw a distinct line between the first, the Kipchak Turkish, and the second, the Circassian, era of Mamluk history. The reasons for this strict bifurcation can only be guessed. The racial provenance of the new rulers and their pronounced Circassian (Abkhaz), anti-Kipchak ginsiyah must have been of importance (although at least two of them were not Circassians but rather Albanian or Greek), as well as the gradual abandonment of the dynastic principle of succession to the sultanate. Barkuk himself (like his Kipchak predecessors and almost all the future Circassian sultans) had, quite understandably, tried to reserve the prestigious office of sultan for his own family. Yet under his rule this claim was evidently no longer accepted as a natural gift. He himself may have prompted this development. When his son died prematurely, funds set aside for him were transferred to the coffers of the newly-founded diwan al-mufrad, an additional source of revenue for the badly needed royal mamluks (797/1395). To be true, Barkuk could extract the bay'a of the Mamluk grandees for his second son, the youthful and impetuous al-Malik al-Nasir Faradj, yet unmistakably the automaticness of such a succession was becoming increasingly questionable. There is also economic evidence for these subtle changes. During Barkuk's rule the so-called sids, i.e. the male relatives of the sultan, who did not serve a productive function in the state, forfeited their isdɑ in Egypt.

When Barkuk died in 801/1399, Timur must have been fully aware of the crisis and the ubiquitous tensions within the Mamluk military aristocracy. He used the propitious moment to attack Syria when the sultan of Mamluk Egypt, regarded his attempt as outright illegal, as contravening the principle of succession to the sultanate), he extended the Mamluk sphere of influence far north into central Anatolia. His ambitious military and administrative reforms, designed to imbue the Mamluk system with new strength, never achieved fruition. He was also a very religious man, devoid of culture though he was. On the spot where he had languished in jail, i.e. directly in the neighbourhood of the Báb Zuwla, he had his impressively ḥanqâq erected. This building was to become a focus for Turkish literary activities well beyond the Mamluk period. Shaykh himself sought the company of dervishes, preferably from the regions to the north of Syria. His capable successor Ţatar did not however live long enough to justify the high-flying expectations he had aroused among his contemporaries. The panegyric vitae of Shaykh and Ţatar written by the linguist T (Arabic and Turkish historian, traditionist and jurist Badr al-Din al-5Ayńi (from 5Aynāb) (d. 855/1451 (q.v.)) not only tell us much about Circassian genealogy and the popular cabalistc play with letters and figures, current in these genres of writing) but also about the dire need of legitimacy which Mamluk sultans seem to have felt in these years after the fall of the houses of Kalâwin and Barkuk. Another scholar of great repute who flourished in this very period should be mentioned here, Abu l-Mubāhin b. Taghrībīdī (d. 874/1470 (q.v.)). His father, a seasoned Mamluk amīr, had served sultan Faradj during his short reign, both as governor and as father-in-law. The son personifies the limits and opportunities of the Mamluk second

The country under the most adverse circumstances. After 815/1412 onwards the dynastic succession was no longer truly accepted. Thus at last even the sultanate had to accommodate to the Mamluk system of recruiting only outsiders, newcomers, to the disadvantage of those born in the country. After 815/1412, until the downfall of the Mamluk empire, the sons of deceased sultans were allowed to mount the throne only temporarily until a strong man had been found among the various contenders. Actors and spectators alike seem to have known and accepted these new rules of the game. Therefore, when in the very final phase of Mamluk history, Muhammad b. Kâyibây (901-4/1496-8), for whom his father had vacated the throne, tried to assert and buttress his position, he not only failed politically and militarily; this was to be expected. More to the point, contemporary judges, both inside and outside Egypt, regarded his attempt as outright illegal, as contravening the principle of succession to the sultanate, he extended the Mamluk sphere of influence far north into central Anatolia. His ambitious military and administrative reforms, designed to imbue the Mamluk system with new strength, never achieved fruition. He was also a very religious man, devoid of culture though he was. On the spot where he had languished in jail, i.e. directly in the neighbourhood of the Báb Zuwla, he had his impressively ḥanqâq erected. This building was to become a focus for Turkish literary activities well beyond the Mamluk period. Shaykh himself sought the company of dervishes, preferably from the regions to the north of Syria. His capable successor Ţatar did not however live long enough to justify the high-flying expectations he had aroused among his contemporaries. The panegyric vitae of Shaykh and Ţatar written by the linguist T (Arabic and Turkish historian, traditionist and jurist Badr al-Din al-5Ayńi (from 5Aynāb) (d. 855/1451 (q.v.)) not only tell us much about Circassian genealogy and the popular cabalistc play with letters and figures, current in these genres of writing) but also about the dire need of legitimacy which Mamluk sultans seem to have felt in these years after the fall of the houses of Kalâwin and Barkuk. Another scholar of great repute who flourished in this very period should be mentioned here, Abu l-Mubāhin b. Taghrībīdī (d. 874/1470 (q.v.)). His father, a seasoned Mamluk amīr, had served sultan Faradj during his short reign, both as governor and as father-in-law. The son personifies the limits and opportunities of the Mamluk second
generation. He owned considerable property in Egypt (his endowment deed is preserved) and was at the same time a crafty and ingenious interpreter of Mamluk lore and Turkish language to the Egyptian audience of his time. He wrote a special treatise on the phonological and orthographic problems which the Arabs had with Turkish names. He rejected violently al-Mākriī's unjust and “racist” attacks against the appointment of a non-native, non-Arab (ā'gāni) duzzdr to the office of private secretary in Egypt (Nudjum, xiv, 263-6; see L. Fernandes, Mamluk politics and education, in Annales IIS., xxiii [1987], 93). His numerous enemies in the local academic institutions used his Turkish background in order to denigrate him and to question his scholarly acumen. Two of the richest historical sources of the time, especially on Mamluk affairs, go back to Ibn Taḡri Birdī.

With al-Āṣrāf Barsbāy's reign (825/1423-829/1428 [q.v.]) the “Indian summer of the Mamluk sultanate” (P. M. Holt) is associated. Major achievements in foreign relations are connected with this ruler. Cyprus was reduced to tributary status. The attempts of a leading amīr, Džānī Beg, to dislodge the sultan with the help of allies from among the Turcoman confederations in the Qaṣrāt and Eastern Anatolia were frustrated even before the rebel re-entered Mamluk territory. Furthermore, the shrewd scheme of the Timūrid ruler Shāh Rukh [q. v.] to gain at first only symbolic, and then tangible political influence in the Hijāz by sending a kūsha to Mecca to cover the Kaʿba, was rejected by Barsbāy. He had the Hanafi chief judge of Egypt confirm the prerogative of the Mamluk sultan in supplying this precious textile. The Egyptian control of Western Arabia, re-established by al-Malik al-Nāṣir Muhammad a century earlier, was further strengthened when the harbour (bandar) of Quidda [q. v.]—instead of 'Adan—was made the main emporium for the ships bringing the precious goods of India and the Far East to Egypt. Barsbāy occupied Quidda and put it under direct Mamluk control. A garrison and a chief accountant were stationed there to safeguard the control and proper fiscal exploitation of the profitable Red Sea trade.

Ever since the Fāṭimid era the “rich trades” (Immanuel Wallerstein) with the East, directed through the Red Sea and Cairo, had been a central source of wealth for the Egyptian authorities. During the pax mongolica of one century, this trade route had temporarily fallen into neglect, to the benefit of the ancient silk-route through Transoxania and Iran. With the gradual disintegration of the Il-Khanate during the 8th/14th century, however, the maritime route through the Indian Ocean had regained its old importance. Since the Ayyūbid period, the so-called Kārimi merchants [q. v.] of Egypt controlled this lucrative international trade from their commercial headquarters in Cairo and in the great ports of the Red Sea. This changed under Barsbāy's rule. In order to increase the depleted finances of the state, he removed his merchant advisers from the court and brought the spice trade under state monopoly. By this short-sighted move he forced the European customers in Alexandria to buy the precious commodities of the East at the prices (and with the quantitative limitations) decreed by the sultan and his bureaucracy. Complaints came not only from western quarters but also from the rulers of Persia. As early as 825/1423, Barsbāy had brought the Egyptian sugar industry under state control. The results of this policy were deleterious. With the Kārimi merchants also, their entrepreneurship and vigilance in the highly vulnerable, long-distance trade disappeared. After a brief increase in state revenue, demand fell, with a consequential negative impact on the Egyptian budget which was already overburdened with high state expenditure on luxury goods (e.g. costly East European furs for Mamluk robes) and, most importantly, slaves to replenish the Mamluk ranks that were depleted by the plague and by constant and intermittent warfare.

The decades following Barsbāy's death saw the brief sultanates of two old gentlemen, Džakmak and Ināl (841-63/1438-61), the last generation of Barkūk's own Mamluks. In these years, the Mamluks gradually slipped into the defensive in their dealings with Anatolia and the borderlands to the northeast. The Ottomans, whose triumphal conquest of Constantinople in 857/1453 was duly celebrated also in Cairo during Ināl's sultanate, began to annex the buffer principalities (the Dughquldu, Ramdānīs and Karamāνīs) which the Mamluks regarded as their proper sphere of influence. From the mid-9th/15th century onwards, Mamluk-Ottoman relations were strained. In a first Ottoman-Mamluk war (during sultan Kāʿībīb's long rule, 872-901/1468-96 [q. v.]), in which the Ottoman ruler Bāyezīd did not commit all his forces, neither side was victorious. Relations improved again. Only two years before the collapse of the Mamluk state during the short sultanate of the Timūrid ruler Shāh Rukh [q. v.] (868-90-1408-10), the sultan of the ‘Abbasid dynasty of Egypt and the Far East in 857/1453 was duly celebrated also in Cairo against the White Horde (Ak-Koyunlu) in 885/1480 was a disaster. Yāṣbak was caught and executed in al-Harrāb (Fesada) at the command of Yakūb Ak-Koyunlu like a common criminal. Also, the success of Yaʃbak's father, Uzun Hasan, “Hasan al-Tawil”, in having his name recognised in Medina, if only for a very brief interval, in 877/1473 was symptomatic of the gradual loss of control which the Mamluks had so long been able to exercise on this front.

There was a direct connection between the decreasing prestige of the Mamluk state in the concert of regional powers and the gradual, yet in the end, alarming deterioration of the Mamluk military organisation, prowess and ethos. Hallowed rules of recruitment and promotion had been allowed to pass into oblivion. No longer were Mamluks imported as malleable youngsters, ready to follow their master's commands without second thoughts and imbued with a deep sense of solidarity with their immediate comrades. Now, middle-aged Mamluks were canvassed who often brought with them professional skills, e.g. in carpentry. They were no longer able and ready, either culturally and linguistically, to adapt themselves easily to the Egyptian environment. They could no longer be moulded into a homogeneous military household in which no member would have dared betray his fellow Mamluk (dawddr) or his common master (ustddh). In the final years of Mamlūk history this philosophy had lost its overall validity. The grandees of sultan Kāʿībīb's household schemed against each other without evident restraint. Four of them succeeded each other on the throne in brief
sequence between 904/1498 and 906/1501. Mamluk factionalism and the deplorable economic foundations of the Mamluk ruling class aggravated each other in a rapidly turning vicious circle. The principles of military training that had been held in esteem during the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries—continuous exercise, advancement in rank only on the basis of proven merits, no sale of benefices reserved for Mamluks to non-Mamluks—had been allowed to lapse during the 9th/15th century, whilst the hippodromes (see MAYDAN) lay in ruins. More significantly, the Mamluk military system proved immune against the blatantly necessary technological modernisation. The use of gunpowder remained categorically limited to siege warfare during the 9th/15th century, at a time when the Ottoman Janissaries (who were to rout the Mamluk army in Syria from any major threat from the north, lacked the physical stamina and resilience of native Egyptians against such infections? Or was it rather the hermetic living quarters that promoted the rapid spread of such a highly contagious disease? Certainly, from the early 9th/15th century onwards, the rigid residential requirements for Mamluks were loosened. Many officers moved to the city, married Egyptian women and allowed their children to grow up as natives with all the accompanying career options. Yet one should also realise that owing to the privileged status of the Mamluks, who literally possessed the country, they could afford a satisfactory diet, still the best panacea against malnutrition and the ensuing illnesses.

The plague was pernicious also for the economic survival of the Mamluk caste. The reasons are patent. The personal wealth of the Mamluks rested on the dawull, the army bureau, headed by a civilian, often a Copt or recent convert (see above), with the indispensable expertise in the agricultural geography of Egypt, these allotments were recorded, collected, re-issued and exchanged. From his assignment, the Mamluk beneficiary had to cover his personal expenses as well as all the expenditures in connection with the army unit under his command, i.e. weapons, horses, fodder, equipment and personal gratuities. Even in the bleak days of Mamluk decline, the army bureau seems to have continued working efficiently and rigorously. Upon the death, demotion, or promotion of a makt, his assignment reverted to the central bureau and could not be passed on to the heirs of the holder, natural and consistent as the efforts of Mamluk beneficaries were to circumvent this iron law. Pious endowments were, owing to this impasse, increasingly discovered as a device to compensate for this drawback. The money invested into waqf could now at least partially be stipulated to be made available to the well-paid nazar, the supervisor, of the endowment. Moreover, this office was, in most cases, reserved for the Mamluk founder, his progeny and his freedmen, although this was a legally dubious procedure. With the wholesale collapse of Egyptian agriculture, the basis of Mamluk personal material welfare was thus eroded. Land was abandoned. Large parts of the delta, notably the provinces of al-Buwayra to the south of Alexandria, of al-Sharkiyya (on the south-eastern edge of the delta around the vital communication lines from Cairo to Syria) and al-Qhariyya (the central delta), let alone the Sa'id, returned to tribal control. One can follow this process of gradual (re-)Bedouinisation of major parts of Egypt in this period when one compares the data in the different cadastral surveys that were made of the country in the years 777/1376, ca. 890/1397 and 885/1480. The entries in the following table for some dates are more or less completely preserved in the works of Ibn Dukmak (d. 809/1407) and Ibn al-Djurain (d. 885/1480). In these lists usually, albeit not

### Table: **Benefit Allotments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>904/1498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906/1501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The demographic effects were disastrous. Whole regions, especially in the Nile delta, were depopulated. In cities like Alexandria and Mahalla, the population dropped to a fraction of its former size. The losses in weaponry (as was a social and ethnic group, seem to have been hit with particular severity by the plague. Why this was the case has been the subject of heated debates. Were they especially vulnerable because they, who came from the cold steppes and mountainous regions of the north, lacked the physical stamina and resilience of native Egyptians against such infections? Or was it rather the hermetic living quarters that promoted the rapid spread of such a highly contagious disease? Certainly, from the early 9th/15th century onwards, the rigid residential requirements for Mamluks were loosened. Many officers moved to the city, married Egyptian women and allowed their children to grow up as natives with all the accompanying career options. Yet one should also realise that owing to the privileged status of the Mamluks, who literally possessed the country, they could afford a satisfactory diet, still the best panacea against malnutrition and the ensuing illnesses.

The plague was pernicious also for the economic survival of the Mamluk caste. The reasons are patent. The personal wealth of the Mamluks rested on the dawull, the army bureau, headed by a civilian, often a Copt or recent convert (see above), with the indispensable expertise in the agricultural geography of Egypt, these allotments were recorded, collected, re-issued and exchanged. From his assignment, the Mamluk beneficiary had to cover his personal expenses as well as all the expenditures in connection with the army unit under his command, i.e. weapons, horses, fodder, equipment and personal gratuities. Even in the bleak days of Mamluk decline, the army bureau seems to have continued working efficiently and rigorously. Upon the death, demotion, or promotion of a makt, his assignment reverted to the central bureau and could not be passed on to the heirs of the holder, natural and consistent as the efforts of Mamluk beneficaries were to circumvent this iron law. Pious endowments were, owing to this impasse, increasingly discovered as a device to compensate for this drawback. The money invested into waqf could now at least partially be stipulated to be made available to the well-paid nazar, the supervisor, of the endowment. Moreover, this office was, in most cases, reserved for the Mamluk founder, his progeny and his freedmen, although this was a legally dubious procedure. With the wholesale collapse of Egyptian agriculture, the basis of Mamluk personal material welfare was thus eroded. Land was abandoned. Large parts of the delta, notably the provinces of al-Buwayra to the south of Alexandria, of al-Sharkiyya (on the south-eastern edge of the delta around the vital communication lines from Cairo to Syria) and al-Qhariyya (the central delta), let alone the Sa'id, returned to tribal control. One can follow this process of gradual (re-)Bedouinisation of major parts of Egypt in this period when one compares the data in the different cadastral surveys that were made of the country in the years 777/1376, ca. 890/1397 and 885/1480. The entries in the following table for some dates are more or less completely preserved in the works of Ibn Dukmak (d. 809/1407) and Ibn al-Djurain (d. 885/1480). In these lists usually, albeit not con-
sistently, the legal status of the land (state land; royal land or khdiss; allodial land or milk; iktcf land; ... the Egyptian economy through the iktcf-system, or, the further we advance in history, increasingly through the fun-

A Mamluk officer whose tax district lay waste and no longer produced the grain whose sale was necessary for his own upkeep was bound to look for alternative sources of income. Urban commerce, a sphere that had hitherto not suffered all that much from Mamluk infringements, indeed suggested itself as such an outlet. For trade and urban manufacturing flourished despite, or even because of, the general malaise. As has been mentioned before, the lucrative spice trade returned to Egypt as early as 745/1345. As A.L. Udovitch has plausibly suggested, the first generation of urban plague survivors benefitted from an enormous inheritance effect. Their business expanded rather than shrank in the decades after 750/1350 and thus provoked outright state intervention. All economic drawbacks notwithstanding, demand for luxury goods on the markets of Cairo not only did not decrease but grew considerably. Besides Russian furs needed for ceremonial Mamluk costume (mentioned above), spices (by no means all re-exported) that should be singled out as such precious commodities. It was all-too-inviting for the impoverished Mamluks, whose rural fiefs no longer allowed for the customary sumptuous life style (visible primarily in the number of personal mamliks), to begin filling their pockets with the arbitrary exploitation of the commercially active urban élite. The notoriously rapacious Mamluks who populated the curia of Circassian history (and served to rationalise the more deeply seated racial and cultural prejudices of the native Egyptian 'ulama' against the barbarian Mamluk) must be seen against this background.

Not only the Mamluks but also the civil population of the major Egyptian centres suffered from this breakdown of the rural economy. It is true that prices for wares and barley had risen more or less to the same. The decrease in production was matched by a decrease in demand. Yet all the labour attached to food production, i.e. the services of millers, bakers, boatmen, etc., became significantly more expensive. And of course all the stipends and salaries provided for in the pious endowments for pupils, students, professors, Sufis, architechts, physicians, food-purveyors and janitors alike, were impaired by the shrinking of the economic resources of urban awkaf. During the whole of the 9th/15th century, the administrators of these endowments were gravely at odds how to balance these losses of agricultural revenue and how to establish negative lists of priority of the services (as laid down in the awkafyya) that could be curtailed or even sacrificed. The great polymath al-Suyutl (d. 911/1505 [q. v.]), himself overseer of the Baybarsiya madrasa, got entangled in these everyday problems so far aloof from the world of theological, juridical and grammatical speculation for which he is famed. This growing economic tightness in the institutions of higher learning was aggravated by a consistently high number of scholars in Cairo, the shining capital city of orthodox Islam during all the Mamluk period, with the ensuing qualitative (though not quantitative!) decline in learned output. In the second half of the 9th/15th century we still have 130 colleges in Cairo alone, with some 3,000 students, compared to 6,000 in the previous century. And since the endowments with their fiscal immunity still fared comparatively well in juxtaposition with the state finances that no longer sufficed to pay for the campaigns inside, and beyond, the borders of Egypt the sultans and their aides did not hesitate to infringe upon the (in principle) inviolable stipulations of awkaf and confiscated part of their annual income to fill the gaps of the treasury. Even pious sultans like Ka'itbay (who did not desist from taking a pronounced personal stand in the scholarly religious controversies of the time) did not hesitate to break the awkaf laws. In public opinion they had lost their stringency long before. The sale of awkaf and especially the exchange of mediocore for valuable maqaf (urban property and agricultural lands) had long ago become an established practice. The private documents of the last eighty years of Mamluk history that have recently been made available, at least cursorily, by Muhammammad Muhammad Amin make clear that by this time endowments were anything but unalienable. They changed owners and legal qualifications at rapid speed, if the pressure upon the venal judiciary was only strong enough.

To contemporary authors, a rather contradictory image of rulers emerged in these critical last years of Mamluk history. On the one hand, there were arbitrary confiscations and brutal exactions (one need only mention forced purchases, jarb or remaya, imposed upon the civilians) by the sultans and their generals, who desperately tried to keep the system in abeyance. On the other hand, there was a last efflorescence of religious culture at and around the Mamluk court. Many sultans impressed the populace, including the otherwise very haughty and critical scholarly observers, with their personal piety and devotion. The Egyptian "national" saint Ahmad al-Badawi [q. e.] of TanT was the object also of Mamluk veneration. Religious sessions were held in the citadel, in the cemeteries among the tombs and contains of late rulers, and in the halls of Mamluk grandees such as Yaghbak al-Zahiri, who wrote Turkish poems and an Arabic treatise on the descent of the Prophet Muhammad. Numerous prized Persian and Arabic into Old Anatolian Turkish were produced with the encouragement of Mamluk dignitaries. With one exception, the curious author Abu Hammad al-Kusdi, mentioned at the beginning, these achievements were not, or at least not readily, recorded by the Arab contemporaries, for whom the Turks, with their political and military superiority, were difficult enough to tolerate. They were not supposed to be versatile in the Arabs' own domains, i.e. the arts, writing and scholarship. The sultans Ka'itibay (872-901/1468-96), Muhammad b. Ka'itibay (901-4/1496-9), and Kansawh al-Ghawri (906-22/1501-16 [q. e.]) have left us Turkish diwaIns of their own. At Kansawh's madiJis on the citadel, religious and juridical texts were discussed by an impressive circle of learned men, some of them from regions far away. The sultan himself was polyglot, demonstrating the cosmopolitan atmosphere in Mamluk quarters that contrasts favourably with the parochial and self-sufficient narrowness of the local Egyptian academic.

The relationship between the Mamluk military aristocracy and the local population in all its different layers, both in the cities and in the countryside, had always been contradictory. The Mamluks were the lords of the country and their autocratic powers were more or less unrestricted. They controlled the Egyptian economy through the iktcf system, or, the further we advance in history, increasingly through the fun-
nelling of public funds into *awākif* of which they could, as has been said, dispose at liberty. Not without good reason (found in its critics rebuked the liberalism with which Mamlūk magnates spent their allegedly personal funds for endowments. These *awākif* were, it was said, to perpetuate the name of the *awākif* and otherwise to serve the needs of the sons and grandsons, to whom otherwise no privileges could be bequeathed; thus this sanctimonious behaviour was vituperatively brought into relief.

As founders and administrators of *awākif*, the Mamlūks also exercised great influence upon the civilian élites. It was within their prerogatives to dismiss professors or *shaykhs* who displeased them. In the *khansākah* [*q.v.*], the Sūfī convent (an institution going back to Sālāḥ al-Dīn al-Ayyūbī’s days and actively promoted especially by Baybars II Džaḥenklīr and al-Mālik al-Nāṣir Muḥammad b. Kaḥlāwīn), the Mamlūks found a vehicle to exercise at least some influence upon the religious classes. On the one hand, they staffed these Sūfī establishments with men in their confidence—preferably, as has been mentioned, of Ḥanafī *muḥādhīn* and often of foreign background (the *khawāsinik* were interesting centres for the study of Persian and Turkish in Mamlūk Egypt). On the other hand, by stipulating a strictly orthodox curriculum and by gradually merging the functions of the *khawāsinik* with those of the medrassah and Friday mosque, they secured the grudging approval of their potentially sharpest critics, the Ṣahlīs [*q.v.*] of autochthonous Egyptian origin. The celebrated al-Suyūtī was one of the few who adamantly resisted any such temptations by the Mamlūk court. His prestige was so high that the sultan could not afford to punish him for his obstinate refusal to pay even minimal honours to the ruler.

The question to which degree, if at all, Mamlūk autocracy was intrinsically limited, has been discussed in recent research, but the time for a conclusive answer has not yet come. Certainly, the Mamlūks who were transplanted from an alien world into the tightly-knit web of Egyptian society, could not simply rule in splendid isolation in the Cairo citadel aloof from the *miṣrī* public. The irritation with which the Ottoman army with their muskets, the Mamlūks with their swords, the Ottoman consular reports and paintings, was quick and, despite bureaucratic tensions in this policy, it is not cogent to deny Mamlūk Egypt the character of an organic state.

Yet when the final downfall of the Mamlūk sultanate came, the same people soon seem to have sensed that this regime had not been just a gang of marauders and oppressors. ‘Rather the tyranny of the Turks than the self-righteousness of the Arabs’ (*diwār al-Turk wa-l-Amāl al-ʿArab*) seems to have been of more concern to the current generation of Cairo Moslems. As an example, they were interested in the *mawlūd* commemorations of the part of the Ottomans after the accession of the Selīmīs. The *diwār al-Turk wa-l-Amāl al-ʿArab* brought Egyptian, Turkish, and Arab publications that brought Western Europe, in the following centuries, the blessings of capitalism, enlightenment, industrialisation and modern thought.

The end of Mamlūk power and splendour, so vividly depicted also in the richly illustrated consular reports and paintings, was quick and, despite all signs of internal weakness and increasing external vulnerability, unexpected. The mounting pressure on the part of the Ottomans after the accession of the Selīmīs, the heretic Shāh Ismāʿīl of Persia, and the picture of complete discord presented to the outside, induced Selīm to invade Syria in 922/1516. Largely thanks to the high treason and defection of the Mamlūk governor of Aleppo, Khāṣir Bey, but also the superior fighting power of the Ottoman army with their muskets, the Mamlūks with all their outmoded knightly ethos were utterly defeated. Sultan Kānsīwā al-Džawīrī, eighty years old, died of an apoplectic stroke during the battle. His royal standard and other spoils of this crucial battle of Mardj Dābīk [*q.v.*] today adorn the War Museum in the *Topkapı* palace in Istanbul. Invited, invited, and almost driven by the ambitious Mamlūk traitors headed by Khāṣir Bey, Selīm followed the defeated Mamlūk army into Egypt. Here Tūmān Bāy had been elected new sultan in the hour of affliction. But his troops had no chance either. They lost twice to the Ottomans, at al-Raydānīya before the gates of Cairo, and then finally close to Džiśa, i.e. at a site where so many battles were fought that became decisive for the history of Egypt. Tūmān Bāy was cap-
tured and mercilessly hanged on the Bab Zuwayla by the Ottoman invader, to the intense despair of the people of Egypt. A splendid chapter in the history of the country had come to an end. The unique Mamluk system with its chivalrous ethos and its peculiar morale, that combined the utmost brutality in its internal controversies and its sacrificial spirit for Muslim and Egyptian interests; a flourishing cultural, scholarly, and religious life; the impressive architectural heritage that continues to characterise mediaeval Cairo to our days; the conservative tranquillity of life, at least in the good days of Mamluk history—all these and many more reminiscences may have contributed to keep this outlandish régime in a far from solely negative memory. Many institutions of Mamluk Egypt, including the principle of recruiting Cauca-
stan, white slaves, were to survive the Ottoman con-
quest. It was only in those ensuing decades that the term Mamluk received its exclusively bleak connota-
tions that are prevalent in our own time.

Bibliography: The vast primary and secondary
literature on Mamluk Egypt until 1967 has been
brought together in I.M. Lapidus, Muslims cities in the
late Mamluk and early Ottoman Egypt, London 1986, 217-
42 (a total of 575 entries, many of which deal with
Syria). An important supplement to this list is con-
tained in the new edition of this work, Cambridge,
England 1984, 192-7. One may also consult the
appendix on sources and studies in U. Haarmann,
"Der arabische Osten im Mittelalter" (U. Haar-
mann, ed., Ottoman Egypt).

Monographic descriptions of the history of
Mamluk Egypt of recent vintage are P.M. Holt: The
age of the Crusades. The Near East from the eleventh
century to 1517, London 1986 (see esp. the biblio-
graphical essay on the primary sources at 207-16) and
R. Irwin, The Middle East in the Middle Ages. The
early Mamluk sultanate 1250-1382, London 1986 (a
second volume on the Circassian régime is
announced). (U. HAARMANN)

6. The Ottoman period 1517-1798.

On 29 Dhu 'l-Hijja 922/23 January 1517 the last
Mamluk army under Selim I annihilated the first
Mamluk field force at al-Raydâniyya outside Cairo.
Al-`Ashraf Tumân Bây, the fugitive Mamluk sultan,
was betrayed to the Ottomans and hanged at the
Zuwayla Gate of his former capital 22 Rabî' 2 1923/14
April 1517. To the Ottomans, a potentially dangerous
rival power had been eliminated, and the extensive
territories of Syria and Egypt had been annexed.

To some Mamlûks, however, Selim had been a useful ally
in their inveterate factional politics. The Ottoman vic-
tory at Marj Dâbîk [q.v.] had at least been facilitated
by the defection of the Mamluk governor of Aleppo,
Khâ'rî Bey, who after the occupation of Syria, had
urged Selim to advance on Cairo and overthrow
Tûmân Bây. Probably Selim would have left Tûmân
Bây as a vassal ruler, but the Mamluk sultan’s own
partisans rendered such an accommodation impos-
sible. The outcome of the conquest was not the
destruction of the Mamlûks and their institutions but
a developing symbiosis of Mamluk and Ottoman
elements, which evolved into a curious and
anomalous policy within the Ottoman imperial
system.

The triumph of Khâ'rî Bey's faction was consum-
ated when he was left as viceroy, bearing the old
Mamlûk title of malik al-umârâ and residing like the
former sultans in the Citadel of Cairo. Under him, the
proscription of the Mamlûks soon ended; they, as well
as the bureaucracies of the old régime, returned to com-
fort, dignity and office. Selim had however left an
Ottoman presence in the form of garrison troops:
the two infantry formations of the Janissaries
(Mustafâbîzân) and the 'Azhân, and the two cavalry
corps of Gûnlûyân and Tûfînîyân. To these were
added by 1524 two other cavalry corps: the Çerkezî-
(reruited from Circassian Mamlûks) and the
Gûnû, and in 1554, the Muferredî, an
viceroys bodyguard. Khâ'rî Beys successors were
responsible for the promulgation of the kânûn-nâme
[q.v.], which regulated the administrative system
of Ottoman Egypt. The Mamlûk territorial divisions
remained as subdivisions under governors
designated, as in the past, kâshîfs, who were
also perhaps usually of Mamlûk origin. Upper Egypt
was dominated, as it had been under the last Mamlûk
sultans, by a clan of Hawwâra [q.v.], the Banât
`Umar, who ruled the region until 1015/1606-7. An
Ottoman reform, at first of great significance, was the
ending of the Mamlûk system of assignments of
revenue (sing. ikâd) as remuneration. A new cadastral
survey was made in 933/1526-7. To the old town districts, it
seems, to substitute a salaried military and civil
administration for the mukhâfs of the old régime.

These steps towards the ottomanisation of Egypt
followed a time of troubles. Shortly after Khâ'rî
Bey’s death (928/1522), a revolt broke out, headed
by two survivors of the old régime, Qâ'nîm and Inâl, who
now held office as kâshîfs. Their rebellion was
suppressed by Ottoman troops under the Ottoman
viceroys. In 930/1524 a more serious challenge was
offered by a later viceroy, Ahmad Pasha (al-Kâ'în,
"the Traitor"), who although not himself a Mamlûk,
recruited a private army mainly from Mamlûks and
usurped the sultanate of Egypt. Expelled from Cairo
by a loyalist counter-group, he was shortly afterwards
captured and executed.

The ensuing period of about 60 years was uneve-
ntful. Egypt was administered according to the kânûn-
nâme by a succession of viceroys in consultation with
the council of notables, the Diwân, which met four
times weekly. Nevertheless, developments during this
time were to produce the troubled history of Egypt in
the next 200 years. An important factor was a shift in
the financial system, as tax-farmers (sing. mulazm)
increasingly took over the rural and urban sources of
revenue. These mulazms passed into the hands of the
Ottoman and Mamlûk grandees, and formed the
financial basis of their power. The landed mulazms, like
the ikâds of the old régime, were technically sources of
revenue, but in practice (if never in law) they gave rise
to a species of rural (but not feudal) lordship control-
ling the agrarian administration of the villages.

Meanwhile, Egyptian society, formally divided into an
Ottoman-Mamlûk ruling group and a mass of sub-
jects (wâsaa), was becoming increasingly complex and,
in the towns at least, curiously homogeneous. The
Ottoman garrison corps (sing. âdîk), permanently
stationed in Egypt, soon ceased to be aliens. Inter-
marriage with Egyptian women (although repeatedly
and ineffectually forbidden), and the abandonment of
devshîrme recruitment, opened the corps to men of
Ottoman and Egyptian descent, the Ansân. The occa-
sional arrival of fresh detachments of Ottoman troops
does not seem to have provoked the polarisation and
conflict which occurred between the local (wâsaa) and
imperial Janissaries in Damascus. Moreover, the
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distinction between the Ottoman military and Egyptian civilians broke down. Probably from about the middle of the 10th/16th century, merchants and artisans of Cairo enrolled increasingly, particularly in the Janissaries and ‘Azebân. Their military service was only nominally required; their financial contributions bought them the protection (himaye) of their corps in a society where the formal structure of Ottoman government was breaking down. Reciprocally, ‘military’ members of the corps participated in the commercial life of the city, and again the later 10th/16th century appears to have seen the increase of this movement.

This beylicate in Egypt presents some unusual features. Although personal or institutional continuity cannot be traced, it seems likely that the sânjak beyis of Egypt were the Ottomanised successors of the high amir of the Mamlûk sultanate. No longer maintained by đêkis, they were originally salaried officers, although later they drew their great wealth from tilizâms. They stood apart from the command-structure of the garrison corps. In the 10th/16th century they were not all Mamlûks, and service in Egypt might be only an episode in their careers. In the following two centuries the beylicate became almost exclusively the preserve of Circassian Mamlûks, members of relatively small households, notably the (Dhu ‘-) Fakâriyya, Kâsimiyya and Kâzâdhulîyya [q.v.], also MAMLUKS. (If(i), (ii)(b)]. By this time, the whole of their careers from the command of expeditionary forces as serdâhs, normally passed in Egypt, where they became governors of the sub-provinces, and acquired a prescriptive right to the great and profitable offices of defterdar, amir al-hādjdj and interim viceroy (kâ’ım makâm). The neo-Mamlûk households included hereditary and members, as well as free-born armed retainers (sing, sarrâdâq). The original demarcation between the military corps and the beylicate broke down as corps officers founded Mamlûk households (notably the Kâzâdhulîyya), while Mamlûk chiefs enrolled their free-born retainers in the corps. In the 12th/18th century the links of patronage and diente were far more important than the formal structure of Ottoman-Egyptian administration.

In that formal structure, the weakest element was the Ottoman viceroy at its head. Holding office briefly and precariously, usually a stranger to the province which he governed, the viceroy endeavoured to secure the transmission of the annual tribute (irsâdîyye [q.v.]) to the sultan’s treasury, and to acquire a personal fortune sufficient to defray his own expenses in obtaining the post. Both his public and his private interests therefore ran counter to those of the multizims, who were concerned to secure as large a share as possible of the revenues they farmed. The end of the 60 years of Ottoman administration came in 994/1586, when a military revolt was provoked by an inquiry into a deficiency of the ırsâîyye. The viceroy, formerly an Ottoman treasury official, was brought down from the Citadel and deposed by the troops. This was the first of a series of revolts, which culminated in the killing of a viceroy by rebels in 1013/1605. Although severe repressive measures were taken between 1016/1607 and 1020/1611, they did not result in any permanent restoration of the viceroys’ authority. Henceforward with rare exceptions, they gained what influence they could by playing off rival groups against one another. During the 12th/18th century they became virtually prisoners in the Citadel, pompously received by the grandees, and sometimes ignominiously deposed by them.

In the middle decades of the 11th/17th century, the dominant figures in Egyptian politics were the beys. In 1040/1631 they removed a viceroy who had procured the murder of one of their number, invested a bey as kâ’ım makâm, and reported the matter to the sultan’s government, which confirmed their action, thereby setting an important precedent for the next century. The beylicia was at this time divided between the households of the Fakâriyya and the Kâsimiyya, between whom there may have been some degree of ethnic rivalry, the former being Circassians and the latter apparently in part Bosniaks. The head of the Fakâriyya, Ridvân Bey, was amir al-hâdjdj almost continuously from 1041/1631 to 1066/1656. A curious genealogical work of these years suggests that he regarded himself as the lineal and lawful successor of Barkük and Barsbay. If, however, he nourished plans for a revival of the Mamlûk sultanate, he died with them unrealised. Thereafter, the fortunes of the Fakâriyya quickly declined. The turning-point was an episode known as ‘the Conflict of the Beys’ (wâdhât al-sanâdîq) in 1071/1660. The incident which set off the crisis was significant in itself. It began as no more than a rural affair between the peasants of two multizims, but one of them was a Janissary officer and the other was supported by the rival ‘Azebân. The bey was a junior officer (kuciik) of the Fakâriyya and in the backing given by the Fakâriyya to the Janissary multizim involved them in resistance to the viceroy, who was inevitably brought into alliance with Ahmed Bey the Bosniak, the chief of the Kâsimiyya. The Fakâriyya were proscribed and almost annihilated. This episode was an early manifestation of a polarisation which ran through the Egyptian society of the period: the Mamlûk Fakâriyya and Kâsimiyya households were linked (ironically in a stable coalition) with the rival Janissary and ‘Azebân corps, and there was a further link with a more ancient popular schism, originally of Arab tribal origin, between two groups designated Sa‘d and Harâm.

The Kâsimiyya had broken the Fakârî ascendency but their triumph was brief. The next viceroy procured Ahmed Bey’s assassination, and the beys, while retaining their hold on the great offices and fulfilling their military functions, ceased to challenge the viceregal authority and relapsed for some decades into political obscurity. During these years the power of the Janissaries was at its height, but the corps, like the beylicate, was a faction-ridden body, as the events of 1087/1676-94 were to show. In these years a turbulent junior officer (kâh dich bâhî) Kûcûk Mehmed, repeatedly made himself the most powerful man in the corps. At the end of his career he assumed the role of a popular tribune. In 1103/1692, after a successful coup, he compelled the commanding officers of the seven corps to abolish the protection dues (himaye) levied on the tradespeople of Cairo; and in 1106/1694, when the city was threatened by dearth and famine after the failure of the Nile flood, he intervened vigorously to hold down the price of the grain. This measure offended not only the dealers but also their patrons among the Janissary officers. At this point, Kûcûk Mehmed was murdered, grain-prices rose immediately, and Cairo experienced a dreadful famine. The instigator of the murder was almost certainly a high officer of the Janissaries, Mustafa Kâhayâ al-Kâzâdhûlî.

The coup of 1103/1692 has further political significance in that it marks the revival of the political activity of the Fakâriyya. In the 32 years since the Conflict of the Beys, the household had been refounded and at this time it held most of the great offices. The Fakâri chief İbrahim Bey was seeking to
gain control of the Janissaries in collusion with Küçük Mehmed. The attempt collapsed with Küçük Mehmed's death, but ironically his opponent Muṣṭafā al-Kăźuḡğilş had also been an associate of İbrahim Bey in Cairo and was the founder of a Mamluk household allied to the Fakāriyya.

The next major political crisis, the Great Insurrection (al-fītna al-kabīra) of 1123/1711, also began with a Janissary boss, the bābāʾ ēl-baṭḥāʾ Āfrandj Ahmād. His activities set the Janissaries against the other six corps, headed by the Ašrāk, who were supported by the Kasāmiyya. Although the Kasāmiyya were on this occasion divided. At the end of the episode the Kasāmiyya were completely victorious. Āfrandj Ahmād had been put to death, and the site of political power had moved to the Mamluk households. While the old constitutional structure remained, with the viceroy at its head and his Dīsān as his council of state, the de facto supremacy (rūsāʿ) was held by the head of the dominant household. When, as always after 1168/1754, the holder of the rūsāʿ was a bey, he came to be called šayḵ al-balād. An assembly of the grandees (dāmīṭiya) appears to have superseded the Dīsān as the effective consultative body. Meanwhile Upper Egypt, the granary of Cairo, reverted to tribal rule, the various chiefs being allied to the Fakāriyya or the Kasāmiyya. From about 1153/1740 onwards, the paramountcy was held by the bey Humān b. Ḫusūʿ, who came from a section of Hawwārā.

The ascendancy of the Kasāmiyya ended in 1142/1730. Their chief opponents were now the Kasādughliyya, headed by İbrahim Kāʿahyā, a corps officer like the founder, and the last to play a major role. Although henceforward until the coming of Bonaparte the Kasādughliyya virtually monopolized the matağād al-balād and the great offices, they in turn split into rival households. The ultimate victor in a power-struggle after the death of İbrahim Kāʿahyā (1168/1754) was ʿĀli Bey [q.v.], who ruled Egypt autocratically as šayḵ al-balād, broke the power of Humān in 1183/1769, and as the sultan’s delegate intervened to install a Ḥāšimite protegé as amīr of Mecca in 1168/1754. The expeditionary force of the Mamluks, headed by İbrahim Mūḥammad Abu l-Dḥahab [q.v.], which was sent then to invade Syria as the ally of ʿShayḵ Zāhir al-ʿUmar, the Arab ruler of Galilee. After taking Damascus, however, he returned to Egypt, and drove ʿĀli Bey into exile in Syria (1186/1772). ʿĀli attempted to regain power, but was intercepted and died of his wounds (1187/1773).

Like Riwādīn Bey in the previous century, ʿĀli Bey had given indications of an ambition to restore an independent Mamluk sultanate over Egypt and its dependencies. Abu l-Dḥahab made no such challenge to Ottoman lordship, and was on campaign against ʿShayḵ Zāhir when he died in 1189/1775. The ensuing decade was a miserable period for Egypt. There was a recurrent power-struggle, in which İsmāʾīl Bey, a survivor of İbrahim Kāʿahyā’s household, was pitted against two of Abu l-Dḥahab’s mamlāqs, İbrahim Bey and Mūḥammad Bey, who together formed a reluctant and unstable duumvirate. Extortion, oppression and anarchy meanwhile reigned in the countryside, while the administration, such as it was, was, defaulted on the payment of tribute to Istanbul.

This last consideration in particular prompted the sultan’s government to make a determined effort to break the power of the Mamluk beyls and to bring Egypt again under effective Ottoman control. An expeditionary force under Dżezāʾīrī Ghāzī Ḥasan Paštā [q.v.] arrived at Alexandria in Şawwāl 1200/August 1786. Proclamations in Arabic promised the reduction of taxes and the restoration of the kānān-nāme. The Ottoman forces occupied Cairo and Lower Egypt, but Murūd and İbrahim Bey held out in Upper Egypt. The situation was thus at deadlock when Ḥasan Paštā was recalled in Dhu l-Hijjādja 1201/October 1787, as war with Russia was imminent. The makeshift settlement on his departure left İsmāʾīl Bey as šayḵ al-balād in Cairo with a small Ottoman supporting force, and İbrahim and Murūd nominally confined to the territory they held in Upper Egypt. When İsmāʾīl Bey died of plague on 16 Şaban 1205/20 April 1791, they came back to Cairo and restored their duumvirate. They retained power until another expeditionary force, composed this time of French troops under General Bonaparte, occupied Egypt in 1213/1798.

The high politics of Egypt during this period of nearly 300 years thus consisted largely of a prolonged struggle for power and the control of the revenues, in which the main contenders were the Ottoman viceroy, the Janissaries and ʿAzībān corps, and the beys. At the same time, there was a parallel but more obscure movement of low politics: popular movements of one kind or another, stimulated by the recurrent natural cycle of low Nile, death and epidemic, and aggravated by the unconscionable exactions of the grandee class of agents. An early phase may be probably to be found in the revolts in the late 10th-early 11th/late 16th-early 17th centuries, which although ostensibly military rebellions seem to have been produced largely by the rural cavalry corps who lacked the privileges and corporate strength of the Janissaries and ʿAzībān in Cairo. A second phase may be observed about a hundred years later, when between 1096/1687 and 1149/1736 repeated episodes of death aggravated by monetary crises resulted in a series of popular risings in the capital. The years of oppression and anarchy following the death of Abu l-Dḥahab in 1189/1775 form a third such phase. Here again the populace of Cairo were the agents of revolt, but associated with them, and giving legitimacy to their actions, were the ‘ulāma’. ʿAl-Ẓahrā became the voice of that sullen resistance to oppression, anticipating the part it was to play during the French occupation.

1297/1880. The French translation by Chefik Mansour et alii, Merveilles biographiques et historiques ou Chronique du Cheikh Abd-El-Rehamane Daghâ[. . .], Cairo 1888-96, is unreliable. Two contemporary reports on Ottoman Egypt have been published by S.J. Shaw: Ottoman Egypt in the eighteenth century, Cambridge, Mass. 1962, gives the Turkish text and a translation of Djezzâr Ahmed Paşa's report; for problems of dating, cf. review by Uriel Heyd in BSOAS, xxvi (1963), 187-8. Ottoman Egypt in the age of the French Revolution, Cambridge, Mass. 1964, is a heavily annotated translation of an Arabic report by Huseyn Efendi, an Egyptian treasury official, to the French administration in 1216/1801. An Arabic text of the report was published by Shafik Qurbâl as Misl 'inda mafârik al-turâk, in Magallat Kulliyat al-Adab [Cairo], iv (1936), 1-71. Important Arabic and Turkish chronicles, as well as abundant archival materials, remain unpublished; cf. surveys by P.M. Holt, Ottoman Egypt (1517-1798): an account of Arabic historical sources, and S.J. Shaw, Turkish materials for Egyptian history, both in Holt (ed.), Political and social change in modern Egypt, London 1968, 5-12, 28-51. (b) Western: Chief among these are the writings of European travellers and residents in Ottoman Egypt. As many of these were French, a convenient guide is provided by J.M. Carré, Voyages et écrivains français en Égypte (1517-1869), 2 vols., Cairo 1932. Examples of such materials are: F. Lestringant, Voyages en Égypte des années 1549-1552: Jean Chesneau-André Thoet, Cairo 1984; J.M. Vansleb, Nouvelle relation . . . d’un voyage fait en Égypte en 1672 et 1673, Paris 1677; C.F. Volney, Voyage en Égypte et en Syrie, ed. J. Gaulmier, Paris 1959. At the end of the period is the uniquely important work by Bonnin, Description de l’Égypte, État moderne, Paris 1809-22.

(2) Secondary works: A compendious account of the political history of Ottoman Egypt is given in Holt, Egypt, the Funj and Darfur, in Cambridge history of Africa4, Cambridge 1975; for his specialised articles, see Pearson, Index Islamicius and Supplements. Financial and administrative history are handled in den Biesen's convenient archival materials, by S.J. Shaw, The financial and administrative organization and development of Ottoman Egypt, 1517-1798, Princeton 1958. His article, Landholding and land-tax revenues in Ottoman Egypt, in Holt (ed.), Political and social change, 91-103, is a useful outline. Of outstanding importance as a deeply researched study of the social and economic history of Ottoman Egypt is A. Raymond, Artisans et commerçants au Caire au XVIIIe siècle, 2 vols., Damascus 1974; its range is considerably wider than the title suggests. An important article by Raymond, Quartiers et mouvements populaires au Caire au XVIIIe siècle, is in Holt (ed.) Political and social change, 104-16. Both original sources and modern writing on Upper Egypt are very deficient. A useful summary of the region's history in the Ottoman period occurs in J.C. Garin, Un centre musulman de la Haute-Égypte méditeâlne: Qūṣ, Cairo 1976, ch. IX. Garcin has also published a document of the period, Emirs Haussewârs et beyes de Gîrqa au XVIe et XVIIe siècles, in Annales Islamologi- ques, xii (1974), 245-55. (P.M. Holt) 7. The early modern period 1798-1882.

(a) The French occupation, 1798-1801.

In the night of 1-2 July 1798, a French expeditionary corps under the command of General Napoléon Bonaparte disembarked at Alexandria with the aim of threatening the British position in India by occupying Egypt. The Mamlûk army under Murād Bey was defeated (Battle of the Pyramids, 21 July) and Mamlük rule was ended. The French established a new administration, while seeking to win the cooperation of the Egyptians through a system of điwâns of notables in Cairo and the provinces. Yet the population of Cairo revolted for a first time on 21 October 1798, and there were occasional risings all over the country.

French rule in Egypt was never consolidated. After a campaign into Syria had achieved no decisive result, Bonaparte returned to France on 23 August 1799, leaving the command, successively, to generals Jean Baptiste Kléber (assassinated on 14 June 1800) and ʿAbd Allâh Menou, a convert to Islam. While from now on the ultimate aim of the French had become to bring their troops safely back to France, they did not give way easily to efforts of the Ottoman Empire, assisted by Mamlûk groups and by Great Britain, at recapturing Egypt. An offensive of Turkish and Mamlûk forces was defeated in the Battle of Heliopolis (al-Maṭarîyâ) on 20 March 1800, and the consequent second revolt in Cairo was suppressed. In 1801 British landing forces intervened. Now a honourable capitulation was achieved; the French withdrew from the Cairo area in July, and from Alexandria on 2 September 1801.

The three years of French occupation brought Egypt considerable new experience of political life and disruption. The occupiers raised high taxes and interfered with many traditional concepts and institutions. But they introduced new ones in their place. With the troops, an impressive team of French scholars from various disciplines had come, who founded on 23 August 1798 the Institut d’Égypte for the purpose of "le progrès et la propagation des lumières". They prepared an encyclopaedic survey of the country which they found, the admirable Description de l’Égypte, and prompted innovations in many fields. Some of them may have had no immediate effect on the Egyptian public, but others—e.g., medical work—were certainly noticed. To sum up, it may be stated that the French expedition did not set in motion all modern developments in Egypt, as has sometimes been claimed. Such that it brought the country in direct contact with European culture and drew it into the power-play of European politics.

(b) The Ottoman interlude: Muhammad ʿAlî (1805-48)

After the withdrawal of the French, the Ottoman Empire on the one hand and several Mamlûk factions on the other tried to re-establish their rule, while Brit-ain sought to maintain influence by playing off these groups against each other. An additional intervening group were the ʿulâma of Cairo, who during the French occupation had developed increased self-confidence as leaders of the populace. They found an ally in the person of Muhammad ʿAlî [q.v.], an ambitious officer from Macedonia who had come to Egypt with the Ottoman forces in 1801 and taken command of their Albanian contingent in 1803. An agreement between Muhammad ʿAlî and the ʿulâma, led by al-Sayyid ʿUmar Makram, the nālik al-asrâr, served as a basis for a rising against the Ottoman walis, Khurshid Ahmad Paşa. On 13 May 1805 the ʿulâma3 declared Khurshid deposed; Makram and ʿAbd Allâh al-Sharkâwî, the shâbâk al-ʿAzhar who under the French had presided over the điwân, invested Muhammad ʿAlî with viceregal powers. The event is important for Egyptian historical consciousness; while some scholars regard it as lying in the tradition of the ʿulâma2, who were supposed to intervene at a time when the occupants used to safeguard the interests of the Muslim community by supporting the strongest contender for
power, national-minded Egyptians tend to value it as an act of popular sovereignty at the beginning of the modern Egyptian state. In fact, it cannot be denied that by concluding an agreement with the ‘ulumā‘, Muhammad ‘Alī accepted some sort of constitutional limits to his power.

After the Porte had recognised Muhammad ‘Alī Pasha as wali, he was obliged to share power with the ‘ulumā‘ for some time, but the banishment of ‘Umar Makram in 1809 marked the end of their political influence. Moreover, the British, then at war with the Ottoman Empire, had once more landed troops in March 1807, but in September had been forced to withdraw. Muhammad ‘Alī succeeded also in breaking the power which the Mamluks had regained in the provinces, and finally destroyed this military caste by massacring several hundreds of them in the citadel of Cairo on 1 March 1811. From now on he was the undisputed master of Egypt.

For the outside world, Muhammad ‘Alī’s rule was notable mainly for a number of military campaigns, which he undertook at first on behalf of his sovereign, the Ottoman Sultan, but gradually more and more for the purpose of enlarging and strengthening his own domain.

Immediately after getting rid of the Mamluks, Muhammad ‘Alī in 1811 opened a campaign against the Wahhābī movement [see wahhābīyya], which since the beginning of the century had developed into a permanent menace of the Ottoman provinces surrounding Arabia. After many ups and downs, the Sa‘dī capital, al-Dir‘īyya [q.v.], was conquered in 1818, and Egyptian control over the Arabian Peninsula was maintained in varying degrees till the early forties.

After securing the oasis of Siwa in February 1820, Muhammad ‘Alī began expansion in the Sudan by occupying Dongola, Berber, Sennar and Kordofan in 1820-1; in 1840 al-Tākī, extending towards the Red Sea, was included, and the ports of Suakin and Massawa were leased from the Ottoman Sultan in 1846. The Sudanese possessions were organised under a governor-general (ḥukmādār) in madīnayās in conformity with the Egyptian administrative system.

When the Greek War of Independence began in 1821, the Sultan called once more for the help of his Egyptian henchman. Egyptian troops put down rebellions in Crete and Cyprus in 1822-3, and in February 1825 landed on the Morea [q.v.] which they occupied almost completely till the end of the year. In 1826 they took part in the capture of Missolonghi north of the Gulf of Corinth. After British, French and Russian squadrons destroyed the Turkish-Egyptian fleet in the Battle of Navarino on 20 October 1827, Muhammad ‘Alī decided to terminate his participation in the war. On 6 August 1828 he concluded an agreement with Britain on the withdrawal of the Egyptian forces from the Morea. Crete remained under Egyptian administration till 1840.

The withdrawal from the Greek War marked the beginning of a new phase in which Muhammad ‘Alī’s ambitions turned openly against the Ottoman Empire. For a long time, he had regarded Syria as a desirable accretion to his domain. Using a quarrel with the wali of Saydā as a pretext, he started against him in late October 1831 a campaign which soon induced the Sultan to send his own troops into the fray. After a difficult siege, the Egyptians, under the command of Muhammad ‘Alī’s son ‘ Ib rāhīm [q.v.], captured ‘ Akkā on 27 May 1832 and then took Damascus on 16 June. A victory at Baylān on 30 July opened for them the way across the Amanus mountains to Adana and into Anatolia. At Konya, on 21 December, they won a decisive victory over the Turkish army, taking its commander, the Grand Vezir Reğhid Mehmed, prisoner. On 2 February 1833 Ibrāhīm’s forces reached Kütahyāya, about 200 km only from Istanbul. Now the European powers intervened in order to save the Empire. Early in May a settlement was achieved, obliging the Egyptians to withdraw from central Anatolia, but giving Muhammad ‘Alī the eyālet of Saydā, Tarābulus, Damascus and Aleppo; ‘Ibrāhīm was appointed muhāsīl of the eyālet of Adana.

During the nine years of their presence in Syria, the Egyptians initiated important modern developments in the fields of politics and economics, but of course the occupation also brought interference and hardships, which caused various rebellions of the population. In 1839 an Ottoman army marched against the Egyptians, yet it was once more defeated in the battle of Nizip (Nusaybin), west of the upper Euphrates, on 24 June. As at the same time, a change of the Sultan’s throne (death of Mahāmīd II on 30 June and accession of ‘Abd al-Maqṣūd) and the desertion of the entire Ottoman fleet to Muhammad ‘Alī increased the threat to the Empire even more, the European powers intervened again in order to prevent the Porte from making further conquests; one of their conditions was the evacuation of the oases of the south and the coastal strip of Egypt. When Muhammad ‘Alī refused the conditions offered to him by the London Convention of 15 July 1840, British and Turkish troops landed near Bayrut on 11 September. Their advance and a rising of the Maronites of Lebanon forced Muhammad ‘Alī to sign an armistice convention with the British on 27 November. In February 1841, the last Egyptian troops left Syria.

With his Syrian policy, Muhammad ‘Alī had obviously pursued wider-reaching plans; there had been indications that he thought of substituting an Arab empire for the Ottoman one, or at least of taking over the role of the Sultan’s guardian and tutor. After the European powers had stopped him at Kütahyā he had considered proclaiming his independence. Now he was forced to give up such ambitions. In a final settlement with the Sultan which Muhammad ‘Alī accepted on 10 June 1841, he had to abandon all his territorial acquisitions except the Sudanese provinces, and to agree to a limitation of his armed forces and the regular payment of tribute to the Porte (set, however, not as a percentage of Egypt’s revenues but as a fixed amount). On the other hand he secured the viceregency of Egypt not only for himself but also for his male descendants according to seniority, i.e. the oldest member of the family would be the successor, just like in the Ottoman dynasty. It was also important that the European powers, by assenting to this settlement, guaranteed it. Muhammad ‘Alī had submitted to the sovereignty of the Sultan, yet had won concessions which prepared Egypt to become a state in its own right.

Muhammad ‘Alī gained the means for realising his ambitions by a purposeful policy directed towards monopolisation and modernisation. Soon after becoming wali, he abolished the tilizām system and confiscated the rizāk ahbā‘iyā (agricultural wa‘f estates), thus assuming control of all agricultural land (when from 1829 onwards, he began creating a landed aristocracy by granting unencumbered land to members of his family and to his favourites, they remained initially under his influence, even if the latter then prepared the introduction of a system of private property later on). In this way, he could decide in detail what Egyptian agriculture produced. At the same
time he monopolised the entire trade. As the industries which he created remained state enterprises, it can be said that he controlled the economic life of the country completely. In conjunction with a rigorous tax policy, monopolisation was laid out to finance the foreign enterprises of the ruler, but also to give him a strong centralised power.

All this implied the creation of a modern state apparatus. A new administration was established. The central government was organised on the principle of official deliberation, with the various departments entrusted to divans; from 1829 onwards a larger consultative assembly was convened, comprising provincial notables as well as representatives of the ‘ulama’ and, later on, of the merchants. The state organ to which most attention was devoted was, of course, the army; it was no longer recruited from the Mamluk caste or from mercenaries but raised from the country by conscription. In addition, a navy was built up.

As the bureaucracy and the armed forces needed, above all, qualified people, great efforts had to be made in the fields of training and education. Since 1809 young men had been sent to Europe for studying the military sciences, navigation, shipbuilding, engineering, printing, etc.; the range of subjects was gradually broadened. In the 1820s the students went mainly to France. Simultaneously, schools were founded in Egypt (e.g., a land surveyors’ school 1816; various officers’ schools from 1821; a school of medicine 1827; a school of agriculture and administration 1829; a school of midwifery 1832, being the first girls’ school; a polytechnic 1834; a school for languages and translation 1835). Soon the government became aware of the necessity to prepare the students for the technical instruction dispensed by these institutes; so a preparatory school (madrasa taghizisya) was opened in 1825, and primary schools (makātib mubtadiyya) followed in 1833.

These modernising efforts naturally extended to the economy. In the agricultural sector, new cash-crops (most importantly, long-staple cotton) and new techniques were introduced; irrigation was improved. In the industrial sector, Muhammad Ali pursued a systematic policy of founding modern factories. At first the production of weapons and ships had priority, but in the 1820s so many textile mills were established that a more general import substitution must have been the aim. In the labour force, foreigners played a considerable role; yet more and more Egyptians were recruited and trained for the factories. Even if the results were far from satisfying, the experiment was remarkable.

The failure of Muhammad Ali’s attempt at empire-building forced him to abandon many of his modernisation plans and to curtail the others. In the economic field, the Anglo-Turkish commercial convention of 1838, and the treaties with other European powers following it, contributed to the decisions when the stipulations banning all monopolies and setting a low tariff for imports were applied to Egypt in the 1840s.

Muhammad Ali’s ambitious policies, involving harsh taxation, conscription and other government interference, were painful for the Egyptian people, but they served a grand design for establishing in the East, at an early time, a modern state capable of winning and maintaining political and economic independence. In the end, the attempt was wrecked by European intervention. Yet Muhammad Ali left the country free of debt and had also avoided granting concessions to foreigners. In addition, many developments pointing towards a modern Egypt had been set in motion. Although Muhammad Ali, himself a foreigner to the country, related to a large extent upon military and civilian functionaries from other parts of the Ottoman Empire and upon European advisers, he could not do without the Egyptians. Thus his rule caused or accelerated deep socio-economic and cultural changes. In particular, a new middle class began to rise, trained for service in the modern state by modern schools, dispensing secular education. In the arts and in Islamic education, the influence of European adventurers was felt; so far Islamic education had dominated. The necessity of expressing the new knowledge imported from the West in the vernacular set off a revival of the Arabic language and literature (see ‘Arabiyya. ii. 4. Modern written Arabic, and Nahda).

When old age made Muhammad Ali incapable of ruling, his son Ismail took over the government in April 1848; he was confirmed as viceroy by a firman of the Sultan on 2 September. But Ibrahim died before his father, on 10 November 1848, and a grandson of Muhammad Ali, Abbas Hilmi I, became viceroy. Muhammad Ali died on 2 August 1849; see further on him, MUHAMMAD ALI.

(c) Abbas I (1849-54), Sa‘id (1854-63) and Isma‘il (1863-79).

After an interval of a few years, the policy of modernisation was resumed by Muhammad Ali’s successors. Now, however, it took place under different conditions. Egypt opened itself to overwhelming foreign influences which were no longer firmly channelled by its government. As a result, the country was led to apparent prosperity but then to financial ruin, dependence and, in the end, foreign occupation.

The project which received most attention was the Canal. When Isma‘il deposed his father in 1848, he was confirmed by the British engineer Robert Stephenson (1801-55). When Sa‘id’s son Muhammad (q.v.), who, widely reputed to be hostile to modernisation, in fact continued the course of retrenchment to which his grandfather had turned after 1841, Abbas was murdered in obscure circumstances on 13 July 1854. The two viceregents succeeding him, Muhammad Ali’s son Muhammad Sa‘id (q.v.), who died on 18 January 1863, and Ibrahim’s son Isma‘il (q.v.), were responsible for the opening of Egypt to foreign penetration.

It is undeniable that they brought Egypt considerable material advancement. Their large programs of public works improved the infrastructure. As his only major project in this field, Abbas already began the construction of the Alexandria-Cairo railway, the first in Africa and the Near East (contract with the British engineer Robert Stephenson, 1851). When Isma‘il was deposed in 1879 he left a rail network of 1,881 km, covering the Delta and reaching Suez as well as Asyût. Numerous bridges were constructed. The harbours of Alexandria and Suez were extended and modernised. The cities of Cairo and Alexandria profited from generous programs of sanitation, embellishment and extension. Irrigation canals were excavated or improved on an immense scale.

The project which received most attention was the Suez Canal. Shortly after his accession, Sa‘id granted the concession for the building of this waterway connecting the Mediterranean with the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean to the French diplomat Ferdinand de Lesseps on 30 November 1854. Great difficulties of financing and diplomacy hampered its realisation, but construction work started on 25 April 1859, the Porte at last gave its assent in 1866, and on 17 November 1869 the opening of the canal for navigation was celebrated in the presence of an illustrious crowd of international guests.
The focus of economic development lay in agriculture. Beside the great landowners from the viceregal family and the upper stratum, a new class of provincial notables acquired larger estates, after a law enacted by Sa'īd in 1858 had introduced full private property for one category of land and rights close to this status for another. Having established direct relations with the merchants and through them with the international market, these landowners strongly expanded the already small production of cotton, which was in great demand because of the decline of supply from America during the Civil War. So there was a period of prosperity, even if poor peasants and agricultural labourers did not benefit much. When, however, the cotton boom came to an end in 1866, profits fell and debts grew in the farm sector as a whole. At the same time, this sector had to carry the main burden of the taxes which the government strove to raise continuously. A revival of industrial activities did not go far. State factories, mainly working for the armed forces, suffered under the increasing shortage of funds. Private enterprises remained mostly limited to processing agricultural products (cotton ginning, oil extraction etc.); a considerable number of sugar mills was established on Isma'il's own estates. In education also, a new effort was started. A primary school law of 1868 set the aim of integrating the traditional Koran schools, the katātīb, into the system of modern state schools. In 1871, the Dār al-šāri'ā was founded for the purpose of preparing students of al-Azbar University to teach in the modern schools. In 1873 and 1874 the first regular girls' schools were opened. The growing number of people who had to some degree received a modern education began to form a stratum from which new intellectual movements could rise.

As far as the government was concerned, economic growth never brought in enough revenue to cover expenditure. The solution was borrowing. Of course, it had always been done, but until 'Abd al-Qādir it had not reached important proportions. Then Sa'id incurred such large obligations that he was forced vastly to increase the floating debt. In 1860 he obtained his first foreign loan on a personal basis, and two years later the first public loan. Isma'il continued in the same way. European capitalists were always ready to lend, but, taking advantage of the privileges granted to foreigners by the capitulations [see IMTĂVAZĂR] and the political influence of their governments, they provided money only under conditions extremely unfavourable to Egypt, which had not only to pay high interest but also to concede even higher deductions from the nominal value of the loans. At the end of Isma'il's reign, the total funded and floating debt came close to £100 million. Furthermore, many national assets had passed into foreign ownership; e.g., in 1873 Isma'il had sold his Suez Canal Company shares to the British government. In addition to financial and economic dependence, the result was political interference by the European powers.

The successors of Muhammad 'Ali were always eager to preserve and, if possible, to increase the degree of independence with Egypt had reached within the Ottoman Empire. They fulfilled their military obligations toward the Sultan by sending troops when asked ( Crimean War 1853–6; suppression of risings in 'Asir 1864–65 and Crete 1866; Balkan War 1876–77) and sought to influence the Porte by official and unofficial payments. Isma'il achieved the most noticeable concessions. By a firman of 27 May 1866, the succession of the Egyptian viceregents was changed from the principle of seniority to that of primogeniture. A firman of 8 June 1867 granted Isma'il the title Khedive (al-sudur e.g.), newly-created in order to distinguish the viceroy of Egypt formally from the wālis of ordinary provinces; at the same time, he was authorised to issue regulations for the internal affairs of Egypt and to conclude agreements with foreign agents, below the level of international treaties, on matters concerning customs, foreigners' police, transit and mails. Finally, a firman of 8 June 1873 recapitulated and supplemented all the rights which Egypt had obtained, including agreements with foreign states on all matters of commerce as well as the contracting of foreign loans; in addition, the number of the armed forces would no longer be limited. Egypt had come close to formal independence from its old sovereign.

Isma'il was also aware of the legal handicaps which the capitulations put on Egypt's dealings with foreigners, and started an important effort to overcome them. Meeting the refusal of Europeans to submit to local jurisdiction and their insistence to have their cases heard before their consular courts, Muhammad 'Ali had founded special commercial courts in Alexandria and Cairo consisting of Egyptian and foreign judges. Isma'il took up this idea and, after the mostly French Foreign Minister had in 1863, the newly-won right of influence with foreign governments, in 1867 proposed a judicial reform according to which all cases involving foreigners would be judged by such mixed courts. After difficult negotiations with the capitulary powers, and after special civil, penal, commercial and procedural codes, founded mainly on French law, had been promulgated in 1875, the Mixed Courts (al-mukhtalita) were established in the following year, with the serious restriction that the powers deprived them of almost all criminal jurisdiction [see also MADJLIS AL-MULK].

Yet another policy, intended to emphasise Egypt's development as an independent and modern state, was directed toward representation of the people and at least formal restrictions on the absolute power of the ruler. On 25 November 1866 Isma'il inaugurated the Consultative Chamber of Delegates (Madjlis al-nuwwdb), based upon laws issued on 22 October. Its 75 members were elected by the village shaykhs, it met once a year. On 28 August 1878 the Khedive declared: "Je veux doreravant gouverner avec et par mon conseil des ministres," establishing the principle of ministerial responsibility; he did so, however, under the pressure of the European powers keen on using the council of ministers for strengthening their control of Egypt [see also MADJLIS AL-MULK].

For, in the meantime, Egypt's growing difficulties in meeting its financial obligations had raised fears among the European creditors of a complete insolvency, and they urged their governments to intervene. On 2 May 1876 Isma'il was forced to establish a Comité de la dette publique, comprising a French, a British, an Italian and an Austrian commissioner, to receive those revenues assigned directly for interest and debt repayment. As this did not seem sufficient, on 18 November 1876 the "dual control" was created, through which a Briton and a Frenchman as controllers-general assumed supervision of government revenue and expenditure as a whole. From now on, an increasing number of Europeans were employed in all branches of the administration. An even higher level of foreign involvement was reached when a Briton became minister of finance and a Frenchman minister of public works in the government formed in August-September 1878 under the principle of ministerial responsibility.
In these years, a public opinion had begun to stir, expressing itself in a number of independent newspapers which appeared since 1876 and in discussion circles like that formed around Qabāl al-Dīn al-Alghānī [q.v.], who had settled in Cairo in 1871, encouraged by the Egyptian government. At last the Khedive chose to mobilise influential groups of the local society, Turco-Circassians as well as Egyptians, as his allies against foreign control. Early in April 1879, more than three hundred civil officials, army officers, 'ulāma', urban and rural notables signed a statement of national demands (al-dā'ība al-wataniyya). On 7 April Ismā'īl dismissed the ministry comprising the European ministers and the next day had a national government formed. Feverish diplomatic activity between the European capitals and Istanbul followed. In the end, the Sultan deposed Ismā'īl on 26 June 1879, appointing his son Muhammad Tawfīk [q.v.] as his successor.

Under the new Khedive, the dual control over Egypt's finances was re-established, even if foreigners did not become government ministers again. A final settlement between the country and its creditors was drawn up in the law of liquidation of 17 July 1880, which set the total consolidated debt at £ 98,378,000, assessed at 8% of all state revenues high, Riyād gave orders to collect taxes from the farmers by reasonable methods, without jeopardising anybody's existence; on the other hand he put the screw on the big landowners and reduced their tax privileges. The use of the kurbdj or knout by tax-collectors was forbidden and the corvee (sukhra) for other than public purposes abolished. But these reform policies were not given time to bear fruit.

Elements of a true national movement were now assembling, consisting of three distinct groups: meritocratic and rural notables of native stock who, although many of them had been elected to the Majlis ghānī al-nawwāb, still felt excluded from real power by the old, mainly Turco-Circassian, elite attached to the shurd al-nuwwdb, and on 25 May they demanded the resignation of al-Kindī, minister of war. On 21 September 1879. Although obliged to keep state revenues high, Riyād chose to mobilise influential groups of the large majority of the Egyptians, and on 25 May they demanded the resignation of al-Bārūdī's ministry and his banishment from Egypt. The Khedive was forced to reinstate 'Urbā as minister of war. On 11 June there was an outbreak of popular violence in Alexandria in which about forty Europeans were killed, in spite of the presence of the Anglo-French squadron. Meanwhile, international diplomacy and Egypt's Ottoman suzerain had been brought into the drama; but a conference of the powers, opened at Istanbul on 23 June, achieved nothing, and Sultan 'Abd al-Hamīd II [q.v.], who would of course have liked to use the chance for reinforcing his influence in Egypt, could only send emissaries there. In the end, the decisive intervention fell upon Britain which, although with great reluctance on the part of the Gladstone government, wanted to prevent France from winning preponderance on the Nile. So it acted on its own by having its ships bombard Alexandria on 11-12 July, with the pretext of keeping the Egyptians from further fortifying the harbour.

This brought about the final break between the Khedive and 'Urbā, who had remained minister of war when a successor government had been formed after al-Bārūdī's resignation. When Tawfiq now sought the protection of British troops in his palace in Alexandria, 'Urbā proclaimed himself responsible for the defence of the country, demanding that henceforth only his orders should be followed. In Cairo an "emergency council" (al-majlis al-'urf) was established to serve as a provisional government. Consisting of officers and officials, among them some Copts, it made a remarkable effort to mobilise the resources of the country for fighting, but also to maintain order and to protect the European residents.

Up to its end, the 'Urbā movement enjoyed the moral support of the large majority of the Egyptians, to whom it explained itself in terms of a dhikād against the domination of infidels. On the other hand, most of the notables who had been its allies abandoned it, as they thought it unreasonable to fight against the Khedive and the British at the same time; and even part of its intellectual supporters withdrew. Al-Majlis al-'urf was therefore not in a position to direct the fighting in the country. Yet British military might was needed to bring the movement down. In August a British
expeditionary corps occupied the Suez Canal and on 13 September 1882 beat the Egyptian army at al-Tall. Ar-Rahmân al-Râfîi capitulated to the Khedive, and ‘Urâbî rendered his sword to the capitulated to the al-Kâblî. British. The leaders and many participants of the movement were tried by military courts; ‘Urâbî was sentenced to death, but on British urging the sentence was commuted to exile for life (in 1901 he was allowed to return to Egypt).

The ‘Urâbî movement had not aimed at a political or a social revolution. Although refusing obedience to the Khedive, it had never made concrete plans to depose him, and it had always asserted its loyalty to the Ottoman Sultan. As to structural changes in Egyptian society, it had never gone beyond promising a serious endeavour of some important Egyptian groups to decide on their own how Egypt’s problems should be solved, and in the al-nawâsîb it had created an institution for achieving this purpose. Even if the struggle for independence had failed, the foundations of a national consciousness had been laid on which future generations could build.

GENEALOGICAL TABLE OF THE DYNASTY FOUNDED BY MUHAMMAD ‘ÂLI

1. Muhammad ‘Âli
   (ruled 1805-48)

2. Ibrâhîm
   (ruled 1848)

3. ‘Abdâbâ Hilmi I
   (ruled 1863-79)

4. Muhammed Sa’îd
   (ruled 1854-63)

5. ‘Abdâbâ Hilmi I
   (ruled 1848-54)

6. Muhammad Tawfik
   (ruled 1879-92)

7. ‘Abdâbâ Hilmi II
   (ruled 1892-1914)

8. Husayn Kâmil
   (ruled 1914-17)

9. Ahmad Fu‘âd I
   (ruled 1917-36)

10. Fârîk
    (ruled 1936-52)

11. Ahmad Fu‘âd II
    (nominal rule 1952-3)


8. The British Protectorate and the end of the monarchy 1882-1952. [see Supplement.]

9. Republican Egypt 1952-1990. [see Supplement.]

MISRÁ (see 'Arabí).

**MISRÁ of MISRÁTA, also Misrata, important Berber tribe belonging to the branch of the Hawwara [q.v.] of the Baranís [Brānís] group.**

According to Ibn Khaldún, to whom most of the information concerning this people is owed, the Misrāta derived their origin from a certain Meld, who was the son of Awrīgh, son of Barānīs and the brother of the Hawwara. According to Ibn Hazm, and also according to the Berber genealogist Sābīk b. Sulaymān, both quoted by Ibn Khaldūn, the Misrāta and other families descended from Meld, including the Sābārīs, are the result of goods which the Waṣīlīs, a nomadic tribe, used to transport from their own country, which is now situated in the south of the region of the Misrāta, to the coast of Tripolitania. According to the genealogists of this tribe, the Misrāta tribe, whose true name should be read as 'Arsakīnī or 'Ashakīnī, a Lybian tribe mentioned by Ptolemy which inhabited the island of Ptolemais (Tolmēta)—Cyrene in Cyrenaica (called Barka [q.v.] by the ancient authors). The French historian J. Destang, who speaks of the small town of Barka, whose name is derived from the tribe whose true name should be read as 'Arsakīnī or 'Ashakīnī, said that this tribe, whose name is derived from the tribe whose true name should be read as 'Arsakīnī or 'Ashakīnī, was a large town, very civilised and very wealthy because they paid no tribute and because they were active in commerce. They handled the goods which reached them in Syrian galleys and transported them to Numidia, in other words the interior of North Africa, where they were exchanged for slaves and other goods coming from Ethiopia and the Sudan. These varied goods, including slaves, were exported to Turkey.

A certain proportion of the tribe of the Misrāta took part in the migrations of its sister tribe the Hawwara, of which various segments made their way, through Tríkiya, towards what are now Algeria and Morocco. A group of Misrāta which accompanied these segments settled in the central Maghrib, on the mountain of Djaibal Hawwara which dominates the town of Baṭḥā. According to A. Épaudard, the town of Baṭḥā (whose precise location is unknown) was probably situated on the left bank of the Mina, in the region of the present-day town of Reţiţane, on the main route from Tlemcēn to Algiers. Today, only a few ruins remain. Leo Africanus states that in his time, that is about the beginning of the 10th/16th century, al-Baṭḥā was “a large town, very civilised and very populous... built recently by the Africans (Berbers)”. According to Épaudard again, it was probably built at the beginning of the 8th/14th century. Later, it was destroyed and, in Leo’s time, only the foundations remained.

It may be added that a diminutive group of Misrāta, probably natives of the oasis of Misrāta, arrived at an uncertain period, possibly at the time of the conquest of Sicily by the kāfīr Asad b. Fūrāt in 218/826 or shortly afterwards, in the region of the town of Catania, where there were observed (during the period 469/1075-1125) peasants belonging to the diocese of this town and descended from the tribe of Misrātah (Misrāta).

MISRATA — MITHAK


Misrî Efendi [see Nizâl].

Missîs, Missîsa [see Mässêsa].

Misurata [see Misrata].

Miswâk (.), a term denoting the toothbrush as well as the tooth-pick. The name was previously used for the tooth-pick (siwâdk, susûk) which denotes also the act of cleansing the teeth. Neither of the two terms occurs in the Kur’ân. In Hadîth, miswâk is not used, siwâk, on the other hand, frequently. In order to understand its use, it is necessary to know that the instrument consists of a piece of smooth wood, the end of which is incised so as to make it similar to a brush to some extent. The piece of wood used as a tooth-pick must have been smaller and thinner, as appears e.g. from the tradition in which it is related that Muhammad one day received a visitor and kept the tooth-pick ‘at the end of his tongue’.

Concerning Zayd b. Khâlid, it is related that he used to sit in the mosque keeping the tooth-pick behind his ear, ‘just as a writer will keep his pen’ (Abû Dâwûd, Tahâra, bâb 25; al-Tirmidhi, Tahâra, bâb 18). When he was in his last hours, there entered a man with a piece of wood fit for a siwâk; Ā‘îha took and chewed it, so as to make it smooth (al-Bukhâri, Maghâzî, bâb 83). In general, Hadîth emphasizes the value attached by Muhammad to the siwâk. When he entered his house, his first movement was towards it (Muslim, Tahâra, trad. 43; Abû Dâwûd, Tahâra, bâb 27). His servant Ā‘îb b. Mas’ûd received the epithet of zâhîb al-siwaq because he used to take care of Muhammad’s siwâk (al-Bukhâri, Faâdîl al-Sâbâha, bâb 20). When Muhammad woke at night, he cleaned his mouth by means of the siwâk before he washed himself and performed the worship (al-Bukhâri, Aßfâhn, bâb 8; Wudû‘, bâb 73; Tâhadghût, bâb 9; Abû Dâwûd, Tahâra, bâb 30; Muslim, Tahâra, trads. 46, 47). When fasting, Muhammad also made use of the siwâk (Ahmad b. Hanbal, iii, 445, 446).

The miswâk is chiefly used before the wudâ‘ as a preparation before the salât. It is said that this was the practice of Muhammad (Muslim, Tahâra, trad. 48), who attached so great a value to it that he would have declared it obligatory before every salât were it not that he feared thereby to overburden his community (al-Bukhâri, Aßfâhn, bâb 8; Muslim, Tahâra, trad. 45; Abû Dâwûd, Tahâra, bâb 25; al-Tirmidhi, Tahâra, bâb 18). In one tradition it is said, as a matter of fact, that the obligatory use of the siwâk before every salât was introduced by Muhammad as a compensation for the abolition of the obligatory wudâ‘ before every salât (Abû Dâwûd, Tahâra, bâb 25). In another tradition (al-Bukhâri, Qa‘îl al-‘itâm, bâb 66) the use of the siwâk is called obligatory before the Friday worship.

The appreciation of the miswâk which appears from all these traditions culminates in the fact that it belongs to the customs of the ‘natural religion’ (fitra) (Abû Dâwûd, Tahâra, bâb 29) or to the ordinances of the Apostles (al-Tirmidhi, Nikâh, bâb 1).

Nevertheless, Fîkh does not declare the use of the miswâk obligatory in any case. There is general agreement on this point. According to some traditions, however, the Zâhirîs did declare the use of the miswâk obligatory before the salât, but these traditions are not generally accepted. According to Fîkh, the use of the miswâk is recommended at all times, especially in five cases: in connection with the salât, under all circumstances; in connection with the wudâ‘, with the recitation of the Kur’ân; after sleep; and as often as the mouth has lost its freshness in any way too long since eating. According to the school of al-Shâfi‘î, the use of the miswâk is blamable (makrûh) between noon and sunset at the time of fasting, for the foetid smell (khaîâf) of the faster’s breath is beloved by Allâh (cf. al-Nâsâ‘î, Tahâra, bâb 6).

It is recommended to use a miswâk of anâk wood of medium size; for further tests, dry after too moisture to clean the piece as well as all sides of the teeth, beginning from the right side of the mouth, moving the miswâk upwards and downwards in order not to hurt the sockets of the teeth.

Bibliography: References to the Hadîth literature in Wensinck, A handbook of early Muhammadan tradition, s.v. Tooth-brush; the juridical points of view in al-Nawawi’s commentary on the Sûrât of Muslim, Bulûk 1290, 873-4, i, 125; Wellhausen, Reste arabischen Heidentums2, 172; Goldziher, in RHR (1902), xi, 15-16; F. Buhl, Das Leben Muhammeds, 354 n. 94. (A.J. Wensinck)

Mithâk (., the noun of instrument from wa’tükha ‘to trust, have confidence in’, or wa’tukha ‘to be firm’, in usage the equivalent of the masdar mimî or noun of place and time ma&wâhk, covenant, agreement, used 25 times in the Kurgan and often linked with its synonym sh’dh [q.v.].

In a few places, it refers to political compacts (IV, 92,90, 94,92, VIII, 73,72, and cf. the use of sh’adha in VIII, 58,56), and once to the compact between husband and wife (IV, 25,21), but the majority of usages relate to compacts between God and various members of His human creation, the unilateral imposition of a covenant upon men, as we have the mithâk with the prophets (III, 75,81, XXXII, 7; cf. VII, 131,134-5); the mithâk with Muhammad himself when he was at Medina (II, 78,84); the mithâk with the People of the Book (III, 184,187), once specifically with the Christians (V, 17,14), but most frequently in reference to God’s covenant with the Children of Israel at Sinai, subsequently broken by them (II, 20,25,24, 60,67, 77,83, 87,93, IV, 153-4,154-5, V, 107, 15,16,12,13, 74,70). The source of the concept of covenant, and the imagery associated with it, is clearly Biblical, going back to the Pentateuchal bêqîq (see J. Wansbrough, Quranic studies. Sources and methods of scriptural interpretation, London 1977, 8-12). Note-worthy, however, are references to God’s mithâk or sh’dh with the believers (XIII, 20,25,1,VII, 8) and the mithâk of the Book (VII, 168,169), which link up with the idea which grew as part of the Islamic Creation story of a primordial compact: that God, according to predestinationary interpretations found e.g. in al-Ash’arî [q.v.], separated the future elect from the damned before Man was actually created. Likewise, in a Shî‘i work which apparently stems from the early 4th/10th century and may be from the hand of the historian al-Ma’sû‘î [q.v.], and which aims at proving ‘Allî’s role as the wâhy and the repository of the Prophet’s thoughts, the K. I/Ih&ât al-wasâyqa li ‘l-IImâm ‘Abî b. ‘Abî Tâlib, we have retained the story that, in the act of creation, God took a lump of clay, from which were formed the Prophet, the Ahî al-Bayt [q.v.], etc., and then passed them through the flame unharmed; after this, God concluded with them a mithâk involving tawlid, risâla, imâma, etc., and then He went on to create Adam (cited by Ch. Pellat, in Le Shî‘isme imâmite, colloque de Strasbourg (6-9 mai 1968), Paris 1970, 78-9).

Muslim lore, building on Kur’ân, VII, 171,172, also applied the idea of a covenant (mithâk, sh’dh), a

In modern Arabic political and diplomatic parlance, miḥāk denotes a treaty, pact or agreement. Finally, one might note that the cognate form maḥāk is used in the Kurʾān, XII, 66, 80, for the assurance from God taken by Jacob upon his sons for their safely bringing back Joseph.


MİTHAK — MİTHAK-I MILLİ

MİTHAK — MİTHAK-I MILLİ (r.), the "National Pact", a proclamation voted by the last Ottoman Parliament which met in Istanbul in January 1920. Essentially, the National Pact proclaimed the territorial integrity of the remaining non-Arab heartlands of the Ottoman Empire. It was passed at a time when, after defeat in the First World War, the Ottoman Empire was threatened by the dismemberment of Anatolia and Rumelia which was provided for in the abortive Treaty of Sèvres (10 August 1920). Under the terms of that treaty, Greece was to receive a large portion of Thrace and the Dodecanese Islands, whilst there was a distinct possibility that Izmir and its environs would eventually become Greek. Armenia was recognised as an independent state and the Kurds were granted autonomy by the right to claim the Arдаhānān. However, Armenia was not mentioned in the Sivas Declaration, reference is made to the sen-

mâl allowed negotiations to take place in Amasya between Mustafā Kemâl and the Navy Minister, Sâhil Pâsha. At this meeting, which resulted in what has become known as the second Amasya Declaration, there was agreement on the Erzurum and Sivas Declarations. Particular reference was made to the need to make no new concessions to non-Muslims that would undermine national sovereignty; to cede no territories on the Ottoman Muslim side of the armistice line. Although it seems that this wording reflected pressures to include Syria within the national boundaries, it was recognised in the National Pact that those portions of the Ottoman Empire with a majority Arab population and under Allied occupation after 30 October 1918 were to be decided their fate by free vote. The Arabs had not been mentioned in the Sivas Declaration.

Article 2 allowed the three sandjak (subprovinces) of Kars, Ardahan and Batum, which were adjacent to the Soviet Union, to decide their own future by free vote. (A free vote had already been taken in 1918, under the terms of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk when the inhabitants had decided to join the Ottoman Empire.) Article 3 required the legal status of Western Thrace to be decided by the free vote of the inhabitants. Article 4 required the security of Istanbul and implied free passage for commerce through the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus Article 54 ambiguously, but shrewdly, guaranteed the rights of minorities "as defined in the treaties concluded between the Entente Powers and their enemies", implying that the new state would be in good company in denying autonomy to minorities. This article expressed, though in much more general terms, the attitudes towards minorities evident in the Erzurum and Sivas Declarations. But at no point in the
Erzurum and Sivas Declarations, nor in the National Pact, is there any reference to Turks, only to Ottoman Muslims. Although the National Pact clearly did not include areas where there were Arab majorities within its scope, it was not overtly a declaration of Turkish independence, however much it came to be regarded as such later. Article 6 declared that no restriction was accepted on political, financial and judicial development—an all-embracing article which does not directly derive from the Erzurum and Sivas Declarations. In short, the National Pact expresses the development—an all-embracing article which does not directly derive from the Erzurum and Sivas Declarations. In short, the National Pact expresses the basis of the settlement in the Treaty of Lausanne, signed on 24 July 1923.
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old Greek σάντιος, and is described in the Mafatih al-ulum, 236, as "an instrument of the Greeks (Τυνανσίπηλος) and Byzantium (Ῥώμ) resembling the ḍrūj). According to Ibn Khusrushdabhī, it had twenty-four strings (al-Maṣūdī, viii, 91 = § 3216; cf. Farmer, Byzantine musical instruments in the ninth century, 4 ff.). Ibn Sīnā classes it with the ṣandj among the instruments with "open strings" stretched across a space. Psaltery. In describing those instruments with "open strings" stretched across a surface, both Ibn Sīnā and Ibn Zayla mention a particular type named the ṣandj. Whilst the name suggests a "long-necked" instrument, the details given of strings of different lengths but identically situated bridges (hamīlīt), compel one to recognise in it a trapezoidal psaltery, one species of which was known later as the kānān. The word ṣandj also stood for "phoenix" and we know that the Greeks of old had an instrument called the ṣandj. This may account for both the instrument and the name among the Arabs. It is not mentioned, however, after the 11th century.

The kānān [q.v.], the present-day psaltery of the Arabs and Turks, is said by Ibn Ghāybi to have been invented by Plato, although the instrument as known in the 4th/10th century is attributed to al-Fārābī (Ibn Khallīkān, Bog. dat., iii, 369). The word itself is derived from the Greek ἱδρα (idhēra, a long-necked fowl), resembling the Byzantine musical instruments in the ninth century, udī, viii, 91 = § 3216; cf. Farmer, Byzantine musical instruments in the ninth century, 4 ff.). We find it mentioned by Ibn Khaldūn (d. 1080/1406) and al-Haythamī (d. 957/1563), but its popularity was but trifling among the Arabs. In the 18th century it is doubtfully acknowledged by Russell (i, 132) and Niehbuhr (tampān). In Egypt, both Villoteau and Lane show that it was only to be found in the hands of Jews, Greeks and other foreign residents, whilst native writers like Mushākā and Darwīsh Muḥammad make no mention of it. To-day it is practically unknown in Syria and Egypt. In the Maghīrib it is unnoticed by Hūst, Christianowitsch and Salvador Daniel, and although it is dealt with by Delphieu and Guīn, it is scarcely known to-day. In Persia, however, it obtained greater recognition. In the 17th century it is mentioned by Chardin but not by Kaempfer, whilst Advieille in the 19th century gives both a design and a description. In Turkey, whilst the word is registered in the 17th century by Meninski, it is not mentioned by Ḥādījī Ḥālīfī, nor described by Ewliyāʾī Celebi, in their lists of Turkish musical instruments. In the next century, however, it is recognised by Toderini, and to-day the santur is one of the most esteemed instruments in the country, where it may be seen in two forms: the ṣantīr turkhī and the ṣantūr frānsīz. The former, exclusively used by the Jews, has 160 strings, grouped in fives, giving thirty-two notes, a two octaves chromatic scale. The latter, which is common to the Turks, was invented by a Turk from the West about the middle of the last century by a certain Hilmi Bey. It is mounted with 105 strings, also grouped in fives, which are placed on the sound-chest in the Occidental way.

Bibliography: In addition to the references given in the article, see H.G. Farmer, History of Arabian music, London 1929; idem, Studies in oriental musical instruments, London 1931; idem, Historical facts for the Arabian musical influence, London 1931; J.P. Kosegarten, Alii Ispahanensis liber cantilenarum magnus, Greifswald 1840-2; Land, Recherches sur l’Histoire de la gamme arabe, Leiden 1884; Erlanger, La musique arabe, i, al-Fārābī, Paris 1930; Ibn Sīnā, Ṣīfī, India Office ms. 1811, fol. 173; Ibn Zayla, B.L. ms. Or 2361, fol. 235b; Kanz al-tuhaf, B.L. ms. Or 2361, fol. 265-4; Ibn Ghāybi, ms. Oxford, Marsh magnus, 1836; Ibn Ṣafī al-Dīn Shalahī, ms. Madrid 503; ZDPV (1927), c, 19; Haythamī, ms. Staatsbibliothek, Berlin 5517, fol. 24b; C. Niebuhr, Voyage en Arabie, Amsterdam 1776-80, 143; E. Kaempfer, Amoenitates exoticae, Lemgo 1712; Russell, Natural history of Aleppo, London 1794; A. Shībāsh, The theory of music in Arabian writings (c. 900-1900), in Répertoire international des sources musicales, x, Munich 1979, index s.v. instruments/mizalāfa. (H.G. Farmer) MIZALLA (a.), lit. "an instrument or apparatus for providing shade, zill," apparently synonymous with the šamsa, šamsiya, lit. "an instrument or apparatus for providing shelter from the sun," probably therefore referring to the sunshade or parasol born on ceremoinal occasions and processions [see mawāki'a] over early Islamic rulers. 1. In the ʿAbbāsid and Fatimid caliphates. The historical sources provide a few references on practice in the ʿAbbāsid caliphate. Thus the official Muhammad b. Ḥādījī al-Malik al-Zayyāt [see Ibn al-Zayyāt] was responsible in al-Muʿtāsīm’s time for the manufacture of inter alia the m.sh.m.s. (? mushanssa, mishnā), al-Malik al-Zayyāt, i, 1183. During al-Mustaʿṣim’s reign, control of the caliphal šamsa was disputed by the Turkish general, as is one point it was held by al-Yūnūk al-Farghānī (al-Tabari, iii, 1553). The troops accompanying al-Muktaṣir in 294/1006-7 and protecting the Pilgrimage caravan against the Car-
mizalla of Zakarawayh had a shamsa which had been set with jewels by al-Mu'tadid (al-Tabari, iii, 2274; 'Arith, 16). In 320/932 al-Mukhtar marched on his fatal expedition against Munis al-Muzaffar [q.v.] wearing a tākhtādī coat, a black turban and with his head shaded by a shamsa ('Arith, 167).

Whether this shamsa, etc., really was a parasol is thus not entirely clear from the contexts, but whatever it was exactly, it passed also to the Fatimid, and one of those caliphs' Salābī soldiers had the duty of functioning as šābīl al-mizalla; see A. Mez, Die Renais sance des Islams, 131, Eng. tr. 133; 1. Hrbek, Die Slawen in der ersten Hälfte des 9. Jahrhunderts (Khatrat al-tayf, 44) described a parasol carried by the officer whose rank was closest to that of the sultan, and was remunerated with a robe of honour. In several respects the Mamluk mazalla differed from its Fatimid prototype as described by al-Kalkashandi (Subh, iii, 469). The latter appears to have lacked the bird, to have varied in colour according to the caliph's robes, and to have been carried in processions generally.

**Bibliography:** Given in the article.

(P.M. HOYT)

3. In the Islamic West. Here it would seem that a certain impression, hence variability, existed in the meaning of two words derived from the same root and designating "shades". Properly speaking, the mazall is a canopy and also the general's tent, insignia of command, rallying point and headquarters on campaign. In this sense, it is a synonym of kubba. The mizalla/mazalla, however, is a parasol. Lévi-Provençal let himself be caught in this confusion between mazall and mizalla (Hist. Esp. Mus., iii, 14, 111). We may note that the Vocabulary had mazallīgalūps, capel de sol, and P. de Alcalá, medel, mededlitnamada, sombra de ramos.

Technically speaking, as against mazall, a portable but firm construction—at least for the daytime and whose sudden removal provoked many a rout—and quite spacious (the commander withdrew there, slept there and met his officers in council there), the mizalla/parasol constitutes a movable piece of equip ment whose ultimate purpose is to accompany a particular person during his diurnal travels in order to protect him from the sun. The use of the parasol constituted one of the special privileges of the sovereign, at least under the Fatimid [q.v.; see also Ibn Hamado, Hist. des rois Oubaidides, 14/15/27/8; al-Makrizi, Khilol, i, 448, 451, 486/477; al-Kalkashandi, Subh, iii, 473]. It has still to be demonstrated that the Umayyads made use of it in the East. As for al-Andalus, the only indisputable mentions are references to fixed canopies, supported by several posts, that one drives into the ground and arranges to pitch them [cf. Mawārib]. The use of the parasol did not constitute one of the external insignia of the caliph's power. Ibn Khaldūn never mentions it in his enumeration of the "sovereign's attributes". Nor is it to be found in the descriptions of processions as being part of the etiquette displayed [see Marāṣim]. In this sense, it is striking to record that no reference to a normal use of this parasol during the Umayyad caliphate appears to have come down to us. The sources speak of the kubbā [q.v.], real or metaphorical, the chronicles of the kuba and mazall, but never of the mizalla. It seems, however, that the sporadic (and non-"official") use of this apparatus was not totally unknown. On the contrary, it would be difficult to understand the emphasis with which al-Rāzī stresses the fact that, during the capture of Calatayud, in 325/937, "the caliph al-Nāṣir rode from one point of the town to another, until dusk, without protecting himself from the sun (ghayr mazalla)" (Muktabas, v, 269).

The use of the parasol by the Almoravid, Almohad, Marinid and Naṣrid rulers is not attested either by the chronicles or the geographers' accounts. When Ibn al-Khaṭīb (Khatur al-asf, 44) described a mizalla, in 755/1354, it was not actually a sunshade but a fixed canopy. In the latter case it seems to have been based on poles of plane tree wood, ʿālā'umāid al-ṣāf (which is quite different from a parasol which only has one stem). This canopy had been erected by the Genoese merchants (tubgar al-Rūm) of Almeria. The fact that Ibn al-Khaṭīb lingers on it would tend to prove that it was an exceptional object, whose use was unknown in Oranada and which constituted an import. One may add that Leo Africanus does not mention the use of the parasol in Fez, Tlemcen or Tunis. Thus it would seem that its use in the Maghrib may not be earlier than the Saʿīdids. The first known mention is that of the Nashat al-hādī, 116, "When the Sultan al-Manṣūr rode with his royal retinue, the sunshade was carried by the officer whose rank was closest to that of the caid Ebruiz.... When the sultan went on foot to the masjid.... the sunshade was carried by Ebruiz himself."

**Bibliography:** Given in the article.

(P. CHALMETA)

4. In the Persian, Indian and Turkish lands. Although in the Arabic cultural context mizalla denotes both a parasol considered as one of the insignia of rank and also a large tent, in the Iranian cultural sphere this term is usually replaced by Pāppūr or Pāppūr, also in Urdu in the form dārā (Skr. ḍāt), a hook, and a hooked bronze ferrule found in the Hsüng-nu burials at Noin Ula (see Rudenko, Kul'tura, fig. 42) are probably of Han manufacture. Concomitant use in religious contexts is already attested on a coin of Caracalla (r. A.D. 211-17), where two parasols flank a bauṣā at the temple of Jupiter Sol at Emea (Hims) in Syria; both royal and devotional use are shown in the art of Gandhara, Ajanta, Sanchi, Amaravati and Dunhuang (the Buddhist use extends to Thailand and Burma), in either an umbrella shape, or a more mushroom-like form with downward-curving edges, often elaborated with fringes and pendants. A heavy stone umbrella is a frequent member of the iconography of the crowning of Caracalla. In fact, he teeters on the umbrellas and Buddhist stupas. This dual significance is resumed in the Muslim Persian concept of the sāya-yi Zill Allāh, "shade of the Shadow of God".
The existence of the catr among the Samanids in the 4th/10th century is attested by Manucihri [q.v.]. The black parasol remained the principal one under the Tughluk dynasty, 13

Menoutchehri, poète persan, [q.v.]

The close association of catr red parasol, Mahmud, though their founder Seviik-Tigin had a standard in colour was to remain typical of following dynasties; in this case black may have been adopted as of silk, made for the kings of the Turks to protect the parasol (A. Kalmak Mongolian as shār. A painting in the Zafar-nāma of ca. 1434 (Freer Gallery, Washington, no. 4/18) shows Timūr entering Samarqand under a parasol of dark red brocade semé with small gold kalsufs, formed in a small concave curve from the central hub, ca. 1 m in diameter, with an edge flounce 20 cm deep and thus similar to the Il-Khānīd version. An example in the Gulbenkian Anthology of Iskandar Sultān (177) of 1314-1104 is the same shape, scarlet with gold arabesques, but the spirally gilded pole is set at an angle to the parasol itself, as though adjustable (see Gray, Persian painting, 74, 77); in both cases the bearer is mounted as well as the monarch, and this remains the pattern in bookpainting. González de Clavijo reports that in 807/1404 Sarāy-Mulk Khāzrān, Timūr’s first wife, made her court entry shaded by a white silk parasol “like the dome of a round tent”, and made to stay open by a round wooden hoop (ark) raised on a lance-like shaft (Historia, fol. 62a). Following the contemporary emphasis on their practical function, Safawid paintings are depicted almost exclusively in outdoor scenes of battle, hunting, games or royal encounters and travel. The Safawid type resembles the Timūrid in being conical, with the shaft set at a variable angle, probably as an adjustment to its use from horseback, but the cone is steeper, at ca. 40°, and is of the characteristic arabesque brocade with a red flute, and sometimes a macramé fringe. A black parasol was black, red, and white (DžuzdjanT, fol. 62a). Kaider to his son Khīdr Khān on his appointment to the RaPT of Deoglr was given a blue one, sakf-rang (ibid., 66), whereas

Illustrations of parasols used by the roughly contemporary Khatān, both open and folded, survive in the Wen-chi scrolls (op. cit. scenes 2, 14-9): that of the Khān is red, like a shallow, red parasol attributed to the chief minister, yegrubgū (Kāshghāri, 462), with the same practical purpose; it seems that orange, dil, may have been reserved for the sovereign and his family (cf. ibid., 53). These catr could be folded (ibid., 470). Illustrations of parasols used by the roughly contemporary Khatān, both open and folded, survive in the Wen-chi scrolls (op. cit. scenes 2, 14-9): that of the Khān is red, like a shallow, red parasol attributed to the chief minister, yegrubgū (Kāshghāri, 462), with the same practical purpose; it seems that orange, dil, may have been reserved for the sovereign and his family (cf. ibid., 53). These catr could be folded (ibid., 470). Illustrations of parasols used by the roughly contemporary Khatān, both open and folded, survive in the Wen-chi scrolls (op. cit. scenes 2, 14-9): that of the Khān is red, like a shallow, red parasol attributed to the chief minister, yegrubgū (Kāshghāri, 462), with the same practical purpose; it seems that orange, dil, may have been reserved for the sovereign and his family (cf. ibid., 53). These catr could be folded (ibid., 470). Illustrations of parasols used by the roughly contemporary Khatān, both open and folded, survive in the Wen-chi scrolls (op. cit. scenes 2, 14-9): that of the Khān is red, like a shallow, red parasol attributed to the chief minister, yegrubgū (Kāshghāri, 462), with the same practical purpose; it seems that orange, dil, may have been reserved for the sovereign and his family (cf. ibid., 53). These catr could be folded (ibid., 470). Illustrations of parasols used by the roughly contemporary Khatān, both open and folded, survive in the Wen-chi scrolls (op. cit. scenes 2, 14-9): that of the Khān is red, like a shallow, red parasol attributed to the chief minister, yegrubgū (Kāshghāri, 462), with the same practical purpose; it seems that orange, dil, may have been reserved for the sovereign and his family (cf. ibid., 53). These catr could be folded (ibid., 470). Illustrations of parasols used by the roughly contemporary Khatān, both open and folded, survive in the Wen-chi scrolls (op. cit. scenes 2, 14-9): that of the Khān is red, like a shallow, red parasol attributed to the chief minister, yegrubgū (Kāshghāri, 462), with the same practical purpose; it seems that orange, dil, may have been reserved for the sovereign and his family (cf. ibid., 53). These catr could be folded (ibid., 470). Illustrations of parasols used by the roughly contemporary Khatān, both open and folded, survive in the Wen-chi scrolls (op. cit. scenes 2, 14-9): that of the Khān is red, like a shallow, red parasol attributed to the chief minister, yegrubgū (Kāshghāri, 462), with the same practical purpose; it seems that orange, dil, may have been reserved for the sovereign and his family (cf. ibid., 53). These catr could be folded (ibid., 470). Illu...
though Ibn Battūta reports that in 734/1333-42 Muhammad b. Tughluk had no less than sixteen parasols of the Ajanta type.

(P.A. ANDREWS)

5. In Indo-Muslim architecture. An architectural type was used, as before, to shade the ruler in the field; the form, like that of the Safawids, is conical, with a deep flounce, a gilt pear-and-ball finial, and an angled shaft borne by a horseman. In some cases the surface is of blue flowered brocade, and in others red (e.g. fol. 274a); the rim is emphasised, with either a gilt border, or an intended, coronet-like golden trim, sometimes with a row of pearls. The A'in-i Akbari lists the 'atār used, as before, to shade the ruler in the field; the form, like that of the Safawids, is conical, with a deep flounce, a gilt pear-and-ball finial, and an angled shaft borne by a horseman. In some cases the surface is of blue flowered brocade, and in others red (e.g. fol. 274a); the rim is emphasised, with either a gilt border, or an intended, coronet-like golden trim, sometimes with a row of pearls. The A'in-i Akbari lists the 'atār second after the throne among the insignia of royalty (A'in 19), specifying "it is adorned with the most precious jewels, and there may not be less than seven ('atār or jewels?)." Another type is shown with a convex shape and a system of curved stays from the shaft (Bābur-nāma fol. 94b). Nevertheless, 'atārs do not appear prominently until the reign of Djihaṅgīr, when a pair of the conical type is set either side of the throne in a carefully composed court scene below a three-tiered tent (Leningrad Murākka), no. 14, fol. 22); thereafter, they are used regularly in similarly symmetrical tented settings by Shāh Djihaṅgīr for court appearances. Where gold and precious jewels have the gently convex profile still to be seen at Rājpūt palace museums (cf. the ex-Vever coll. court scene of 1037/1627-8, Freer S86.0406). Later, a 'atār is shown surmounting the peacock throne (court scene at Agra, 1048/1638, by 'Abīd, Binney coll., 58). Contemporary court literature confirms this use, the parasols being set on a dias below the audience tent, aspark, used at festivals; they were jewelled and handmade, sometimes with strings and fringes of pearls (cf. Muhammad Šāliḥ Kāmūb, Amāl-i sāliḥ, i, 282-3, and Muhammad Wārī, Pāṭīdāzh-nāma, fol. 406b-407a). They do not, however, appear in tenent palace settings (see the Windsor Shāh Djihaṅgīr, passim.). In ca. 1070/1660 Awrangżīb was depicted with a single golden 'atār, fringed with pearls and set with squared rubies and emeralds, but one of the older Timūrid shape (Welch, Imperial Mughal painting, 57).

The Ottomans seem to have used the parasol neither at court nor in the field, except for a version too large, at 3 m across, to be carried, set up to shade the royal tent on occasion (see Sāleemān-nāme, fols. 297a, 346a, 441a, cf. 550a, for Safawid equivalent). Bibliography: For the pre-Islamic examples referred to, see Sir A. Layard, Nineveh, London 1848-9; S. I. Rudenko, Kul'tura Khvānum i Natsunilski kurgany, Moscow 1962; Madanjeet Singh, introd., Inde, peintures des grottes d'Ajanta, UNESCO, New York 1954, pls. xiv, xvii, xxv; K. Krishna Murthy, The Gandhara sculptures, Delhi 1977, 113-14. For the Sāmānids, see Manuchīrī, Divān, ed. and tr. A. de Bieberstein-Kazimisky as Memouichehī, poête persan du onzième siècle de notre ère, Paris 1986. For the Ghaznavids, see Abu l Fadl Baykāhā, Ta'rīkh-i Ma'sūdī, ed. K. Ghani and 'A. Fayvād, Tehran 1324/1945; Fakhri, Mudabbir Muḥarrak-

The natural form of the mizalla is known in India as chain, diminutive of the Skt. chatlra, sc. small, canopied chatlra, or as a fortification, or as decorative elements at roof level on mosque, tomb or other building, or as simple level on mosque, tomb or other building, or as simple decorative elements at roof top.

In certain architectural styles (e.g. Bengal, Málwá) a chatri may cover a minbar [q.v.], or, as in the Red Fort in Delhi, a baldachino intended as the ruler’s seat.

The finest uses seem to be in fortification, where a chatri at the angles of a walk-against affords protection from the elements for the guard; heavy domed rooms, with almost solid sides, often as the upper part of a burdag [q.v.]. The best existing example is in the corner towers of the fortified Khirki mosque in Delhi (Yamamoto et alii, Architectural remains of the Delhi Sultanate period, pl. M, 7), by the time of the fortified Kadam-i Sharif (see mn.ii. Monuments), the chatri has assumed its characteristic form of a domed canopy supported on four strong pillars, with heavy protective eaves (Yamamoto, pl. 0, 8): thereafter it continues as a regular feature, on four, six or even eight supports, on buildings of the Delhi sultanate, whence it spreads to most of the provincial styles [see hund. vii]. Among the earliest royal tombs at Delhi are the chatri at the graves of Ruak al-Din Firuz Sháh and Mu’izz al-Din Bahram Sháh at Malikpur outside the complex known as Súltan Ghári (S.A.A. Naqvi, Sultan Chári, Delhi, in Ancient India, iii [1947], pl.). There are sporadic uses of the chatri in the “Sayyid” and Lodi periods as a sort of lantern crowning the dome of a tomb, e.g. in the “Póti” of the “Dádéli-Póti” complex near Hóv Káss, the tomb of Múbárak Sháh in Múbárakpur, and (according to old illustrations) in the tomb of Sísra Sháh in Sábsáram [q.v.](H.H. Cole, Preservation of national monuments, Report for... 1882-3, Calcutta 1883, two pls.; also in J. Ferguson, History of Indian and eastern architecture, London 1876, ill. 288; this was later replaced, by a British engineer, with an incongruous heavy stone kalásakand-amalaka finial). In Lodi times the pillars supporting the dome become much thinner (e.g. in the Dílahán Mahall at Múháfi, south of Delhi: Yamamoto et alii, pl. O, 22), and this tendency persists into the Mughal period. Chátris are used with great freedom on all roofs, and with the reintroduction of the minaret [see mn. árára] under the Mughals, invariably form its topmost storey, or crown corner turrets as in the tomb of l’tímád al-Dawla in Agrá, or the tomb of Mirzá Múškin Ábú’l Mánár Khán (Sáfár Djang) in Dílah. In Akbar’s tomb at Sikándra, outside Agra, is first seen the expedient of uniting two chátris, at the corners of the building, under one common projecting eaves-pent, leading to the common Mughal practice of a string of conjoined chátris as a feature above doorways, etc.: a row of seven above the Láháwí gateway of Dílahí fort, thirteen surmounting the central arch of the Buland Darwáza in Fathpur Síkri, eleven over both front and rear elevations of the ornamental gateway to the Tádí Mahall, nine over the central arch on each face of the tomb of “Sáfár Djang”, which is directly modelled on the Tádí gateway, etc. The cupola over the baldacchino (násháman-i zíli-I Iláh) in the Diwán-i Amm in the Red Fort of Dílahí is unusual in having a “Bengáli” roof with curved cornices, an innovation made popular in Sháh Dílahán’s reign.

Bibliography: In addition to references in the article, see T. Yamamoto, M. Ara and T. Tsubinowa, Delhi: architectural remains of the Delhi sultanate period, i, Tokyo 1967, for a complete photographic corpus of sultanae buildings in the Dílahí region; good illustrations for Fathpur Síkri in S.A.A. Rizvi, and V.J.A. Flynn, Fathpur-Síkri, Bombay 1975, or in the Marg special Fathpur Síkri volume, Bombay 1987; the Tádí Mahall is best illustrated in M. Bussagi, Il Taj mahal (Forma e colore series), Florence 1965, and now in W. Begley and Z.A. Desai, The Taj Mahall: the illuminated tomb, Seattle-London 1989. But adequate illustrations abound in all works of Indian architecture, for which see Büh, to hund. vi. (J. Burton-Page) AL-MÍZÁN (A.) balance, is the nomen instrumenti from wazana “to weigh”, which means to weigh in the ordinary sense and also to test the level of something, like the Latin librae. Here we shall discuss:

1. The various instruments used for weighing in the ordinary sense; brief notes are added on the ascertainment of specific gravities.
2. Levelling instruments.
3. Aspects of the balance in Indian Muslim art.

1. BALANCES.

The steelyard (al-karajin [q.v.]) has already been dealt with, and the general principles of the balance are also discussed in that article.—The usual balance with two arms of equal length had the same shape among the Muslims in ancient times and at all periods in the West; we know from extant specimens and illustrations in various works, notably in al-Kızání, in a manuscript of al-Kázwíni with reference to the constellation Libra (fig. 1), in a manuscript of al-Harírí, in the Â’ám-i ‘Akkhír of Abu ’l-Fadl (fig. 2). In the beautiful manuscript from which Ch. Schefer published the Safar-name of Nasír-i Kushraw, on p. 80, in the illustration of the Masджíd-i Aksá, there is a balance labelled zarau (Sefar Nameh, Relation du voyage de Nasiri Kushras, ed. Ch. Schefer, Publications de l’Ecole des Langues Orientales Vivantes ii, 1)

**Fig. 1**

Paris 1881). The common balance is called mizán, but in the Kur’an we also find kísár, which, according to al-ThafÁli, is a loanword (in fact, from Greek or Aramaic, see A. Jeffery, The foreign vocabulary of the Qur’an, Baroda 1938, 238-9). Other names are sháhin, which does not only mean the beam and tongue of the balance and is contrasted by the Ikhwan al-Safa to the kahbán (steelyard), also târis from the Persian tarâzí, then mishmâl for scales or gold and küshâ for beam and tongue. Minâdam means the tongs and also the beam. According to J. Ruska, küshâh seems to be used for scales (for gold). On the expressions connected with karástán, see that article. Al-Mukaddamí, 141, mentions Harrán as a place where balances were made; in this town, many very skilful mechanics were
engaged in making astronomical instruments. The accuracy of the balances made in Harran was proverbial.

The Arabs devoted special attention to the construction of balances used to identify metals and jewels for their specific gravity, to distinguish false from genuine and pure and to ascertain the composition of alloys of two metals by the use of the principle of Archimedes. They called these balances *mīzān al-māz*, "water" (hydrostatic) balances. Of makers of these, al-ْKhāzīnī (flor. early 6th/12th century [q.v.] mentions Sanād (Sind) b. ʿAlī (ca. 250/864), Muḥammad b. Zakariyāʾ al-ʿRāzī (320/932-3), Ibn al-ʿAṣmīd (359/969-70), Yūḥannā b. Yūsuf (perhaps al-Ḵāṣ, d. ca. 370/980-1), Ibn Sinā (428/1037), Ahmad al-Fadl al-ʿMassāḥ (the "measurer, also mentioned by al-Bīrūnī without the "Massāḥ") and Abū Hafs ʿUmar al-Ḵhayyāmī (as the celebrated mathematician is never called Abū Hafs, it is doubtful whether he is the individual mentioned by al-ْKhāzīnī). The balances made by these names are still fairly simple as only two, or at most three, scales were used in them. A contemporary of al-ْKhāzīnī, namely Abū Ḥākim al-Muṣaffār b. Ismāʿīl al-Asfizarī (d. before 515/1121), added two more scales; these and other improvements made the scales much more convenient to use. Of him, al-Bayhaqī says (E. Wiedemann, *Beitr.,* xx. *Einige Biographien nach al-Baihaki*, in *SPMSE*, xlii [1910], 17): "He constructed the balance of Archimedes with which one ascertains forgeries. The treasurer of the Great Sultan feared that his frauds would thus be discovered. He therefore broke the balance and destroyed its parts. Al-Muṣaffār died of grief as a result." Al-ْKhāzīnī then took up al-Muṣaffār's work and made the balance a most accurate means of measuring; he called it the univer-

---

**Fig. 2**

**Fig. 3**

**Fig. 4**
sal balance, *al-mizān al-dāmī*. But, no doubt in memory of his predecessor, he called his book *Kitāb Mīzān al-hikma*. For special purposes such as the examination of gold and silver and their alloys, many contrivances were made with balances and the movable scales and running weights on the beams, for example in the physical (*TAB*2) balance of Muḥammad b. Zakariyya al-Ḥāfiz (fig. 3); it goes back to Greek models, e.g. of Archimedes (fig. 4; cf. al-Ḥāzīnī, op. cit.).

Here we shall describe somewhat more fully the "balance of wisdom" of al-Ḥāzīnī. (H. Bauerrei, *Zur Geschichte des spez. Gewichtes im Altertum und Mitte
telalter*, diss., Erlangen 1913, has reconstructed the "balance of wisdom" as nearly as possible following the data of the original. Reproductions are in Erlangen and the German Museum in Munich. The illustration is taken from a photograph. In the original right and left are reversed.)

Al-Ḥāzīnī gives the beam *A* of the balance (fig. 5) a thickness of 6 cm. and a length of 2 m. In the centre it is strengthened by an additional piece *C*, obviously intended to avoid any bending at this point. A cross-piece *B* (*ʿarīfā*) is let in here. Corresponding to it is a similar cross-piece *F* on the lower part of the tongs, in which moves the tongue *D*, itself about 50 cm. long. The upper cross-piece *E* is hung by rings to a rod which is fastened somewhere. Pegs or small holes are placed at exactly opposite places of the crosspieces *B* and *F* to which threads are tied or drawn through. The friction at an axis is thus avoided, which, in view of the great weight of the beam, is quite considerable. The knob visible below the beam under its centre is used to secure the tongue to the beam or to take it out in order to adjust it evenly. The tongue has for this purpose a peg at the foot which goes through a hole in the beam. Al-Ḥāzīnī also observes that one could also take shorter beams, but then all the other dimensions must be proportionately smaller. The beam is divided not on one side only, as in the illustration, but on both. The scales are hung on very delicate rings of steel (*ghurūb "ravens"*), the points of which fit into little niches on the upper surface of the beam.

Five scales are used in ascertaining specific gravities, i.e. in investigating alloys and examining precious stones. Of these, the scale *H* (fig. 5*) is called the cone-shaped or *al-hākim*, "the judge", as it is used to distinguish false from true. It goes into the water, and in order to meet less resistance in sinking, is cone-shaped and pointed below. The scale *J* is called the winged (*mudrīnah*, figs. 5b and 5c, side and top view). It has indented sides so that it can be brought very close to the adjoining scales. It is also called the movable (*munakkal*). There is also a movable running weight *K* (*al-rumānā al-sayyān*) which serves, if necessary, to adjust the weight of the lighter beam; it is therefore also called the *rumānā* of the adjustment (*al-taʿdīl*). The other scales are used to hold weights.

---

Fig. 5.
Al-Khāzīnī attained an extraordinary degree of accuracy with his balance. This was the result of the length of the beam, the peculiar method of suspension, the fact that the centre of gravity and axis of oscillation were very close to each other, and of the obviously very accurate construction of the whole. Al-Khāzīnī himself says that when the instrument was weighing 1,000 mīthkāls, it could show a difference of 1 ĥabba = $\frac{1}{168}$ mīthkāl, i.e. about 75 kg in 4.5 kg. We thus have accuracy to $\frac{1}{160},000$.

Al-Khāzīnī used his scales for the most varied purposes. Firstly, for ordinary weighing; then for all purposes connected with the taking of specific gravities, distinguishing of genuine (samīm) and false metals, examining the composition of alloys, changing of dirhams to dinārs and countless other business transactions. In all these processes, the scales are moved about until equilibrium is obtained and the desired magnitudes in many cases can at once be read on the divisions on the beam.

The word mīzān also means testing the correctness of any calculation (cf. Bahā' al-Dīn al-Āmilī, Khilāṣāt al-hisāb, ed. G.H.F. Nesselmann, Berlin 1843).

In magic squares, the sum of the largest and smallest figures is called al-mizān; it is half the total of the vertical row, horizontal row or of the diagonals (G. Bergsträßer, Zu den magischen Quadraten, in Il Fil., xiii [1913], 252).

Alchemy is often called 'ilm al-mizān, the science of the scales, or of accurate measurement, as in the preparation of the elixir, etc., the choice of the right proportion of the ingredients is an important matter. Among other uses of the word mīzān, it may be mentioned that a tree on a boundary near Bāniyās at the source of the Jordan was called "tree of the balance" (mizān). We may also note that on the day the source of the Jordan was called "tree of the balance" (mizān). We may also note that on the day the source of the Jordan was called "tree of the balance" (mizān). We may also note that on the day the source of the Jordan was called "tree of the balance" (mizān). We may also note that on the day the source of the Jordan was called "tree of the balance" (mizān).
have the same volume as 100 mithkals of gold, and in the case of other substances the same volume as 100 mithkals of blue yđkut. Al-Bırünī for example, like the hemispheres of the different metals or logs of equal size and compares their weights, or the volumes of equal weights are compared by finding those of any weights and then comparing the specific volumes (i.e. the volumes of the unit of weight). For these measurements, one either used methods based on the principle of Archimedes, according to which a body loses in a liquid as much weight as the volume of the fluid displaced by it, or one measures the fluid displaced by the body itself. For this purpose al-Bırünī constructed a cone-shaped vessel (al-adding mukhtalite) (fig. 6). This vessel is filled with water until it begins to run out by a pipe at the side; then a definite mass, as large as possible, of the substance (weight $P_1$) is weighed, as is the scale $P_2$ that is placed under the outlet pipe. The substance is then put in the vessel and the pan with the water displaced weighed ($P_3$), so that from $P_1 - P_2$ we get the volume of water corresponding to the mass $P_1$, which is then calculated by al-Bırünī for a weight of 100 mithkals. As almost always, in ascertaining the specific gravity, the Arabs rely on the artsifice by which one ascertains the quantity of each of a number of mixed bodies $\frac{1}{1}$, fi haī allati ya-rājī bi-hā mīkdar kull wāṣid min `idda ad-dām mukhtalita (from the Escorial ms.) and ma-rīfāt kammīyyat tamāyyuq al-adārām al-mukhtalita (according to Ibn al-Kifī, 321). In al-Bırünī’s word, Archimedes himself is mentioned and a certain Mašātīyūs (according to Nödeke, probably Mašrāq). The Muslims, however, did not slavishly take over the statements of the ancients. Al-Bırünī, ibid, for example emphasizes that one can ascertain the composition of an alloy of two components but not one of three, as Menelaus says. Among the Muslims it was certainly al-Bırünī who did most in this field, in his work “on the relations which exist between metals and jewels in volume” (Makāla fi ‘l-nisāb allātī bayn al-flīṣṣāt wa ‘l-ajawdhir fi ‘l-hādīm, cf. also al-Bırünī, Chronology, text, p. xxxiv), which still exists, and also in another work, which only survives in fragments quoted by al-Khāzīnī. Al-Bırünī was induced to compose the first named by the difficulties encountered by goldsmiths in ascertaining the quantities of metals necessary to copy a given article. As predecessors, he mentions

Sanad b. ʿAlī, Yūhanna b. Yūnūs and Ahmad al-Fadl al-Bukhārī. So far as we know he was followed and his results were used by Abū Haṭī ʿUmar al-Khāṣṣāmī (see above), al-Īsāfīrī (see above), al-Khāzīnī (see above), Fākhī al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ʿUmar al-Rāzī (d. 606/1210, Suter, no. 328), and Abu ʿl-Fadl ʿAllāmī, Elijī Mīrākhī, a work ascribed to Plato which was composed in the time of Bāyazīd by a slave of a son of Sinān, a Turkish work by al-Ghaffārī, and a Persian one by Muḥammad b. Maṣūr (on these works, as on mineralogical literature in general, see Wiedemann, Beitr., xxx. Zur Mineralogie des Islam, in SPMS, xlv [1912], 205). We must also mention the study by Abū Maṣūr al-Nayrizī, who is not to be confused with the commentator on Euclid, and the work on the measurement of bodies which are computed of other substances, in order to ascertain the unknown amounts of the separate constituents: Miṣbār fi misādāt al-ad-dām al-mukhtalita li ʾtākhādīr mīkdar maḏḥailāh by Samūmeld l b. Yaḥyā b. ʿAbbās al-Maghribī al-Andalūsī (d. 570/1174-5 at Maghāra; see Ibn al-Kifī, 299; Suter, no. 302).

The statements on specific gravities refer to: A. Metals: gold, mercury, bronze (ṣifḥ), copper, brass (gibb), iron, tin (raṣā), lead (urṣaf and urṣub). B. Precious stones: blue yḍkūṭ, red yḍkūṭ, ruby, emerald, lapis lazuli, pearl, coral, cornelian, onyx and rock crystal. C. Other substances: Pharaonic glass, clay from Siminyān, pure salt, salt earth (sabakh), sand, chert, enamel (miṣa), amber, pitch, wax, ivory, bak- kam wood and willow wood.

The weights of equal volumes of liquids and the volumes of equal weights of liquid are sometimes found directly, sometimes ascertained with the arcaoonometer of Pappus. The former magnitude plays an important part in the liquids used in everyday life like oil and wine. The second was of more scientific interest. It is especially interesting that the Arabs found that hot water and hot urine had a larger
volume than equal weights cold. They also knew that ice had a larger volume than the same weight of water.

The facts ascertained with the araeometer of Pappus for fluids refer to cold fresh water, hot water, ice (which does not properly belong to this connection), sea water, vinegar, wine, sesame oil, olive oil, cow’s milk, hen’s egg, blood of a healthy man, warm and cold urine.

Fig. 7 shows the araeometer reconstructed by H. Bauerreiss from al-Khazinī. X is a massive cone used to make the instrument heavy. There are inscriptions corresponding to the Roman numerals. For details, the reader may be referred to H. Bauerreiss’s article. The principle that floating bodies of the same weight sink in water to the same depth finds application in a juristic trick cited in the Kitāb al-Hiyal fi 'l-fikh of Abū Ḥātim al-Kāzwinī. The weight of a camel is ascertained by putting it in a boat and noting how deep the boat sinks. The camel is then replaced by iron weights until the boat sinks to the same level (cf. J. Schacht, in G. Bergsträßer, Beitr. zur semitischen Philologie und Linguistik).

In medical works and treatises on weights and measures, figures are given for the weights of equal volumes of wine, oil and honey (cf. Bauerreiss, op. cit.).

So far as it is a question of particular bodies, the values as ascertained by the Arabs agree very well with those obtained by modern science and even surpass in accuracy those obtained by it up till the beginning of the last century.

Bibliography: Given in al-Karāstūn.

2. Leveling (waqzana, to weigh, corresponding to Latin librae).

The Arabs certainly adopted a large number of methods of levelling and testing levels from other peoples, either the Byzantines or the Persians. The statements in Ibn Wabshiyya [q. v.] (see below) about the making of canals, etc., agree with those of Vitruvius, who in turn drew on Greek sources. The Arabs learned partly from Greek works; for example, we are told that according to Philemon (according to M. Steinschneider, Philo), the incline in canals must be at least 5 : 1,000; but they also utilised data gained from the practical experience of landowners, canal builders, etc. Whether the Arabs were acquainted with the standard works of Hero on this subject, the Metrica and the “On the Dioptra” (Hero, Opera omnia, ed. H. Schöne, iii, Leipzig 1903), is not known, for no corresponding title is found in the biographical or bibliographical works. But the writing mentioned in the Fihrist “On the use of the astrolabe” may have dealt with geodetic problems. Many problems in the Arabic sources are very similar to those dealt with in the work “On the Dioptra”; only the Arabs use the astrolabe or quadrant instead of the dioptra. Whether one or other of the methods described below was discovered independently by the Arabs, and by whom, cannot be established from the authors on the subject, who were mainly practical men. They are described in the most different places.

In levelling, one is faced with two problems: firstly to make a surface exactly perpendicular, and secondly to ascertain the point on the same level as a given one, or to ascertain the difference in height between two points.

1. A surface is made level and horizontal in the following way:

A ruler with a straight edge is moved over the surface and one sees whether it touches it everywhere so perfectly that no light penetrates between ruler and surface; in this case the surface is perfectly smooth (al-Shirāzī, see below). That the ruler itself is straight is ascertained by seeing whether a thread stretched along it and fastened to it at one end can be lifted the same height from the ruler along its whole length. Whether three rulers are straight is tested by putting them side by side and exchanging their sides (Ibn Yunūs, in K. Schoy, see below).

To examine whether a surface was perfectly horizontal, the following tests were adopted:

Water is poured over the surface and it is observed whether this flows equally in all directions; this is one of the most usual methods. The same plan is given by Proclus in his Hypotyposis (ed. K. Manitius, Leipzig 1909, 50, 51). According to him, one pushes supports under a level surface on all sides till it shows no slope anywhere; this is the case when water poured on it remains standing without running to one side.

2. An object which can roll is placed on one side; if it does not roll off but only oscillates, the surface is horizontal (al-Shirāzī, see below).

3. Water is poured onto a plate or dish (ḏfma, fig. 8) with an edge which is parallel to the surface and of the same height all the way round, and it is observed whether the water comes exactly up to the edges on all sides (Ibn Luyūn, see below). An exactly straight ruler is laid on the plate and one looks over this.

Ibn Sinā (ms. Leiden, no. 1061), in order to test whether the upper surface of the base of a theodolite is horizontal, makes a cavity in it with exactly perpendicular walls, pours water in and proceeds as in the case of the plate. To test whether a large ring is absolutely smooth, al-Urdī used a process which he called al-aglādan. This is not a ready-made instrument, but an apparatus to be put together from case to case. The ring to be tested is first of all placed exactly horizontal with the ground by means of the level (fig. 9). Inside the ring on its concave side, a circular gutter of potter’s clay is built. Its outer edge comes up to the level of the surface of the ring while its inner edge is a little higher. The gutter is filled with water and some light ashes are scattered on it. If the water flows over
the ring the depressions in the ring are filled with it, while the ashes remain on the raised parts of it. The inequalities in the surface of the ring are thus brought out (fig. 10). Al-'Urdi emphasises that the test must be made in absolute calm.

Al-'Urdi also used the same method in order to see whether the outlets for water in a distribution system at Damascus were all of the same level. In the centre of the reservoir he put a gutter like this and deepened or raised the bottoms of the channels running out of it until the water from the gutter spread equally over the channels which revealed any inequalities (fig. 11). Cf. H. J. Seemann, in *SPMSE*, lx, 1928), 49, 81 and J. Frank, in *Zeitschrift f. Instrumentenkunde*, xlviii [1929].

4. A plumb-line (ṣhākāl, ṣhād, ṣhalād [from ḫālq], ṣhakkāla) is dropped from the apex (fig. 12) of an isosceles triangle, made for example of wood, with its perpendicular marked; a piece is sometimes left open in the centre of the underside for the weight of the plumb-line. If the plumb-line coincides with the perpendicular, the surface is horizontal (the figures go back to al-Shirazi and al-Khalkhālī). Such drawings have led to the erroneous idea that Muslim students were already acquainted with the pendulum (cf. E. Wiedemann, in *Verhandl. d. d. Phys. Ges.* [1919], 663; the apparatus is called al-fādin [e.g. in al-Shirazi and al-'Urdi, see below], Dozy, *op. cit.*, also al-kādir).

In the architect's balance (fig. 13), according to Ibn Luyūn or al-Tīghnārī (see below), a quadrangular piece of wood is placed on the beam $\alpha \alpha$ to be examined; in the middle of it, a perpendicular line $\delta \alpha$ is drawn before which a plumb-line is hung; according to the original figure, it seems to be two parallel lines between which the plumb-line hangs.

Al-Marrākushi (flor. later 7th/13th century [q.v.]) has described a more perfect form (fig. 14). In the figure $a b, a c$ and $d e$ are rods, and $a b = a c$ and $a d e$ is an equilateral triangle; $d e$ is pierced in the centre. A plumb-line is hung from $a$ through the hole. If the surface on which $b$ and $e$ are put is horizontal, the thread of the plumb-line goes through the centre of the hole.

Whether the levels and other instruments are themselves correct, whether for example the plumb-line from the apex to the base is perpendicular, is tested in this way. After the plumb-line comes to rest in one position of the level, the latter is put in various positions on some horizontal surface, particularly in one
perpendicular to the first, and in one in which left and right have places exchanged. If the plumb-line always comes to rest, the level is correct but if it only does so in the former case the error can be corrected by adjusting the position of the surface and that of the level.

The level here described is usually called qanīja (yowla); the word, however, is also used for the wooden setsquare, as used by carpenters (see Mafāth al-'ulam, ed. van Vloten, 255) and land surveyors like Abu 'l-Walā (see Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaft und Medizin, Heft ii, 1922, 98). A synonym is afajdn, according to al-Shirāzī (Nihāyat al-ittirāk fi diriyat al-ṭālāl, Mak. 2, ch. 13). From the same root we have in Ibn Wahshiyya (ms. Leiden no. 1279, 527) fawdān, in Dozy (Supplément, ii, 246) fādin and fādān. Connected with this is fawdān, dual of faud.

Sometimes one finds it stated that levelling is done with the ḍakhul, e.g. in al-Battānī (ed. Nallino, text, 1903, 137), mawzun bi ḍakhul, and an exactly similar statement is made by Ibn Sinā (ms. Leiden no. 1061). A setsquare is either brought up to the plumb-line and a perpendicular dropped on the surface from it, or the ḍakhul is used for the level, the essential part of which is the plummet.

On larger surfaces, such as roofs, etc., a long rod (kuṭūl = cubitale) is first of all laid down, and on it the apparatus for testing the level is placed; this is called mizān al-izur (or al-bannān, that of the architects; cf. al-Luyūn, see below).

5. At the apex A and B (fig. 15) of two sharp-pointed tetrahedra of equal height A I H k and B L M N, a rod of some length A B is laid, on which is fixed a triangle with a plumb-line hanging from it or an arrangement such as is already described for the scale-beam. If the plummet or the tongue comes to rest, the rod and therefore the surface is horizontal (al-Marrākūshī).

The necessity of making surfaces exactly level continually crops up in building, and also in setting up astronomical instruments, and in constructing the Indian circle with which the meridian and then the direction of the kibla is ascertained. In this case, the level surface is usually not prepared on the ground but on a firm foundation, perhaps of stone. The construction for the Indian circle is already described in the Hypothesis of Proclus (loc. cit.) in the same way as by the Arabs.

We now deal with the tests used to see if a thing is perpendicular:

1. The simplest method is to hang a plumb-line beside it. In the case of level perpendicular surfaces, this must touch it all the way down if its point of suspension is on it. This method is always recommended in working with the quadrant (see also below).

2. If the point of suspension is a little in front of the surface, the thread must be equidistant from it all the way down.

3. In the side of the gnomon, a perpendicular rod, often with a cone-shaped top, Ibn Yūnus (see below) cut out a groove which ended in a hemispherical cavity. In the groove a thread is hung from the top of the gnomon with a ball-shaped weight. If this comes to rest in the hollow, the gnomon is perpendicular.

4. The gnomon is moved backwards and forwards (turned about on its foot: mukbal wa-mudbar); its shadow must only move so far on the level surface, on which it stands, as is in keeping with the movement of the sun during the turning (Ibn Yūnus, see below).

5. A circle is described at the foot of the rod and a pair of compasses used to test whether the distance of the top of the gnomon is the same from all points of the circle.

6. Ibn Sinā drills a small hole through the gnomon parallel to its base, puts it in a vessel with a horizontal bottom which is filled with muddy water and examines whether the surface exactly coincides with the level of the hole.

7. In order to examine whether a level surface is standing exactly perpendicular, two exactly equal parallelepipedal blocks of wood (fig. 16) are placed on it, L1 and L2, one above the other. From the upper edge of L1 a plumb-line is hung; one watches whether its thread exactly touches L2; the best plan is to place a very thin ruler between L1 and the plummet and test the position of the thread with respect to L2 (al-Marrākūshī, see below).
perpendicular, plumb-lines are hung beside them (fig. 17).

The horizontal line of vision is obtained in various ways:
1. A rod (e.g. an ell long) with square sides is put up in such a way that the upper surface appears horizontal to the eye and one looks along this surface.
2. The rod (alkhshla) is put on the above-mentioned dish or plate (fig. 8) and one looks along it.
3. At the end of the rod, nails are fastened at the same height and their heads are pierced and one looks through the holes.
4. For a rough examination, one can put, at two places, two tub-shaped bricks which for convenience may be made each out of two half-pipes (Ibn al-

5. An astrolabe is put in a horizontal place such as the edge of a well or on its cover, and one looks through the eyepiece.

Other methods of ascertaining differences of level are as follows:
1. An assistant is sent from the higher positions to the lower holding a rod of a known length / vertically until one sees just the end of it; if \( h \) then is the level of the eye, \( h \) is the difference in height. If the distance is too great for the top of the rod to be distinguished, a light is put on it, e.g. a lighted candle, and the observation is made by night.
2. If it is a question of ascertaining whether a place outside a well is lower than the level of water in the well, the distance of the latter from the surface of the ground or from the edge is ascertained by letting a rod and thread down with a shining heavy object at the end and used in calculation.

Two apparatuses, closely connected with each other, are the following:
3. To a rod (fig. 17) the triangle with the plumb-line is attached. To its two ends, two threads with weights at the ends are attached, \( a \) and \( b \). Two posts \( 1 \) and \( 2 \) are erected at the points, the difference in level of which is to be ascertained. One thread is fastened to the end of the lower post \( 1 \) and the other hung along and over the post \( 2 \) until its weight comes to rest. The amount of shifting of the thread measures the difference in height (al-\( \text{Khāzīnī} \), see below).

4. The m ordinal (the bat, fig. 18) consists of an equilateral triangle with a plumb-line which hangs from the middle of one side. The triangle is suspended by this side. Two rods, an ell in length, are erected to 10 ells apart; a rope is passed from the top of the rod to the other, are replaced by rings which are put over the long rope \( a \). The third arrangement (fig. 19c: al-anhub, the pipe) is also mentioned by al-Kaṛkhī and Baha° al-Dīn al-\( \text{Amīlī} \) but not described;

5. In the Paris manuscript no. 2468, an unknown author describes 3 apparatuses for levelling (figs. 19a-c). In the first (al-mushbūr, the known) a rod of wood

\[ \text{Fig. 17} \]

\[ \text{Fig. 18} \]

\[ \text{Fig. 19a} \]
\[ \text{Fig. 19b} \]
\[ \text{Fig. 19c} \]
Essenz der Rechenkunst, ed. F. Nesselmann, see Wiedemann, **Beiträge**, x, 319.

Full details of levelling are given in the astronomical books in the treatment of the ascertainment of the meridian, e.g. in Kūfī al-Dīn al-Shirāzī (d. 710/1311 [q. v.]; cf. E. Wiedemann, in Zeitschr. für Physik, x [1922], 267), al-Khalīhālī, etc. Many books on the astrolabe give information on the subject in their treatment of surveying problems, e.g. in al-Bīrūnī (cf. Wiedemann, **Beiträge**, xvii, 59 ff.)

Once again are given here the names of the levelling instruments: mīzān, mīzān al-banān, mīzān al-katf, mīzān al-isur, kūtbāl, kūnīya, jādīn, jādīn, afḍāyīn, ḍaffān, mūgrīdīl, karkā.

The writer knows no comprehensive treatise on levelling in connection with canal building, etc., in the early Muslim period. For the literature, see Wiedemann, **Beiträge**, iii, 229; xvii, 26, and H. Scharlowski, *op. cit.*, 41. For knowledge of these matters in ancient times, see C. Merkel, *Die Ingenieurtechnik im Altenum, und H. Diels, *Antike Technik*, Leipzig 1920.


**(E. Wiedemann)**

3. **Aspects of the balance in Indian Muslim art.**

The "Straightforward" sense, the balance (centrally) pivoted (there seem to be no depictions of the balance counterbalanced), is shown in certain Mughal miniature paintings, e.g. in fol. 245 (artist: Mukund) of the Chester Beatty *Akbar-nāma*. Akbar is being weighed against silver and gold, seated on a square cushion occupying one of the balance-pans, on a large balance suspended from the roof of a pavilion (an occasion of court ceremony, with the maqṣūrān and the kūr conspicuous; see *Marāsim*, 5; the incidents are described in *Akbar-nāma*, iii, 177-8; tr. iii, 304). There is a similar incident of Dājahgīr's time where the young Prince Khurrum is being similarly weighed against gold and silver on the anniversary of Dājahgīr's date of accession in the Ūrtā garden at Kābul; the (unsigned) miniature is on a leaf which presumably formed part of the rejected *Dājahgīr-nāma*, and refers to an incident of 1016/1607, although the interpretative reference is of some twelve years later (BM 1948-10-1069). The balance is shown also in some of Dājahgīr's commissioned "allegorical" paintings (to use the terminology of Asok Das for some paintings which seem to have been inspired by Dājahgīr's direction, see *Bibl.*), always empty and level, and representing the "scales of justice" in the *adl-i Dājahgīr*; there is an extraordinary scene in a miniature by Abu l-Ḥasan in the Chester Beatty *Dājahgīr-nāma* (Catalogue, pl. 62) where Dājahgīr, standing on a globe in a (European) wooden stand atop an ox standing on a fish, transfixes the severed head of Mālik Anbar [q.v.], which stands on a spear fixed in the ground, with an arrow (European putti wait above him with spare arrows). Between the stand of the globe and the shaft of the spear is a chain of twelve bells running obliquely, from the middle of which is a balance; a Persian verse on the miniature refers to the "justice of Dājahgīr". The chain of bells represents the sandgīr-i *adl* which Dājahgīr had directed to be suspended from the battlements of the Ārāf fort so that supplicants might advert him of their grievances (*Tāzuk-i Dājahgīr*, i, 7). See Chester Beatty Catalogue, i, 3, for Wilkinson's interpretation, and tr. of the verses. Also in the Chester Beatty collection (Catalogue, iii, pl. 86), the young Shāhjahān is depicted standing on a globe (a direct reminiscence of Dājahgīr's "allegorical" paintings) which bears the representations of a lion and a lamb; the latter, directly under Shāhjahān's feet, is an empty level balance (another version appears in the Kevorkian album, *Ḥāshim*, 1038/1628). A level balance appears also in a *darbār* scene in another *Shāhjahān* album, where it figures as a device on the front of the throne; and, perhaps the most familiar example, carved on the translucent marble screen in the Red Fort in Dīlī between the Khābābān and the Rang Mahal, the *mīzān-i *adl* straddling the ornamental water-channel known as the Nahr-i biḥtāgh. The intention again seems to have been to depict the emperor as the dispenser of Justice, following Dājahgīr's precedent.

founded in the French capital as the official organ of the Committee of Union and Progress (Ittihad ve Terakki Djam'iyyeti [q.v.]); besides Mehmed (nos. 1-18), from the middle of 1896, only for a year transferred to Geneva a few months later (nos. 19-29, May-July 1897). Murâd’s final return to the Ottoman empire resulted, after the proclamation of the Constitutional Period, in yet another re-foundation of Mizân in Istanbul in July 1908, now published as a daily and progressively critical of the ruling Ittihad ve Terakki Djamîyeti (nos. 1-135, until April 1909). Mizân was finally suspended soon after the incident known as the 31 Mart vakâlası.

**Bibliography:** An invaluable source lies in Mehemd Murad’s autobiographical works (see MIZÂN MÜHEM MURAD, 2. Works, 1). For a selection of leading articles from the Mizân of the Egyptian and French-Swiss periods, see ‘Onur Fârûk (ed.), Ebu’l-Faruk Mehemd Murâd, tahvari-ye ittikâbî. Mîrzedâ ve Aseâpâda nezîh olan, ‘Mizân’-dan maktûbesîr, 2 vols., Istanbul 1329-30/1911-12. At present, the most detailed general account is Biroç Emlî, Mizânec Murad Bey. Hayât ve eserleri, Istanbul 1979, ch. 2, Mîzan, 227-399.

(M. Ö. H. URSINUS)

**AL-MIZÂN [SEE MINTAKAT AL-MURAD], MIZÂN MUSTAFÂ MEHEMâD MURAD, Ottoman politician, official and journalist: editor of the weekly (later daily) Mizân [q.v.] and for some time leader of the Ittihad ve Terakki Djamîyeti [q.v.]; lecturer in history at the Mekteb-i Müllîkîye and in the Dâr al-Muallîmin, commissioner in the Public Debt administration and member of the Şhirâ-yi Dewlet [q.v.]; political essayist, author of several history books, novelist and playwright (1854-1917). Murad is son of Mustafa b. al-Kadî Taha, kâdi of Mislîdâ ve Avrupda neshr olunan ‘Mizân’-dan maktûbesîr, 1979, ch. 2, Mîzan, 227-399.
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**AL-MIZÂN [SEE MINTAKAT AL-MURAD], MIZÂN MUSTAFÂ MEHEMâD MURAD, Ottoman politician, official and journalist: editor of the weekly (later daily) Mizân [q.v.] and for some time leader of the Ittihad ve Terakki Djamîyeti [q.v.]; lecturer in history at the Mekteb-i Müllîkîye and in the Dâr al-Muallîmin, commissioner in the Public Debt administration and member of the Şhirâ-yi Dewlet [q.v.]; political essayist, author of several history books, novelist and playwright (1854-1917). Murad is son of Mustafa b. al-Kadî Taha, kâdi of Mislîdâ ve Avrupda neshr olunan ‘Mizân’-dan maktûbesîr, 1979, ch. 2, Mîzan, 227-399.

(M. Ö. H. URSINUS)

1. Life. Mizânji Mehmed Murâd (alias Emîrîf Murâd, Ebu’l-Fârûk) was born in 27 October 1854 as the son of Muştafa b. al-Kâdi Tâha, kâdi of Hurâkî in the republic of Dârghî, Dihhistân, and head of a local family of (Shi‘î?) ‘ulamâ’. He received a traditional education in Arabic and Kurşânic studies until the age of ten, when he himself decided to be taught in Western subjects instead. Murâd registered at a Russian school in the provincial capital where he soon acquired a profound knowledge of the Russian language, whereupon he was sent to Stavropol to continue his studies in a lycée at the expense of the Russian government. Here he found the opportunity to read Draper and Guizot as well as Rousseau and Montesquieu and to satisfy his interest in world politics by following the news in various Russian and French newspapers. It was during this period that Murâd began publishing essays in Russian papers and periodicals, and regularly putting down notes in his Defter-i Hâfilât (see below, 2. Works, Alters Ego). The news of the promotion of the liberal Ahmed Midhat Pasha [q.v.] to the rank of vizier, together with the tragic death of his best friend Haydar Bâmâtîlî in 1288/1872, led Murâd to leave Russia for Istanbul (according to his memoirs, the focus of all his hopes and dreams from early childhood). He arrived there in Dhu ‘l-Hijjâbi 1289/February 1873. After a prompt conversation with Midhat Pasha (conducted in French as Murâd—‘in his own words’—‘did not have any Turkish’ at that time) and an audience with the Grand Vizier Ahmed Esâd Pasha, Murâd was introduced to ŞîrÎnâzâde Mehmed Rûchî Pasha who became Grand Vizier the very day Murâd was his guest (17 Safar 1290/16 April 1873). This and the fact that Rûchî Pasha saw Murâd as his compatriot sealed the latter a prominent place in the pasha’s konûk. Having been given an apprenticeship in the Marûbât Kalemi of the Foreign Ministry instead of a military post offered to him at the instigation of Esâd Pasha (which he refused), Murâd was then additionally appointed mûhâdarî (private secretary) of the Grand Vizier. But the dismissal from the Grand Vizierate and subsequent death of ŞîrÎnâzâde Rûchî Pasha on 11 Şâhîbân 27th/29 September 1874 surprised Murâd without his consent, having given him no other choice than to retreat from the inner circle of power. During the subsequent years of political instability, Murâd lived through a personal crisis which came to an end only with his marriage in 1294/1877 and his appointment to a lectureship in the newly re-opened Mekteb-i Müllîkîye the same year. ‘Teaching general history and geography, political and Ottoman history, and the study of Ottoman discipline’ (Yahyâ Kemâl). For use as a textbook in history classes, Murâd compiled the first comprehensive modern History of the Romans to be written in Ottoman-Turkish (vol. ii of his Tarîh-ı umâmî). His appointment to an additional lectureship in the Dâr al-Muallîmin in Şawwâl 1297/October 1880 was followed by his installation as a member of the Inspection Committee of the Ministry of Education (Safar 1299/January 1882, re-appointed Qumadâ-i 1305/February 1888), and by his promotion as director of the Dâr al-Muallîmin on 9 Rabî‘ 1307/27 May 1882. This marks the zenith of Murâd’s career in the Ottoman educational system; his manifest belief in the political press as a particularly suitable means of enlightening people and influencing politics soon led him to reduce his commitments as a history teacher and to establish a newspaper of his own: the first issue of Mizân appeared on 22 Muharâm 1304/20 October (sic) 1886. Although he had resigned from all his functions in the Dâr al-Muallîmin by Rabî‘ 1307/January 1886, he continued teaching history and geography in the Mekteb-i Müllîkîye until 1313/1895. Tensions between Murâd and the central authorities arose after he had frankly commented in Mizân on the Armenian question and had advocated the abolition of tax privileges for the Sultan’s estates. The last issues of Mizân appeared in Qumadâ-i 1308/December 1890 after the newspaper had been suspended several times. In 23 Şâhîbân 1308/4 April 1891, however, the Sultan appointed Murâd commissioner of the Public Debt administration as some kind of douceur. An encounter between Murâd and ‘Abd al-Hamîd II in Rabî‘ 1313/September 1895 took place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding, and gave rise to expectations on Murâd’s side that he had a real chance to be appointed to a high-ranking post close to the Sultan.
(whom he described at this occasion as “like an angel”). But as these hopes did not materialise, Murad finally decided to leave the country. He resigned from his functions in the Public Debt administration on 1 Dümâdâr II 1313/19 November 1895 and embarked on a Russian steamer later the same day, leaving his family behind. Travelling to Western Europe via the Crimea, Kiev and Vienna, Murâd arrived in Paris early in December 1895. After a cool encounter with Ahmed Rîdâ, the leader of the Society of Union and Progress in France, and with Lord Salisbury in London shortly thereafter, Murâd decided to re-establish his newspaper in Cairo, under some kind of British protection. As Murâd’s exodus on a Russian steamer seemed to have confirmed widespread suspicions that he was a Russian spy, Murâd was sentenced to death in absentia. The fear of being abducted by agents of the Porte, together with the fact that he was separated from his family, contributed seriously to the deterioration of his health. Suffering from nervous tension, Murâd was declared mentally ill by many of his enemies who thus found an easy explanation for the increasingly radical stance of Mîzân. After Ottoman pressure on the British and Egyptian governments for his extradition, Murâd was requested to leave Egypt. On 30 Muhrâr 1314/10 July 1896 he left Alexandria for Paris. Back in the French capital, Murâd—despite several reservations—became a member of the Society of Union and Progress and was soon elected its leader. Mîzân was re-established again, this time as the official organ of the Society besides Meccheret. But tensions between Murâd and Ahmed Rîdâ resulted in the splitting-up of the Society, and in the transfer of its headquarters to Geneva on 22 Dhû ‘l-Ka‘da 1314/24 April 1897. After continued disputes with Ahmed Rîdâ, Murâd resigned from the leadership on 29 Dhû ‘l-Hijjâd 1314/31 May 1897. Less than two months later, he suddenly decided to return to Istanbul. The decisive factor in his decision appears to have been Ahmed Djeâl al-Dîn Pasha, head of 'Abd al-Hamîd’s intelligence service, who met Murâd in Paris and Geneve to convey the Sultan’s conditions under which he could be pardoned and returned to Mekteb-âbâd in Istanbul on 12 Rabî’ II 1315/11 August 1897. But in spite of being promised an immediate audience with the Sultan on his return, Murâd was refused entry and put under surveillance, eventually being offered the Sultan on his return, Murâd was refused entry and put under surveillance, eventually being offered

31 Mart 1897. But in

1314/24 April 1897. After a badly-conducted trial, Murâd was sentenced to life confinement in a fortress, the first two years of which he spent on Rhodes where he was to work on his famous multi-volume Ottoman history, Râbi’ II 1329/19 April 1911. He was transferred to the island of Lesbos or Midîlî [q.v.]. Being pardoned by the cabinet of Hûseyin Hilmi Paşa, Murâd returned to Istanbul in Dümâdâr I 1330/15 April 1912. Together with his son Ömer Fârûk, he travelled to France and Switzerland for medical treatment in the summer of 1913. Murâd died in his house at Anadolu Hısaîrî on 21 Dümâdâr II 1335/15 April 1917.

2. Works. 1. Autobiographical: Kâyâgî ve bâkkât-i hâl, unpublished ms. (extensively used by B. Emil, see Bibli. below); After Ego, a “defer-i bâkkârî” composed in Russian (known so far only through a quotation in Mekhânenâ-Revîs, 21); Mekhânê da mâ‘âxedî teghîl edî mîrîî, Istanbul 15/1291/1911 (covering Murâd’s early life until 1895); Mûjdâhâde-i milîyî. Qâbiyet ve uâfed devleri, Istanbul 1526/1908; Hürriyet ûtdûnsîne bir penetration istıb-dâd, Istanbul 1526/1908 (covering most of the year 1908); Taflî emelleri bâkkâtî bâkkâtarî, ed. Tahâzâde Ömer Fârûk, Istanbul 1530/1911-12 (from the 31 Mârt Wâlî’sî to Murâd’s banishment to Rhodes); Enkâî-i istibdâdî tûndî zûrdan tedîlîîî, Istanbul 1532/1911 (largely overlapping with the preceding). 2. Historical: Some of the following titles were composed primarily as textbooks for use in the Mekteb-î Mûkîyye. The earliest of these is Rûma târîkhî, first published in 1297/1879-80 as vol. ii of the following: Târîkh-i umâmi, 6 vols. Istanbul 1297-9/1879-80 to 1881-2 (first impression; fourth and last: 1527/1911); Mekhânê tausar Tahâzâde ‘îsmîî, Istanbul 1307/1889-90; Muhîlî curved Islâm, Baghdârîsârû 1399; Deur-i Hamîdî ahdârî, Istanbul 1308/1890-1 (a bibliography for part of the Hamîdî period); Târîkh-i Ebû ‘l-Fârûk, Târîkh-i ‘Ottmânîîde iṣâyet ve medemneyî tîbşûrîyî hikmet-i aṣîlaye taharîrîne teşgelîhû, ed. Tahâzâde Ömer Fârûk, 7 vols., Istanbul 1325-32/1909-16 (vol. i with another impression in 1330/1914). This remarkable Ottoman history has remained a torso; of the original plan he followed twelve vols. (see mühîl-i eger on p. 2 of vol. i) only the vols. i-vii (the latter dealing with the Köprûlu era) have been published. 3. Political Essays: Le Palais de Yildiz and la Sublime Porte, Paris 1896; Yildiz Saray-i Hûnumiîîî ve Bâb-i Âli, Cairo 1313/1895-6; Mîzân'a nisîyînîte bir teşdîlîî, Paris 1314/1896-97; La force et la faiblesse de la Turquie, Geneva 1897; a good deal of Murâd’s political writings first published in Muzân Egyptian period (1894-95) and then reprinted in Taharî-yi istibdâh, ed. Tahâzâde Ömer Fârûk, 7 vols., Istanbul 1325-32/1909-16. 4. Novels: Turfanda mi yoksa turfa mi?, Istanbul 1308/1890-1 (“the way I spent the first months of employment in the Sublime Porte is accurately illustrated at the beginning of the novel Turfanda” [Mehmed Murad, in Mekheten, 40]); 5. Plays: Tengîrî yuâvsanîî bâkkânlî bûlî, Istanbul 1325/1909.

Bibliography: By far the best general study of the life and works of Mehmed Murad is Birol Emil, Mizân Murad Bey. Hayatî ve eserleri, Istanbul 1979. (M.O.H. URSINUS)

(MIZMAR (A.) means literally “an instrument of piping” in the generic sense, it refers to any instrument of the “wood-wind” family, i.e. a reed-pipe or a flute. In the specific sense, it refers to a reed-pipe (i.e. a pipe played with a reed) as distinct from a flute, as we know from Ibn Sinâ (d. 428/1037) who describes the mizmâr—a reed-pipe—as an instrument “which you blow into from its end which you swallow”, as distinct from an instrument like the yârâ—a flute—“which you blow into from a hole”.

Ibn Zu’l-dîr. (d. 439/1048) writes similarly but substitutes the Persian term nāsâr to the Arabic word mizmâr. In Ibn Sinâ’s Arabic treatise al-Nadîgât, we read of the mizmâr, but in the identical passage in his Persian Dânsîh-nâmá the word is nây. Further, the...
Mafatih al-ulum, 236, says, "the mizmar is the nay." 
For the present purpose, "wood-wind" instruments (mazmūr) may be divided into: 1. reed-blown types. —In ancient Semitic art and literary remains (Lavignac, i, 325 ff.) — Howryy gossip attributes the name to the Persians (al-Mastūdi, Muwardī, viii, 90 = § 3214), whilst Djamāghīd himself is claimed to have been the actual "inventor" (Ewliyā Čelebi, i, 641). With Islamic peoples, reed-pipes are found with a conical or cylindrical tube (unbiḥ) pierced with finger-holes (thukb), and played with a single or double beating reed (qaṣaba, balabān). Among the Arabs of the 6th century A.D., the mizmar finds a place at convivial parties (Mufaddāliyya, 10, xvii, and in the 1st/17th century, it is one of the martial instruments of the Jewish tribes of the Hijādīg (Aghānī, ii, 172). When Islam came, an anathema was placed on reed-pipes, mainly, it would seem, on account of the female reed-pipe player (sammāra) who, as was common in the East, was looked upon as a courtesan, and, indeed, the term samma and tāma became almost synonymous. It is improbable that the Prophet Muḥammad could have referred to a reed-pipe (mizmar) in a well-known hadith in praise of the chanting (kīra 'a) of Abū Mūsā al-Āṣiṣārī. The reference was to "a mazmūr (Hebr. mizmūr "psalm") from the mazmūr of the House of David" (cf. Farmer, Hist. of Arabian music, 33). In early days, what the Arabs called the mizmūr the Persians called the nay, and the latter distinguished the flute by the name nay narm (song nay). Later, they called the reed-pipe the nay siyāḥ (black nay) and the flute the nay rafīq (white nay) because of the colour of the instruments. About the beginning of the 3rd/9th century, a musician at the 4th/10th century court mentioned Zūnām invented a reed-pipe which was named after him the nay zuvandī or simply zuvandī (Qāh), What the reed-pipe was invented for the purpose of altering the tone of the instrument, or perhaps it was the introduction of a conical tube (see Farmer, Studies, 79, 92). At this period we have no information whether the various reed-pipes had cylindrical or conical tubes or whether they were played with single or double beating reeds. The word zuvandī was accorded little recognition in the East, whatever favour the invention itself found. In the West, where the name eventually became vulgarised into zuvānītī, it became the most important reed-pipe not only in Spain, as we know from al-Shakundai (d. 628/1231; al-Makkari, Moh. ājn., i, 59), but also in the Maghrib (Ibn Khaldūn, ii, 353). It became the xelami of the Spaniards (see also Schiparelli, s.v.). The mizmūr (— mizmūr waṣ̄abī) is described and delineated by al-Fārābī (c. 339/950). It had eight holes for fingering, giving a complete octave. He also describes a smaller reed-pipe called the suryānāy (Kosegarten, 95; Land, 122; D'Erlanger, 262). One special feature of this instrument was called the še'īrā. In the Mafatih al-ulum, 237, we read: "The še'īrā of the mizmūr is its head, and it is that by which the cylinder is blown. It is the part of the instrument which lowered the pitch when required (see Farmer, Studies, 82), a device called later the tā'āk (Kanz al-ṭabāf) or yath (Villoteau). It was called the še'īrā perhaps on account of the button at the top of the cylinder which was turned round. The word suryānāy came to be modified into surnāy and then surnāy. Popular etymology opined that the word was derived from the reed-pipe (mazmūr) and the nay "reed", but this form only appears in the lexicons (Burāhān-i kāhī). Some moderns even write surnāy. The surnāy found its way into martial music as early as the beginning of the 3rd/9th century (Aghānī, xvi, 139: the text has surnāb). In the 5th/11th century, Ibn Zayla shows how, by devices in the fingering and embouchure, other notes were obtained on the reed-pipe. nay. In the Persian Kanz al-ṭabāf (9th/15th cent.) the mizmūr, also called the nāy siyāḥ, is both described and delineated. More valuable is the explanation of the actual making of the beating reed with which the instrument was played, from which we learn that it was a double reed. In the next century, a Turkish author Ahmad-oghlu Şukur Allāh copied extensively from his work (Lavignac, i, 3012). Ibn Ghaytī (d. 838/1435) says that all the notes could be obtained on the zamr siyāḥ nay by accommodating the fingering and the embouchure. The smaller instrument, the surnā, was defective in the upper octave, he says. A similar type of reed-pipe to the latter called the balabān is also mentioned by him. Ewliyā Čelebi says that it came from Shīrāz. In the treatise of Muḥammad b. Mu'rād (9th/15th cent.), we learn that the nay aṣṣud (nay siyāḥ = mizmar) was 27 cm. long. With the Turks, the Persian word surnāy had been altered to surnā and the term had become common to both the zamr (mizmūr) and surnā in the East. Ewliyā Čelebi (11th/17th century) mentions among the Turkish reed-pipes of his day the kāḥā zurnā or 'adgāmi zurnā, the 'arabī zurnā, the aṣṣūfī zurnā, and the ṣabāḥī zurnā (a Moroccan reed-pipe). He also speaks of the kurndā, which, he says, was an English invention (i, 642). If this is the same as the karandā, it was the clarinet, an instrument which Denner is said to have "invented" about 1690, which is after its mention by Ewliyā Čelebi. The Persians still continued to call their reed-pipe the surnā, and a 11th/17th century design of the instrument is given by Kaeppel. Both Russell in Syria (1, 155) and Villoteau in Egypt (i, 356-7) refer to several kinds of reed-pipes in use in the 18th century. The latter delineates these and describes them fully. They are three, the kāḥā zurnā or zamal al-kabī, the zamr or surnā, and the zurnā quār or zamal al-sughayrīt, the first being 58.3 cm. and the last 31.2 cm. in length. The modern instrument is also delineated by Lavignac, 2793, and Sacha, 428. For specimens, see Brussels, nos. 122, 355, 357; New York, no. 1331. In the West also we find a new name, or instrument, the ghayta or ghaytā [q. e.]. It is said to have been introduced by the Turks (Delphin and Guin, 48), but the name is mentioned by Ibn Baṭrūṭa (d. 779/1377), who likens the Mesopotamian surnāy to the Maghribī ghaytā (ii, 126). There are, however, two kinds of ghayta, one being a cylindrical tube blown with a single reed, and another being a conical tube blown with a double reed. This may explain why ghayta does not always equate with surnāy and mizmūr in the West (Taḥkīrat al-nīyān, 93; Muhammad al-Saghlī, 34). The cylindrical tube instrument is known in Egypt as the ghīta. For details, see Gālī, 103; Delphin and Guin, 47. For specimens and designs, see Hōst, 261, tab. xxi; Brussels, no. 351; New York, nos. 402, 2824; Lavignac, 2793. A 16th century, became quite famous in Western Europe was the bāk played with a reed. The original bāk [q. e.] was a horn or clarion, and was made of horn or metal. Pierced with holes for fingering, and played
with a reed, a new type of instrument, somewhat similar to the modern saxophone, was evolved. In the 4th/10th century, this bug was "improved" by the Andalusian caliph al-Hakam II (Bibl. de autores Españ., li, 410). Ibn Khaldûn, who describes it, says that it was the best instrument of the zamr family (ii, 353). Ibn Ghaybi, in his hagiograph ms. in the Bodleian Library, writes bug, but adds "also called buk", but the latter remark has been deleted. It appears to be delineated in the Cantigas de Santa Maria (Riaño, fig. 43, b).

Another interesting instrument is the ṭāṣāyya or ṭāṣāya, which may have been the forerunner of the European racket. It has a cylindrical pipe and is played with a double reed. It is probably the descendent of the nay al-ṭāṣātha that al-Ghazãli (d. 505/1111) speaks of. It is delineated and fully described by Villoteau (i, 943 f.). Examples are given at Brussels, no. 124; New York, no. 2861.

With Islamic peoples, reed-pipes belong to outdoor music. Just as we see them in the Al Iflay wa-la-layla as being essential to folk, ceremonial, processional, and martial music, so they are today, and probably have always been.

Double reed-pipes. Ibn Khurradâdjiîbîh says that the Chinese, not the Persians, "inverted" the single reed-pipe called the diyâna (al-Masûdi, Murûdî, loc. cit.), the earliest instrument of this type that we know by name in Arabic literature, although it appears in the 2nd/8th century frescoes at Kusayr Âmra (Müslî, pl. xxiv). It has been suggested that the word should be dûnây, but diyâna is also given by al-Farabi (see Farmer, Studies, 57), who describes and delineates the instrument which, he says, was also called the miznâr al-ghoyd (al-Masûdi, viii, 90). A six-finger holed instrument which, he says, was used by the Kurds (al-Masûdî, viii, 90) is described in the Mafîtîh al-ulum (Menandri Fragm.).

The chanter, terminating in a horn bell (Schallstuck), is a musical instrument of the Chinese. It is made of compounded tubes (andibâh), and its name is to be found throughout the Balkan countries (Tagore, 24; Day, 151). In Turkey, the older word was tûlûm, tûlûm or tûlûm (Meninski, Sachs; cf. Ewliya Çelebi, i, 642: tûlûm dûbak), but ghûdâ would appear to be equally popular, and this name is found in the Balkan countries (cf. Arab. ghûdâ; Span. guita; Eng. uguylâ). The bagpipe used by Islamic peoples is generally equipped with a chanter pipe (with five or six finger-holes) and mouthpiece, but rarely with a drone pipe. The chanter, terminating in a horn bell (Schallstuck), is often double, a feature which was probably the original reason for the term zummâra being used with the bagpipe. The woodwork is sometimes inlaid with metal, whilst another feature is the adornment of the instrument with tassels, beads, shells, and other friberry. Designs may be found in Niebuhr (tab. xxvi) and Sachs (434), and actual specimens in Brussels, no. 372.

Instruments of free reeds. The Chinese chêng is such an instrument. Probably it was not used by Islamic peoples, although known to them. The chêng is described in the Mastitial al-šûlam as follows: "The mûstâk is a musical instrument of the Chinese. It is made of compounded tubes (andibâh), and its name in Persian is bîhâ mushta" (237). We get a little more information from Ibn Ghaybi, who informs us that the tûlûm o mûstâk-â-čeâsy was made of tubes of reed joined together. It was blown through a tube and the notes were obtained by fingerholes. For description and designs, see Van Aalst, Chinese music, 80.

b. Pipe-blown types. — The flutes of the Arabs, Persians and Turks, unlike those of Western Europe, are played vertically, a current of air being blown across the orifice (manâshîh) at its head. Ewliya Çelebi (i, 623, 636, 642 read m, not Jū) is not sure whether it was Pythagoras or Moses who "invented" the first instrument of this type, the shepherd's flute, called the kowal (cf. xowal). Ibn Khurradâdjiîbîh says that it originated with the Kurds (al-Masûdi, viii, 90 = § 3214), and Ibn Ghaybi (Shâhî al-deceâr) says that this instrument was the nay abyad (white nay). We know from Ibn al-Arâbî (d. 231/846) that the Arabs called this flute or reed-pipe the gûhâ. A characteristic of the Arab flute was its length, hence the ancient Greek proverb which likened a talkative person to an Arabian flute (Menandre, Fragm.).

In the early days of Islam, the Arabs called their flute the kussâba (later modified into kassaba), and this is the name used by the poets al-Arâbî (d. 8/629) and Ru'ba b. al-'Adîdjahid (2nd/8th century). These terms
fell into desuetude in the East when Persian musical influence was at their height. The Persians called their flute the ḥayra (soft flute) so as to distinguish it from the ḥayra, which was reed-pipe, and so the Arabs of the East called their flute the nāy, although in the West the old word kūshāba or kūshāba was retained. Another term for the flute in early days, perhaps a different kind, was ṣurā (Majāth al-ṣilām, 236), and in the 7th/11th century Glossarium Latine-Arabicum it equates with ṣulām. In the 7th/13th century it was still a common name with Safī al-Dīn Aḥmad al-Muʿīmin in the East, and with al-Ṣaḥārdī in the West (al-Makkari, i, 59: read ṣurā not ṣafā). In the contemporary Vocabulista in Arabico, it (ṣafā) agrees with fistula. The words ḥayra and hārā (al-Djawharī, al-Firuzbādī) would appear to be vulgar forms of ṣurā.

Whilst the diminutive kūshāba (kūshāba) sometimes occurs in reference to a small flute, qabība and qahāb (ṣabāb; "to grow up") were the more general terms used in ʿIrāq (Ikhwān al-Safāʾ, i, 97), Egypt (al-Maḥrizī, i, 136), Spain (al-Shähābi, Vœc in Arab.), and the Maghrib (Ibn Khaldūn, ii, 352). It became the exābeba of Western Europe. Another name for a small flute was quṣūm, and this word also found a place with the Latins as the jox (Du Cange). In Persia, the small flute was called ṣafā (Kanz al-tuhaf), hence the Balkan piscau and pisak. We read of the nāy in the Aṣkhanī (ix, 71), but we cannot be sure whether it was a flute or a reed-pipe. Al-Fārābī (Kosgenaten, 45) ignores the flute (nāy) and says that it was inferior (ukhjar) to the mizām (reed-pipe), but it so gained wide recognition in chamber music probably by reason of Sufī appreciation and the ḥājīr or drum, hence the phrase in al-Ghazalī: "The ḥājīr of the drummer (tābbāf)."

Pan pipes are also common to folk usage. Both Pythagoras and Moses are credited by Ewliya Celebī (i, 624, 636) with the "invention" of the māṣīkār or pan pipes. Although the word stands for "a composer of melodies" in the Majāth al-ṣilām (see also Meninski), it referred to a musical instrument in the 9th/15th century (N. et E., xiv, 312). A contemporary writer, Ibn Ghaybī, says that "the māṣīkār is one of the [wind instruments with] free pipes. Its notes are determined by size [of pipes]. The longest have the low notes, and the shortest the high notes." We find the instrument in the mīlād māṣīkār (Farhang al-Mahīrī) and in the Mīlād al-dīn Aḥmad al-Muṣṭafī (400) has mīhkhāl, and Todirini (i, 237) mosul, which probably gave birth to the Romanic musca. The term māṣīkār survived up to modern times (Villoteau, i, 963), but the more general word used today (Mushāka, 29) is ḡānāḥ. (Pedro de Alcalā [1503] mentions a harp by this name, but perhaps he confused the name with ḡānāḥ.) Russell (The natural history and history of music, 156) tells us that in Syria in the 13th century, says that pan pipes were to be found with from three to twenty-three pipes. Kaempfer, 743, delineates an 11th/17th century Persian instrument.

The names of instruments in the mazāmīr group in Arabic are legion. Many of those not mentioned in this article are regional and are of folk origin, their source being often discernible, such as in the zamāqāra and zamākār, to name only two. More interesting however, are the older words like hunkāh, nāṣīb, and zānābā. The first two occur in al-Firuzbādī (d. 817/1414), and nāṣīb, which equates with mīzām, reminds us of the much debated passage in Ezchiel, xxviii, 13. Zānābā occurs in al-Azhārī (d. 370/980) and even earlier (cf. Lane). The Greek μουσικός, and the Latin zambulza were stringed instruments, and Isidore of Seville’s sambaca as a “wood-wind” instrument has long been suspect, but since zānābā is to be found in Arabic equating with zamāmāra and mīzāmār would there appear to be good reason for accepting Isidore of Seville.
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MIZWALA (A.), sundial. This term and ṣaʿa ʾshamīṣa are used in modern Arabic, but in medieval Islamic times horizontal sundials were referred to either as ṭukhāma, lit. "marble" or baṣīṭa, lit. "flat" and vertical sundials as mahzarā, lit. "inclined". The gnōmon was usually called ʿsādika, ʿsdika or mīrājū. One exception is that the Muslim astronomers of the Middle Ages (see PI. XVIII, fig. 3) used to regulate the times of prayer [see mikiṣ] was an avid interest in gnōmonics, the theory and practice of sundial construction. Muslim astronomers made substantial contributions to both aspects of the subject, and by the late medieval period there were sundials of one form or another in most of the major mosques in the Islamic world. Those which survived usually bear markings for the hours (seasonal or equinoctial) and for the midday (zuhūr) and afternoon (ʿasr) prayers. Since the beginnings of the permitted intervals for these two prayers were defined in terms of shadow lengths, their regulation by means of sundials was singularly appropriate.

The earliest surviving Arabic treatise on sundials deals with their construction and is attributed to al-Khārāzmi [q.v.], active in Baghdād in the early 3/rd century. The work consists mainly of a set of tables of coordinates for constructing horizontal sundials serving 12 different latitudes. Each of al-Khārāzmi's sub-tables for a specific latitude displays for both of the solstices the solar altitude, the shadow of a standard gnōmon, and the solar azimuth (see Pl. XVI, fig. 1). With these functions tabulated, construction of the sundial would have been almost routine. A 4/10th-century treatise on the construction of vertical sundials has also survived. This is by one of the two Baghdād astronomers Ibn al-ʿĀdāmī or Saʿīd ibn Khaffī al-Samarkāndī (the copyist of the unique manuscript was not sure). Two auxiliary functions are tabulated with which one can generate pairs of orthogonal coordinates useful for marking vertical sundials serving any terrestrial latitude and inclined at any angle to the local meridian. Also from the ʿAbhādī period is the surviving treatise on sundials of the 3/rd century, is the earliest text on the portable conical sundial. Ǧaṣṣīb b. Kurra (fl. Baghdād, ca. 300/900 [q.v.]) wrote a comprehensive work on sundial theory dealing with the transformation of coordinates between different orthogonal systems based on three planes: (1) the horizon, (2) the celestial equator, and (3) the variable plane of the sundial. As far as we know, Ǧaṣṣīb's treatise, despite its merits, was not influential. Later Muslim astronomers were more interested in the practical side of gnōnomics.

The major work on spherical astronomy and instrumentation in the later period of Islamic astronomy was the compendium by ʿAbū ʿAli al-Marrākūṣī [q.v.], who worked in Cairo ca. 680/1280. There are lengthy sections on sundials, with numerous tables and diagrams. The discussion concentrates on descriptions of the mode of construction; there is little underlying theory. The text deals with horizontal, vertical, cylindrical and conical sundials as well as simple, portable vertical sundials, in plane, cylindrical or conical format. Al-Marrākūṣī's treatise was widely influential in later astronomical circles in Egypt, Syria and Turkey.

A contemporary of al-Marrākūṣī in Cairo, Shihāb al-Dīn al-Maḳṣī, prepared a set of tables for marking vertical sundials for the latitude of that city. For each degree of inclination to the local meridian he tabulated the coordinates of the points of intersection of the lines for the seasonal hours and the ʿasr curve with the shadow traces at the equinoxes and the solstices (see Pl. X, fig. 2). The astronomer Ibn al-Sarrāḏ, active in Aleppo some fifty years later, devised several ingenious sundials for all latitudes. Only a few sundials survive from the medieval period. Hundreds or even thousands must have been constructed from the 3/rd/9th century onwards, but the vast majority have disappeared without trace. The oldest surviving Islamic sundial (see Pl. XVIII, fig. 3) was made by Ibn al-Saffāʾ, an astronomer of some renown who worked in Cordova about the year 400/1000. Only one-half of the instrument survives, but the remains are adequate to establish that gnōnomics was not the maker's forte. The sundial is of the horizontal variety and there are lines for each of the seasonal hours and the zuhra prayer; there would also have been markings for the ʿasr. The gnomon is now missing, but its length is indicated by the radius of a circle engraved on the sundial. Several other, later Andalusī sundials which survive are singularly poor testimonials to their makers' abilities; yet proper sundials must have existed in medieval al-Andalus.

The Tunisian sundial shown in Pl. XVIII, fig. 4 is a much newer production. It was made in 746/1345-6 by Abu ʿl-Ḵāsim Ḥasan al-Shaḥādī, and it is of considerable historical interest because its markings display only the times of day with religious significance. For the afternoon (right-hand side) the curves for the zuhra and ʿasr are marked according to the standard Andalusī/Maghribī definitions. For the morning there is a curve for the ʿsdika, symmetrical with the ʿasr curve with respect to the meridian, and a line for the time of the taḥīb one equinoctial hour before midday, this institution being associated with the communal worship on Friday [see gūmʿ]. It was the symmetry of the sdhāba and ʿṣīr on this sundial that first led to an understanding of the definitions of the times of the daylight prayers in Islam.

The astronomer Ibn al-Shāṭīr, chief muwaqqūt of the Umayyad Mosque in Damascus, constructed in 773/1371-2 a horizontal sundial, some 2 m x 1 m in size, which is undoubtedly the most splendid sundial of the Islamic Middle Ages (see Pl. XIX, fig. 5). It was erected on a platform on the southern side of the main minaret of the Mosque. It could be used to measure time after sunrise in the morning and time before
sunset in the afternoon, as well as time before and after midday. This means that it measured time relative to the zuhr and magrib prayers, and the 'asr could enable regulation of time relative to that prayer also.

No vertical sundials survive from the first few centuries of Islamic astronomy, but we know they were made because of the treatises on their use which were compiled from the 3rd/9th century onwards. The munharfa, meaning simply “vertical and inclined to the meridian”, usually bore markings for each seasonal hour and the 'asr prayer bounded by two hyperbolic shadow-traces for the solstices. Tables such as those of al-Makki (see above) would be particularly useful for constructing such sundials on the walls of mosques.

Numerous sundials from the period after the 10th/16th century survive in mosques from Morocco to India. No inventory of these instruments has been made, beyond non-technical surveys of those in Istanbul. In any case, they constitute but a modest testimonial to a millennium of Muslim activity in gnomonics.


On a sundial used by Umayyad caliph 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz [q. v.] and other instruments which attest to the original association of the times of prayers with seasonal hours, see King, On the origin of the prayers in Islam, in Oriens, xxxiii (1990).


(D.A. King) MIZWAR, arabicised form of the Berber amzwir, “he who precedes, he who is placed at the head”, equivalent to the Arabic muqaddam and, like this, frequently has in North Africa the meaning of chief of a religious brotherhood [jarīda] [q. v.]. In the al-Marrakishi treatise, see K. Garbers, Ein Werk Thäbit b. Qurra’s über ebene Sonnenuhren, in Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Mathematik, Astronomie und Physik, Abt. A, 4 (1956), and P. Luckey, Thäbit b. Qurra’s Book über die ebene Sonnenuhren, in Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Mathematik, Astronomie und Physik, Abt. B, Bd. 4 (1937-8), 95-148.

The term mizwar (or mazar) is found early in the histories of the Maghrib in connection with Almohad institutions. There it means the head of a faction, and the corresponding office seems at this time to be often confused with that of hāfiz and muhtasib [q. v.]. In the time of the Mu‘inid caliph Abū Yūsuf Ya‘qūb al-Mansūr, each of the twenty-one Almohad tribes had two mizwaris, “one for the first rank of the hierarchy, i.e. the earliest recruits of the Almohads, and another for those who had joined them later” (Mu‘in al-Ansāb, in E. Lévy-Provençal, Documents inédits d’histoire almohade, Paris 1928, 70; cf. also 63-4, and M. Gaudemory-Demobynes, introduction to the translation of the Masālik al-abyr of Ibn Fadl Allāh al-‘Umarī, Paris 1927, p. xxvii). Ma‘zwar was in constant use in Fās for the nakhīb [q. v.] of the principal ṣanāfīn groups who lived in this capital (see R. le Tourneau, Fès avant le protectorat, Casablanca 1949, 489). In the Almohad period the term was used not only in the Almohads, by the head of a kind of guild of physicians in the town (see G. Verderdu, Marrakech des origines à 1912, Rabat 1959, 251).
1. An extract from al-Khwarizmi's tables for sundial construction showing two pairs of sub-tables for each of latitudes 21°, 28°, 33°, 35° and 40°, based on obliquity 23°51' [see maxl]. The final pair of tables is for latitude 29°30' but with obliquity 23°35'. These tables occur here in a treatise on astrolables and sundials by al-Sidżī (fl. Iran, ca. 975). Taken from ms. Istanbul Topkapi 3342, 8 + 9, with kind permission of the Director of the Topkapı Library.
2. An extract from al-Maṣṣī’s tables for constructing vertical sundials for the latitude of Cairo. This particular sub-table serves an inclination of 15° to the meridian. Taken from ms. Cairo Dār al-Ḳutub mīḥāl 103, fols. 68b-69a, with kind permission of the Director of the Egyptian National Library.
3. The oldest surviving Islamic sundial, made about the year 400/1000 in Cordova by Ibn al-Saffār. The curve for the *zuhr* is just visible on this fragment, and there would have been curves for the beginning and end of the 'aṣr as well. Photo courtesy of the Museo Arqueológico Provincial de Córdoba.

4. A 8th/14th-century Tunisian sundial indicating four times of day with religious significance: the *dhuḥ* and the *taḥqīb* before midday, and the *zuhr* and the 'aṣr after it. Property of the National Museum of Carthage; photo courtesy of the late M. Alain Brieux, Paris.
5. The markings of the splendid sundial of Ibn al-Shā'ir which once graced the main minaret of the Umayyad Mosque in Damascus. The original sundial is in fragments, preserved in the garden of the nearby Archeological Museum. This copy is made from an exact replica made by the 13th/19th-century muwakkit al-Tanṭāwī which is still in situ on the minaret. Courtesy of the Syrian Department of Antiquities and the late M. Alain Brieux, Paris.
AL-MIZZA

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(E. LEVI-PROVENCAL*)

AL-MIZZA, modern form Mezze, a village lying, according to the medioeval geographers, half-a-farsakh (i.e. about 4 km./2.5 miles) to the west of Damascus [see DIMASHK], described as extensive, populous and agriculturally rich, being irrigated by one of the streams of the Baradā river. It was also known as Miz- zat Kalb, having been in the Umayyad period a locality heavily settled by South Arabian, Kalbi supporters of the Sufyānids, and being also the spot where the Companions of the Prophet Dīnay b. Khalīfa al-Kalbi was reputedly buried (al-Harawi, Ziyārāt, 11/27). In historical accounts of the Umayyads, it is mentioned several times as a centre of the Kalb, especially in the confused last years of the dynasty; thus in 127/745 Marwān II after suppressing the revolt of Hīm [q.v.] sent a force against his opponents in the Damascus area, and the properties of the Yamānīyya at al-Mizza were burnt down (al-Tabarī, ii, 1894; Ibn al-Athīr, ed. Beirut, v, 329; cf. G.R. Hawting, The first dynasty of Islam, the Umayyad caliphate AD 661-750, London 1986, 98).

By Ayyūbīd and Mamluk times, however, it is again described as flourishing. Ibn Baṭṭūta (i, 236, tr. Gibb, i, 148; cf. also Ibn Dābīyar, 277, tr. R.J.C. Broadhurst, London 1952, 280) found it to be one of the chief villages of the Dār al-Kabīr, among the latter "inter alia for its 'samāqa", including the traditionist Dīmāl al-Dīn Yūsuf b. al-Zakī ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Mīzī (d. 742/1341-2 [q.v.]). Al-Dīmāghī (Nakhiba, tr. Mehren, 265-6) mentions the renown of its rose water. The expanding modern city of Damascus has now crept towards al-Mizza, and the city's airport is located there.

Bibliography (in addition to references given in the article): Yākūt, ed. Beirut, v, 122; Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, 508; Gaudefroy-Demobynes, La Syrie à l'époque des Mamelouks, 38, 47; Dussaud, Topographie historique de la Syrie, 307-8.

(C.E. BOSWORTH)

AL-MIZZI, Dīmāl al-Dīn ʿAbd al-ʿĀlī Yūsuf b. al-Zakī ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Yūsuf al-Kalbī al-Kuḍāī, famous Syrian traditionist. Born near Aleppo in 654/1256 of Arab stock, he moved early in life with his parents to al-Mizza [q.v.], a rich village, just outside Damascus where he received a traditional education in Kūrān and some fiqh. When he was in his early twenties he embarked upon a career as a traditionist hearing hadīṭh with the masters of his time. One of his fellow pupils was Tākī ʿAbd al-Dīn Ibn Taymiyya (661-728/1263-1328 [q.v.]), who remained a life-long friend. Al-Mizzī travelled extensively in search of traditions in Syria, Palestine, Egypt and the Hijāz and developed into the greatest riḍāql expert the Muslim world had ever seen. Furthermore, he acquired a mastery in Arabic language and grammar. When he was still a young man, he had some contacts with controversial Shīʿī circles but he soon discontinued these, probably as a result of Ibn Taymiyya's warnings against them. A ʿShāfiʿī as to his legal preference, he nevertheless wholeheartedly espoused the new ideas and the creed proposed by Ibn Taymiyya, something which even landed him for a short time in jail.

From 718/1319 onwards, al-Mizzī became the head of one of the major hadīṭh academies of Damascus, the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-ʿArbaʿiyya, which was in fact a madras. Before entering this madras he had to profess that he upheld the creed of al-ʿAshʿarī [q.v.], but in spite of his pledge to this effect, he had many adherents who doubted his sincerity and who suspected him of having been "corrupted" by Ibn Taymiyya's creed. Even so, he taught hadīṭh in this academy until his death in 743/1342.

Among his students we find, apart from Ibn Taymiyya, such scholars as al-Dhahābī (d. 748/1347 [q.v.]), ʿAbd al-Waḥḥāb al-Sūbki (d. 771/1369 [q.v.]), the author of the Tabākāt al-ʿAshʿarīyya al-kubrā, and his son-in-law Ismāʿīl b. ʿUmar Ibn Kaṭīr (d. 774/1372 [q.v.]), the author of al-Bidāya wa ʾl-nihāya.

Al-Mizzī's fame as a muḥaddith rests mainly in two voluminous works: Taḥīḥ al-kamāl fi asmaʾ al-riḍāql, a biographical lexicon listing all the transmitters of the isnad occurring in the "Six" canonical collections as well as in some other minor tradition collections. It constitutes a milestone in the lit al-riḍāql in that it is the first comprehensive lexicon that aims at being exhaustive, very much more so than any of its predecessors. As ʿBaghāhār ʿAwād Maʿrūf, the modern editor of the Taḥīḥ, points out, it not only comprises the biographical material collected in earlier works of that kind, but al-Mizzī has also brought together virtually every scrap of information on the rawāt kutub al-sīta that he could lay his hands on (see Maʿrūf's introduction to his edition in progress, i, 41-9). Various scholars have produced compendia of al-Mizzī's original, none being more famous than the Taḥīḥ al-ʿAshʿarīyya al-kubrā (Gibb, i, 148; cf. also Ibn Dābīyar, 277, tr. Ibn Djubayr, 277, tr. Dussaud, Topographie historique de la Syrie, 47; Gaudefroy-Demobynes, La Syrie à l'époque des Mamelouks, 38, 47; Dussaud, Topographie historique de la Syrie, 307-8).

The edition currently available is especially helpful in that it presents this complex material in an array of different letter sizes with many appropriate modern symbols, easily recognisable abbreviations and a variety of numberings inserted, thus greatly facilitating the use of an otherwise awesome textbook.

In the study of Muslim tradition, al-Mizzī's Taḥīḥ is indispensable and this for the following reasons: 1. It is the only work of its kind which comprises also al-Nasāʾī's al-Sunan al-kubrā, a collection which that collector later excerpted to produce his Sunan as we know it today (also known by the name al-Muḍājībā). Al-Sunan al-kubrā was never edited, and although the Taḥīḥ's editor once announced that he was going to undertake a complete edition, except for one slim volume containing the chapter on tabāra, his plans have not yet been carried out. An analysis of al-Nasāʾī's Kubrā isnadā shows how that collector added masses of single strand isnadā to already existing isnadā.

In the study of Muslim tradition, al-Mizzī's Taḥīḥ is indispensable and this for the following reasons: 1. It is the only work of its kind which comprises also al-Nasāʾī's al-Sunan al-kubrā, a collection which that collector later excerpted to produce his Sunan as we know it today (also known by the name al-Muḍājībā). Al-Sunan al-kubrā was never edited, and although the Taḥīḥ's editor once announced that he was going to undertake a complete edition, except for one slim volume containing the chapter on tabāra, his plans have not yet been carried out. An analysis of al-Nasāʾī's Kubrā isnadā shows how that collector added masses of single strand isnadā to already existing isnadā.
bundles collected by his predecessors, strands which he diligently left unmentioned in his later, excerpted Tuhfa, which he diligently left unmentioned in his later, excerpted Tuhfa, which provided the analyst of the Tuhfa. The mediaeval history of the coast of eastern Africa, in JRAS (1973).
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The reputation of this Zoroastrian priest for religious learning and legal responsibility led al-Ya'kubi to explain this term as *ʾilm al-qurrah*, while al-Masʿūdī explained it as *hāfez al-dīn* and derived it from *mu* - "religion" and *badh* - "protector". The lexicographers add that it meant "learned" (known from various contexts). It is often found in medieval Arabic literature, especially in legal and religious works.

of his career advancing from erpat to magupat. This was refuted by de Menasce, based on the lack of evidence for a hierarchy among different kinds of priests in the 3rd century. Although the existence of mobadh is sometimes retrojected back to earlier times, as in the ArdāVirāzNāmag (i, 9), where Alexander is said to have killed many magpatah, the earliest attested use of this title is in the inscriptions of Kārtīr (Kirdēr) in the reign of Bahārmān II (276-93). Although Kārtīr claims to have been both mobadh and erpat under Shāpur I (ca. 241-72) in his inscription at Naksh-i Rustam (i, 28), in those at Sar Māghād (i, 4) and the Khosrow of Zoroaster (i, 3), he says that he signed contracts which he sealed for the fires and for the Magians under Shāpur I as Kirdēr, erpat. Under Ohrmāzd I (273-2) he was made Ohrmāzd magpat (sc. of the god Ohrmāz), which position he held under Bahārmān I (273-76) and Bahārmān II. As such he was in charge of the divine ceremonies which he increased, founded Vahrām fires and sealed contracts for the fires and testaments, contracts and documents for the Magians at court and throughout the state. Bahārmān II made him magpat and judge (datēbar) of the entire state.

Whether or not a hierarchy of priests was established under Kārtīr, the title of mobadh is hierarchic in nature, meaning that one magus (magomarp) is in charge of others. Although Herzfeld ascribes a magopat to maguṣ under Akbarān in the 3rd century, local magpatah, mainly of Adiabene, begin to be attested in Christian martyrlogies during the reign of Shāpur II (309-79). Their role in apprehending and executing Christians is emphasised, but one of them, who was descended from the same family, was supposed to indict enemies of God, enemies of the king and heretics, according to the Testament of Ardašīr, the king was to name his successor in four signed, sealed documents by the magpatah, who were to open them at his death and compare them to determine his successor. Neither procedure is confirmed by historical accounts of Sasanid successions, but the mobadh is frequently described in the Šahr-nāmeh as placing the crown on the ruler’s head. Islamic sources also describe the bi-annual court of justice held on the festivals of Nawruz and Mihrdjan when the king held public audiences for exceptional cases he judged lawsuits from which appeals had been made to him without seeing the plaintiff or defendant. His decisions were above review, being considered more trustworthy than the ordeal. Veh-Shāpur, whose archives contained wills, promulgated a memorandum dealing with legal procedure, specifically on keeping records of the interrogation in capital crimes. Copies, authenticated by his seal, were circulated to the provinces. It was natural for Muslim writers, such as al-Mas‘ūdī, to translate mobadh as supreme judge (kādi ‘l-⪞udān) and to say that his rank was almost equal to that of a prophet.

As the supreme religious and judicial authority, the magpatah was supposedly beyond the jurisdiction of ordinary courts. The magpat was supposed to indict enemies of God, enemies of the king and heretics, according to the Ma’ītakādān. In exceptional cases he judged lawsuits from which appeals had been made to him without seeing the plaintiff or defendant. His decisions were above review, being considered more trustworthy than the ordeal. Veh-Shāpur, whose archives contained wills, promulgated a memorandum dealing with legal procedure, specifically on keeping records of the interrogation in capital crimes. Copies, authenticated by his seal, were circulated to the provinces.
responsibilities, such as reciting the liturgy and performing sacrifices, tending the fire temples and their endowments and religious education. Their functions sometimes overlapped those of secular officials and other kinds of priests. It is not always clear whether mobads included other forms of priestly dignity (such as dastir), to what extent they were hereditary or what their position was relative to the kirbads. After Hurmizd IV (579-90) abolished the judgments and regulations of the mobads from kirbads, kirbads appear to have been predominant at the end of the Sasanid period, during the Muslim conquest and for a while afterwards.

In any case, mobads, together with other priests, lost political support when the Sasanids fell to the Muslims. The upper levels of the priestly hierarchy disappeared; there was no longer a unity of body of priests; and authority devolved on provincial and local priests, including mobads. It is not always clear whether mobads is used as a generic term for any priest or is used in a specifically technical sense in sources referring to Islamic Iran, and this term is also used somewhat loosely in modern scholarship for Zoroastrian priests in early Islamic times. There was both a chief kirbad and a mobad mobadh or is used in a specifically technical sense in sources of the Sasanid period, during the Muslim conquest and for a while afterwards.

It is only in the Persian Risayds of the Safavid period that precise definitions of different kinds of priests are given, presumably in ascending order. The herbed is one who knows the Avesta and has been initiated as a priest. The mobed is one who recites the Imd-Avesta continually and performs the Yasna service. The dastir is one who knows the Zend-Avesta and the Zand, the MP literature, and has the authority to command Behdins to do religious works. A dastirdn is defined as a chief mobed who is in charge of the ceremonies for the dead. In 1020/1611 there were dastirds and dbahmobeds at Kirkman and a high priest, dastirds and dbahmobeds at Yazd.
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known since the Middle Ages in Europe. In the Middle Ages it was of much greater importance than in antiquity. The good harbour of the town, sheltered by maps.

In the Middle Ages it was of much greater importance than in the Levant. Hence pilgrims frequently mention the refuge and of supply for ships going from the West to the Levant. The good harbour of the town, sheltered by the Ottoman raids the lands outside Modon, and in 1499-1500 launched naval attacks on Modon whilst Sultan Bâyezîd II advanced on the town by land. After a siege of 28 days, the outnumbered Venetians had to surrender (9 August 1500); the populace was now massacred or enslaved, and the Latin cathedral of St. John turned into a mosque.

After a siege of 28 days, the outnumbered Venetians had to surrender (9 August 1500); the populace was now massacred or enslaved, and the Latin cathedral of St. John turned into a mosque. After a siege of 28 days, the outnumbered Venetians had to surrender (9 August 1500); the populace was now massacred or enslaved, and the Latin cathedral of St. John turned into a mosque.

In 1531 the Knights of St. John almost recaptured Modon, and carried off 1,600 Muslim prisoners. Ewliyâ Čelebî visited the Morea 1667-8 and gives valuable information on Modon and its vicinity (Seyyid-nâmé, vii, Istanbul 1928, 334 ff.). During the War of the Holy League against Turkey, which broke out in 1684, the Venetian commander Francesco Morosini recaptured Modon with the help of Greek and German troops, and the treaty of Karlowitz [see KARLOFWA] confirmed the Venetians' possession. Venetian census records from this time show that Modon and its district had become very depopulated, and Modon itself, including the citadel, had only 236 inhabitants, of whom some must have been Muslims.

The town remained for some nineteen years under Venetian rule. In 1715 the grand vizier Dâmid 'Ali Şehehî with the help of a number of Greeks took not only Modon but also the whole of the Morea from the Venetians in a very short time [see MORA. 2]. The Venetian garrisons of Navarino and Koroni as well as the inhabitants abandoned them when the Turkish army approached in the summer of 1715, in order to take refuge in Modon, which was much more strongly fortified. Soon afterwards the Turkish fleet and army began the siege of the town. After a brief resistance Modon surrendered voluntarily. After the capture of the town, the grand vizier ordered a general slaughter of the Christians. Many in the district thereupon adopted Islam in order to save life and property in this way. The Turks who had formerly owned property in Modon or the neighbourhood were allowed by imperial edict to resume possession of it. The Peace of Passarowitz (1718) finally ceded Modon to Turkey. The town recovered from the catastrophe of 1715. From 1725 onwards a busy trade developed between Modon and the lands of North Africa, especially Algeria and Tunis. Modon played a certain part during the war between Turkey and Russia in 1768-74. The Russian vice-general Dolgoruki in 1769 besieged Modon. The siege lasted a long time; the fighting was conducted mainly by the artillery on both sides. The Russians had also two warships cooperating on the sea. At the end of May 1769, Turks and Albanians from the interior of the Morea came to the help of the besieged. In the battle that now developed the Russians suffered heavily. They were forced to abandon most of their artillery and to escape to Navarino, from which they sailed with the rest of the Russian army and a few Greek notables. According to reliable sources, the Turkish population of Modon about 1820 was four to five hundred fighting men. About the same time, 'Ali Agha was prominent among the Turks of the town for his wealth and in other respects also. The vicinity of Modon was almost exclusively inhabited by Greeks who cultivated the land, which mainly belonged to the Turks. During the Greek War of Independence of 1821-7, all the attempts of the Greeks to take the town failed. At the end of March 1821, a Peloponnesian force led by the Orthodox Patriarch of Methone and other notables, besieged Modon and the adjoining towns of Koroni and Neokastron. The besiegers joined in the spring by Greeks from the Ionian islands and later by Philhellenes from Europe. On 18 May 1821, Greek ships blockaded Modon, and many fierce encounters took place between the Turks of Modon and their besiegers. In July 1821, Turkish ships re-provisioned Modon but they were not successful in their attempt to re-provision Neokastron, the garrison of which was in dire straits from want of food and even water. In August 1821, the Turks of Modon decided to attempt the relief of Neokastron and in November 1821 Modon in the meanwhile been forced to capitulate to their Greek besiegers. On the road between Modon and Neokastron a battle was fought on 8 August 1821. On the same day, the Greeks took Neokastron; but they gradually abandoned the siege of Modon. The town was able to continue to hold out, only, however, with the frequent help of the Turkish fleet.

When the captain Ibrahim Pasha [Æ.Æ.] undertook to suppress the Greek rising for the sultan and to pacify the Morea, Modon and its neighbourhood formed his main base. There he landed troops on 24 February 1825 and dug entrenchments. Modon became an important base for Ibrahim Pasha's operations. On 8 October 1828 the town was taken from him by the French General Maisonn. The French left Modon about 1829, and Modon has since that time been colonised by Greeks. According to the 1918 census, the population of Methone was 1,251; the population has been dwindling over recent decades.

MOGHDAN, a town in the vicinity of the city of Kermanshah, western Iran, was the scene of a battle fought in 1334 between the forces of the Mongol emperor Hulegu and the forces of the Persian ruler Fath Ali. The battle, known as the Battle of Mirjâna, marked the end of the Mongol empire in Persia.

MOHAC, also known as Mohacs, was a town located on the Danube River in Hungary. It is notable for the Battle of Mohacs, fought on 29 August 1526, which resulted in the deaths of the King of Hungary, Louis II, and the Elector of Austria, Frederick, and the failure of Habsburg efforts to stop the spread of the Ottoman Empire into Europe.

MOHAMS, also referred to as Moghuls, were a group of people of mixed Mongol and Central Asian descent who lived in the region of Ghur in present-day Afghanistan. They were known for their distinctive culture, language, and architecture, and their influence is evident in the region to this day.

MOHOTAN, also known as Moghulistan or Mogholistan, is a region in central Asia that was ruled by the Moghul dynasty. It is known for its rich history and cultural heritage, and is home to a number of important archaeological sites.

MOHSEN, a town in the province of Zanjan, Iran, is known for its historic sites and cultural heritage. It is a center for the study of the Persian language and literature, and is home to a number of famous poets and scholars.

MOHSEN, also known as Mohsen, is a town located in the province of Fars, Iran. It is known for its rich history and cultural heritage, and is home to a number of historic sites and landmarks.
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Europe. Hungary, which had formerly been a strong and centralised kingdom under Matthias Corvinus (1458-90), gradually lost her wealth and political power under the Jagellons, mainly due to the heavy burdens of continuous warfare with the Ottomans. Seeking a way out from this situation, Louis II did not sign a renewed peace-treaty with Süleyman and detained his envoy. This led to the siege and capture of Belgrade, the key-fortress of the southern marches. For the following five years, the king and his exchequer were unable to secure the necessary international help, and the country had to confront the Ottomans almost wholly by her own means (a fairly considerable monetary aid was, however, given by the Pope and Venice).

In the battle, the sovereigns of the two countries headed their armies. The actual leadership was in the hand of Pál Tomori, the Archbishop of Kalocsa, chief commandant of Lower Hungary, a well-proven soldier, and of Ibrahim, the new Grand Vizier, on the Ottoman side.

Since no muster was made on either side, the number of participants can only be estimated. This can be done with more accuracy for the Turks, thanks to figures in the 1531/1525 state budget (the date of the pertinent manuscript was rectified by G. Káldy-Nagy, Sulamann Angriif auf Europa, in Acta Orientalia Hungarica 17 (1974), 170-1, n. 34). They suggested that an approximate total of 60,000 regular soldiers and timariots could be mobilised. To this, an equal amount of irregular and non-military elements can be added as a possible maximum. The lowest—but still generally accepted—value for the Hungarian contingents is 25,000 men, while others argue that 40,000 or even more troops are also conceivable. At any rate, the Ottoman army was superior in discipline and training. One important element was nevertheless absent from the Turkish forces, i.e. heavy cavalry, which they therefore feared.

The exact place of confrontation is unknown (only some thousand Hungarian skeletons have been found in one group, and almost none of the Ottomans). Tomori decided on a mounted attack against the Turks, who were descending a slope. This caused serious confusion for a short time, but the steadiness of the Janissaries and the unexpected attack by Balı Beg’s forces gave a new turn to the events. In one-and-a-half hours, the Hungarian army was completely defeated, losing its most prominent ecclesiastic and political leaders, including the king, who was drowned in the Csele stream.

Süleyman himself was surprised at his success. He was even able to enter the capital Buda without encountering resistance. Although he did not attach importance to the capture of Buda, he considered it his own possessions from that time onwards. This agrees with the general Ottoman ideology and method of conquest, and not even the fact that he accepted John I as the ruler of Hungary and Vienna in the Ottoman ideology of conquest”, in Keletkutatás, 1987 tavasz, 20-38).

The defeat was a turning-point in Hungarian history. The king’s death gave rise to a long period of anarchy, while the loss of the Szérmésog (Sirmium) made it impossible to defend the borders, and the country became the battlefield of two world powers. The splitting-up of her territory into three zones (i.e. Ottoman, Habburg and Transylvanian [for this last, see REZK]) lasted for more than 150 years, hindering development in many spheres.

**Bibliography:** Primary sources: Histoire de la campagne de Mohács, by Kemal Pacha Zadeh, published in a facsimile edition from the press of H. Siger de Courteille, Paris 1859; Anton C. Schaendlinger, *Die Feldzugstagebcher des ersten und zweiten ungarischen Feldzugs Süleymanes I in Beihelte zur WZKM 8, Vienna 1978, 55-96, and Anhang 25-64; Geschichte Süleyman Kânîn von 1520 bis 1537 oder Tâbâkât-u-Müammâlik e Dereciü uit-Mesdlik von Celdêde Mustafa genannt Kosî Nişânî. In Facsimile herausgegeben...von Petra Kaldy-Nagy, 60. A good collection of various sources in Hungarian translation is: *Mohács emlékesete* (“The memory of Mohács”), Budapest 1976. Commemorative volumes: Mohâsci emlékbüvé ([“Mohács memorial volume”]), ed. Imre Lukinich, Budapest n.d. [1926]; Mohács, ed. Lajos Rüzsas and Ferenc Szakály, Budapest 1986. More important separate studies: Pál Jázay, A magyar nemzet napjár és a moháci csata után [“The life of the Hungarian nation after the Battle of Mohács”], 1, Pest 1846; Tivadar Ortvay, A moháci csata elsőzélékének okai és következményei [“The reasons and consequences of the defeat of Mohács”], Budapest 1916; László Bárdos, Államgyûjtött, Budapest 1921; Anna Maria, Magyar politika a moháci csata után [“Hungarian politics after the Mohács disaster”], Budapest 1945; Lajos Bende, A moháci csata [“The Battle of Mohács”], in Hadtörténeti Közlemények, 1966, 532-67; Ferenc Szakály, A moháci csata [“The Battle of Mohács”], Budapest 1975; Géza Perjés, Mohács, Budapest 1979 (who has worked out a theory concerning Süleyman’s Hungarian policy which has led to long disputes and to a refutation of his views in journals, mainly in Jelenkor, 1976); András Kubinyi, A moháci csata és élemezényei [“The Battle of Mohács and its antecedents”], in Századok, cxxv (1981), 66-107. (b) The place of the—less correctly—so-called ‘second battle of Mohács’ was between the Harštán Mountain and Villány, a district 20 to 25 km. southwest of Mohács itself. It was fought between the forces of the Grand Vizier Süleyman Paşa and Charles of Lotharingia, head of the Holy League’s army, on 12 August 1667. With approximately 60,000 men on both sides, the fight ended with an Ottoman defeat, a result of the European superiority in warfare (mainly in fire-arms) by this time. Soon after this Christian success, their contingents easily took many smaller fortresses, so that the population of Slavonia pledged allegiance to Leopold I at the end of October. The Grand Vizier, on the other hand, was dismissed and later executed, while the Sultan, Mehmed IV, was replaced by Süleyman II [q.v.].

**Bibliography:** Budatol-Belgrad [“From Buda to Belgrade”], ed. László Szita, Pécs 1987 (Hungarian translations of pertinent sources); Czaba D. Vevess, Hol volt az ügynevezet “mélydák moháci csata” 1687 augusztus 12-én? [“Where was the place of the so-called ‘second battle of Mohács’ on 12 August 1687?”], in Haditörténelmi Közlemények, xxxiv (1987), 691-715. (c) The *sandjak* of Mohács [Miháj]—alternatively also called Pécs (Pećuy) and Székcső (Sekőy), of which the former was more often considered as a separate unit—was rather large at the beginning. Later, it was probably divided (e.g. after 1552 most of the *sandjak* of Koppany (Kópán) was carved out from its territories), and partly diminished, losing villages to the *sandjak* of Simontornya.
MOHAMMAD, the name of a Pathan or Afghan tribe on the North-West Frontier of what was formerly British India, now forming the boundary between Pakistan and Afghanistan. The Mohmands in fact straddle the frontier, and their members, estimated at ca. 600,000, are divided between the two countries. The Mohmand territories extend from north-west of the Peshawar district, with Mālākānd and the Yūsufzay territories on the east, up to and beyond the Afghan frontier on the west, and northwards towards the princely state of Dir [q.v.]. The Mohmand Agency, created by Pakistan (see below), has an area of 750 sq. miles, with a population estimated at ca. 250,000, and included in the extreme north-west of the mountainous district of Badajawr [q.v.], home of the Tarkanī Pathans, ostensibly related to such as the Mamonds, Bangash, and the Darwash, has an area of 750 sq. miles, with a population estimated at 250,000, are divided between the two

Mohmands against the Upper Mohmands, the latter sphere on influence can be divided into the following districts: the Bar (hill) Mohmands of the semi-independent hills to the north-west, the Mohmands of Peshawar within the old British administrative boundary, and the Bar (hill) Mohmands of the semi-independent hills to the north-west. The Mohmands of the settled districts represent one of the many cases of fission, where a branch of section of the tribe has broken off from the parent stock and lost all connection with it. The Mohmands across the administrative border can be divided into three chief clans: the Tarakzay, Baezay, and the Khwazay. In the thirty years following the annexation of the Pushtunistan, no less than six punitive expeditions were required to punish them for raiding into British territory. By the Durand Agreement of 1893, certain Mohmand clans were definitely placed within the British sphere of influence, and by the year 1896 the Halimzay, Kamali, Dwayez, and the Yusufzay tribes had submitted to British rule. In recent decades Mohmands have often migrated to the border, and the Bar (hill) Mohmands of the semi-independent hills have found work in the Peshawar region, whence they send back remittances to their families, or else they practice a seasonal migration pattern, usually in winter.

Bibliography: Mountstuart Elphinstone, An account of the kingdom of Caubul, London 1839, repr. Karachi 1972, ii, 40-2, 45, 47-8; C.I. Aitchison, Treaties, engagements and sanads, 1909, xi; C.C. Atcheson, The problem of the Native inhabitants of Afghanistan, London 1975; Frontier and overseas expeditions from India (Confidential), vol. i. and supplement A; North-West Frontier Province Administration Reports (pub-

(C. Collins-Davies [C.E. Bosworth])

MOHUR, an Indian gold coin. The name is the Persian mohr, which is a loanword from the Sanskrit mūḍra, seal or die. The earliest occurrence of the word on coins is on the forced currency of Muhammad b. Tughlak where it has the literal meaning of “sealed” or “stamped”. By the 10th/16th century it had come to be used as a popular rather than precise name for gold coins in general.

Very little gold had been issued in India for two centuries before the reign of Akbar. One of his reforms was the issue of an extensive coinage in gold. In addition to many pieces which had only a brief circulation, he revived the old gold tanka of the sultans of Delhi on a standard of 170 grains (11.02 gr.) to which he gave the name mohur. That the name at first could be applied to any gold coin is shown by Dājahānīr’s reference in his Tuszuk or Memoirs (tr. A. Rogers, Oriental Translation Fund, xix, 10) to mohurs of 100, 50, 20, 10, 5 and 1 tola. After the numismatic experiments of Akbar and Dājahānīr, only one gold piece was struck, occasionally with subdivisions so that the general name acquired a particular meaning, especially among the English merchants in India. Muhars continued to be struck to the end of the Mughal Empire and by the states into which it broke up in the 18th and 19th centuries. Akbar and Dājahānīr issued square as well as round divisions, so that the general name acquired a par-
ticular meaning, especially among the English merchants in India. Muhars continued to be struck to the end of the Mughal Empire and by the states into which it broke up in the 18th and 19th centuries. Akbar and Dājahānīr issued square as well as round pieces and the former also struck a few mīhrāb pieces, so-called from their shape. Of the numerous large denominations so recorded by Abu ‘l-Fadl and Dājahānīr, only 5 mah or pieces of Akbar and of Dājahānīr are known to exist.

As the silver rupee was the standard coin of India, the value of the mohur fluctuated with the price of gold. In the latter half of the 18th and early 19th centuries, the East India Company endeavoured to make gold as the standard of India and issued mohurs (called gold rupees in Bombay) with the legends of the Mughal Emperors. None of their attempts to keep gold and silver in a currency at a fixed rate was successful. When in 1839 a uniform currency was introduced for British India, a gold mohur or 15 rupee piece with English types was struck in name of William IV but never attained general circulation; this was the last attempt to restore the mohar to circulation. The mohurs occasionally seen of Victoria of 1861, 1892 and other dates are patterns.


(M. W. A.)

MOHMAND — MOLLA

MOCKHÁ [see mukhá]. MOLOYA [see boqiyán].

MOLLA, a title derived from the Arabic mawlá [q.v.] in its sense of “lord” or “master”, employed currently with composite forms of mawlá, incorporating pronominal or adjectival suffixes, in use in various periods and regions of the Muslim world. mawláy [q.v.]. mawláy, “my lord” among the Sharífí sovereigns of Morocco (Sa’díds, ‘Alawiids), the Nasrids and the Hafsid [see also laráb]; mawláná/(Turkish) mawlána, “our master”, a title very widespread in the Turco-Iranian world, and still in use today, especially in the Indo-Pakistani subconti-
ent where it replaces high rank (“ulama” and Súfis) in parallel with the traditional form of mawláu, a popular derivation of mawláwá, this last term signifying both “my master” (a familiar designation applied by the Persians to Mawláná Dājahāl al-Dín Rúmí [q.v.]) and that which pertains to the mawlá (hence the jārka of the Mawláwí Mawlaviyya [q.v.]).

As a Persian derivation from the Arabic mawlá (TA. apud Dikkhuda, Laghat-náma, s.v. Molá), the term mólá exists in various forms and spellings. A derivation from the Turkish pronunciation of mawlá into moulá has also been suggested (cf. Popper). Turkish is also familiar with the pronunciation münálı mónálı (Dozy, Suppl., ii, 608; Burhan-i kât’i, ed. M. Mu’rím, Tehran 1530 p., iv, 2030) or ménál (J. W. Reedhouse, A Turkish and English lexicon 1074, 2014). Molá and mólá could be (independent) derivatives from mawláu/mawláná (Dikkhuda, loc. cit.). A derivation from the Arabic verb mula’ā “to fulfil”, whereby the mola is a sage “full” of knowledge (Muhammad Ghivád al-Dín, Ghivád al-lughát, Calcutta 1327/1909, 495), is a whimsical notion. The same applies to direct mutation from Arabic to Hindi (proposed by Yule, followed by P. Hardy, Glossary). The pronunciation mólá or moulá has been noted in Baghdad with its former sense of “slave”, sometimes applied to freed white eunuchs (Kazimírsky, Dict. aráb-franc., ii, 1609). In European languages, the term exists with various spellings: in French mollá/molla, in English mulába/mulla, formerly muleth (Yule, s.v.).

In its primary usage, mollá is simultaneously a title of function (“úda’a), of dignity or profession (mansab) and of rank (mansab), cf. the classical example of Burhdn-i kát’i, munál/mônál (Dozy, Suppl., ii, 608). In European languages, the term mollá has acquired a certain degree of religious education and the aptitude to communicate it. In this sense, it is often confused with the term ‘ulamá’ which denotes the totality of Muslim religious persons who have been seen, especially in the Ilmání Shí‘í context, as constituting a kind of “clergy”, endowed with prerogatives on the spiritual and material planes. Distinguished by their clothing and physical appearance (in Iran: the turban (imáma, popularly aamám), black for the sayyids, white for others; a long and ample cloak, the abá, sandals, na‘ayn, easily removed for ablutions and prayers; a relatively long beard, a trimmed moustache), their prestige and their claims to knowledge, the molláts have succeeded in occupying a wide range of functions at many different levels. Later to appear (9th/15th century?), the title mollá is limited, with a few exceptions, to the Turco-

Iranian and Indian World. Of circumscribed use in non-Shí‘í Arab countries, it may designate religious dignitaries such as Molla of Jerusalem, of Cairo, or of Medina (cf. Popper). But in current usage it is most often applied to modern ‘ulamá’ drawn from the lower and middle strata of society. Having completed their elementary classes (maktab), the students (tuláb), between the ages of eleven and fifteen years, are
admitted as novices to the madrasa (q.v.), where they pursue a traditional education. Few among them succeed in completing the full course of fifteen to eighteen years which will lead them to the superior rank (among the Shīʿīs) of mutjahid (q.v.).

Whatever may be the level of education of its holder, the title of mollā confers certain privileges and "reserved" occupations which vary according to periods and regions. In the Ottoman Empire, the positions held by the mollās in civil and religious administration were known under the generic term of mawlawiyat (q.v.) which embraces simultaneously the rank, the duties or jurisdiction and the tutorial functions of the mollās (see R. Repp in Scholars, 18; there is also the term mollālik, cf. Redhouse, 2035). With the employment of the title of khāṣṣād (q.v.), from the 10th/16th century onward denoting senior Ottoman dignitaries, khāṣṣād-i dīn-i humāyūn (q.v.), the term mollā loses some of its prestige. While continuing to be used, it tends to be supplanted by khāṣṣād-khodja, modern Turkish hoca, which is applied, among others, to the totality of the 'ulāma. The two titles can furthermore co-exist, prefixed and affixed to elements of the name. The subject of amusing tales (Mollā) Naṣr al-Din Khodja (modern Turkish, Nasreddin Hoça) continues to be called Mollā in Derwische Dichtung. In Iranian, mollā (for the latter, see Gaborieau (1989) 1199 f.) but here the title mollā embraces different values. Influenced by the caste system, Indian Islam is mollā, but also that of mawlawiyya, the term mollā renders Muslim onomatopoeic very emphatic (Gaborieau (1985), 18) and the most prestigious titles tend to replace those that have fallen into disuse. Until the beginning of the 19th century, with the exception of the Sūfīs who often prefer to describe themselves otherwise (šaykh, khāṣṣād, pî, less frequently šaykh) numerous 'ulāma', Sunni and Shīʿī alike, bore the title of mollā, but also that of mawlawiyya. It owes its general sense of learned or scholarly, the title of mollā tends to be restricted to the occupations of an educator (of a maktab, occasionally of a madrasa; or of a teacher in the upper levels of society), of a jurist or a judge (sometimes as deputy of a kāfī), of a preacher in mosques or at Shīʿī funeral gatherings. In the capacity of a schoolmaster, he was often responsible for the mosque of the village where he sometimes performed the profession of a butcher (Wilson, 354). The term mollāgarī or mollāʾī was used to denote the duties and the teaching of the mollās. Mollānī mollahānī (Hindi derivation) denoted the wife of a mollā or a learned woman, a school-mistress (Platts, ii, 1063). Although causing no fundamental disruption to Muslim religious life, the arrival of the British led, in 1772, to the replacement of the khāfter by a tribunal supervised by a mawṣī, a situation which continued until 1864 (Yule, 510 ff.; Gaborieau (1989), 1190). The mollāyī kurānī is charged with the duty of taking oaths sworn on the Korān by Muslim witnesses (Wilson, ibid.; Platts, ibid.; Yule, 579). The magistrate entrusted with the interpretation of Islamic law is called mavālā (Garcin de Tassy, 86-7). While continuing to be employed in India during the 19th century, the term mollā is gradually supplanted by mawlawiyya, which could also be applied to mollās of inferior rank (Popper). But it is most of all the prestigious title of mavālānā which replaces the "obsolete" mollā (Gaborieau (1989), 1195). Of relatively ancient usage in India (cf. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, ii, 218), mavālānā has also come to denote a village school-teacher (Wilson, ibid.). A remarkable exception to the devaluation of the title mollā is supplied by the title Hāfiz, held by theologians and ādab of the Farangi Mahall, eminent members of which have borne this title from the 16th century to the end of the 19th century (F. Robinson, Farangi Mahall, in Suppl.; idem, The 'ulamā' of Farangi Mahall and their ādab, in B. Metcalf (ed.), Moral conduct and authority. The place of ādab in South Asian Islam, Berkeley-Los Angeles (1984, 152-83); see also below).

Stripped of its prestige, mollā has reached the point where it is applied to religious agitators (those who proclaim themselves māhds in India and in the Sudan have been given the epithet "mad mullah" by the British), bigots, soothsayers (Platts, ii, 1962). The term becomes entirely pejorative and even vulgar in metaphors such as mollā-zalākulandar-bal (for membrum virile; cf. Vullers, Lexicon Perio-Latinum, 1986, ii, 1208). The equivalent Urdu expression mollā ki betā "son of a mollā" is now employed in the sense of Rufīan, hooligan, in a rural context. Mollās are often regarded as hidebound theologians, clinging to the literal sense of the shāria. The poet Muhammad Ḳbāl (q.v.) denounced the baneful influence of the spiritual master (pī) and of the mollā, the narrow-minded theologians who had forgotten the true understanding of the Kurʾān (cf. A. Schimmel, Islam in the Indian subcontinent, Handbuch der Orientalistik, Leiden-Cologne 1980, 230). But, despite its devaluation, the title of mollā continued to enjoy a certain prestige among religious scholars and religious persons. Thus the Ḹūṣī of the Islamī community of the Bohoras (q.v.), known respectfully by the old title of sayyid, is also called mollā. The title has had a complicated career in Indian Islamic history. In Mughal India and Ṣafawīd Iran, religious Muslims are often designated under the generic term 'ulāma' wa-mashadī, including scholars, theologians and Sūfīs without any clear distinction between 'ulāma' and Sūfīs (for the latter, see Gaborieau (1989) 1195). Of relatively ancient usage in India (cf. Ibn Ḳurgan by Muslim witnesses (Wilson, 1196)), the title mollā has been given to a mawlawiyya, "Parsee Feroz Masūda", founded in Bombay in 1854 (E. Kulke, The Parsis in India, Delhi 1974, 95). The "Parsee Panchayat" charitable foundation has been directed since 1962 by Seth Nadirshah Rustomji Mulla (ibid., 70). The attribution of the title may denote lowly origins. Thus Sir Dinshah F. Mulla (1868-1934) was the son of Fardoonji Kavasji Mulla, an impoverished Parsee priest who became a solicitor and founded his own firm in Bombay, still known by the name of "Mulla and Mulla" (Piloo Nanavutty, The Parsis, New Delhi 1980, 108 f.). Even Hindu scholars currently bear the title of mollā.

Widespread throughout the term mollā continued to enjoy the Iranian cultural influence, the title of mollā has naturally been diffused to the greatest extent in Iran. In the Safavid period (1501-1722), it denoted 'ulamā and Sūfīs of all ranks. Under Shāh Šultān Ḫusayn (1105-5/1694-1722), the office of mollā-ḵāḏāḡi, held by the mollā-ḵāḏāḡi (chief of the mollās), was instituted. The first occupant of this office, Mollā Muhammad Bākī Ḫāṭunābādī, had been the Shāh's tutor. The prerogatives of the mollā-ḵāḏāḡi attained their most prestigious level under Nādīr Šāh Afšār (1148-60/1736-47). Under the Kāḏārs (1794-1925 [q.v.]), his role was limited to that of tutor to the royal household. In the provincial courts, as the Afšāhr period, the princes had also appointed their own mollā-ḵāḏāḡi. The office remained a respectable sinecure until the middle of the 19th century, when it degenerated into frivolity, like other courtly functions (see Arjomand (1983) and (1988)).

In Ḳāḏār Iran, the title of mollā referred both to theologians who had not attained the level of mujtāhīd and to scholars irrespective of status. But certain mujtāhīds retained their title of mollā, sometimes in
combination with others such as ākā or ākhānd. There were also female mollds and some non-Muslims bearing this title (see below).

The most basic prerogatives in matters of education, ritual functions (prayers, marriages, funerals, etc.) and judicial functions, the molld's constitute the basis of what has been called, erroneously in the view of some, a veritable clergy. The molld teaches at the primary school, mukhtāb, also called molld khānā-ye molld (house of the molld), or as a tutor in the upper levels of society. Being of inferior knowledge, the Shi'i molld must be the emulator (muqaddar) of a muqta'ah who is muqta'ah-ī taklīfī (q.v.). Educating the faithful of his entourage, he occupies an intermediate position between the muqta'ah and the simple faithful whose material circumstances are similar to his. However, like the majority of Imāmi 'ulamā, the molld's benefit from revenues which, though sometimes modest, guarantee them a degree of independence. They may receive gratuities by acting as representative (nāvā'd) of a muqta'ah (certification of documents, collection of taxes), enjoy the benefits of pious foundations (a'zaf), receive free lodging, gifts or honoraria for their services as preachers (wudūz, raawdar-ḵīmānāt) at Shi'i funeral gatherings, etc. They can also supplement their income by activity in commerce or in agriculture. The molld can earn a good income in acting as a mediator of the muqta'ahs, who sometimes have armed bands at their disposal. Composed initially of brigands or urban ruffians (lāisī, q.v.), enjoying the protection of sanctuaries or of the homes of 'ulamā; towards the end of the 19th century, these militias, joined by true or false sayyids, were composed to an increasing extent offallāhs, whose agitation was a crucial factor in the end and the leading to the constitutional revolution of 1905-11 (see especially, Algar, 185 ff.; BAST, and J. Calmard, s.v. in Encyl. Iranica; DUSTūR, iv., ŠĀH)...

Like Imāmi religious persons in general, the molld's are exempt from military service (see Richard (ed.) (1989), 45, 54-5). In the context of religious practice, it is their duty to enforce respect for the precepts of the šari'a. This often pedantic exercise of a censor's role can be an incitement to the corrupt or on the contrary an effort to make them unpopular. The title of molld becomes the subject of banter in numerous proverbs (cf. Dīkhūdā, Ambālī u bīkam, Tehran 1338 p., 4 vols.; proverbs, sayings, etc., quoted in Lughāt-šāhī, loc. cit., with additions; see also MAHJUL, ii, Bibl.). According to one popular belief, the molld is somebody who is capable of reading but incapable of writing, in contrast to the mīrāzī (q.v.) who possesses both literacy and knowledge (Dāmālāzā, 405, who quotes the proverb Molld šudan ēsān, adām šudan ē maz̄ānīkī, ‘It is easy to become a molld, difficult to become a man!’). During the 19th century, the term molld tends to be supplanted by ākhānd (q.v.), which in its turn takes on a pejorative connotation. But before being devalued, ākhānd is frequently used in combination with molld. The two terms are seen in parity in the expression ākhāndī-ḵānā-ye molldūzī, trickery or strategem of a molld, i.e., recourse to means permitted by the letter of the šari'a but not by its spirit, associated with suspect practices or activities of the molld (Algar, 21, quoting Dīkhūdā, idem, Ākhānd, in Encyl. Iranica). In response to the devaluation of this terminology as occasioned by the circumstances of the modern world, the generic term of rūhānīyat was created by Rida Šāh (1925-41) to designate the entire community of Iranian 'ulamā in the capacity of a ‘clergy’ (Richard, (1983), 11). Certain terms, however, have not been devalued as, for example, the title ākā, formerly used sometimes in combination with molld or ākhānd, given by his associates to the Ayatollah Khumayni...
preachers in female gatherings of Shi'ite mourning (see Al-Mar'â'î, iii, a; on Molla Kulhâm, an eminent preacher in female graves reserved for girls, are sometimes tutors in the upper levels of society (Mun'în, Farhang-î fârîs, s.v.); Thaiss, 77 f., underline the negative connotation of bâdî', from the Turkish "sister" or "servant"). The term Molla-bâdî' is used here to a very sorrowful woman whom laments incessantly over her misfortunes and those of others (Dibkhuda, Lughat-nâma). In the Shi'ite communities of the Persian Gulf, female mollahs officiate in Shi'ite rituals. This vocation is often handed down within a family. Widows or girls who see no prospect of marrying choose to become a mollah—a respected and lucrative profession—follow a Kuranic education and learn to recite and sing the na'âshiyah recitations', equivalents of the na'âshiyah which they interpret at female funeral gatherings in Muharram and Ramadan (R. Chelkowski, Popular Shi'ite mourning rituals, in Al-Asrâr, xiii (London 1986), 209-26, esp. 223).

In the Iranian world, the term mollah has also been adopted by Jewish and Zoroastrian scholars (Dibkhuda, loc. cit., following Nafisi, Nâzîm al-qâbîbâh. Since the Safavid period, numerous Jewish scholars and theologians have borne this title. The situation of the Jews of Iran became critical under Shah 'Abbâs I (996-1038/1588-1629). When a Jewish butcher (996-1038/1588-1629) and theologians have borne this title. The situation of the Jews of Iran became critical under Shah 'Abbâs I (996-1038/1588-1629). When a Jewish butcher (996-1038/1588-1629) and theologians have borne this title. The situation of the Jews of Iran became critical under Shah 'Abbâs I (996-1038/1588-1629). When a Jewish butcher (996-1038/1588-1629) and theologians have borne this title. The situation of the Jews of Iran became critical under Shah 'Abbâs I (996-1038/1588-1629). When a Jewish butcher (996-1038/1588-1629) and theologians have borne this title. The situation of the Jews of Iran became critical under Shah 'Abbâs I (996-1038/1588-1629). When a Jewish butcher (996-1038/1588-1629). Since the Safavid period, numerous Jewish scholars and theologians have borne this title. The situation of the Jews of Iran became critical under Shah 'Abbâs I (996-1038/1588-1629). When a Jewish butcher (996-1038/1588-1629). Since the Safavid period, numerous Jewish scholars and theologians have borne this title. The situation of the Jews of Iran became critical under Shah 'Abbâs I (996-1038/1588-1629). When a Jewish butcher (996-1038/1588-1629). Since the Safavid period, numerous Jewish scholars and theologians have borne this title. The situation of the Jews of Iran became critical under Shah 'Abbâs I (996-1038/1588-1629). When a Jewish butcher (996-1038/1588-1629). Since the Safavid period, numerous Jewish scholars and theologians have borne this title. The situation of the Jews of Iran became critical under Shah 'Abbâs I (996-1038/1588-1629). When a Jewish butcher (996-1038/1588-1629). Since the Safavid period, numerous Jewish scholars and theologians have borne this title. The situation of the Jews of Iran became critical under Shah 'Abbâs I (996-1038/1588-1629). When a Jewish butcher (996-1038/1588-1629). Since the Safavid period, numerous Jewish scholars and theologians have borne this title. The situation of the Jews of Iran became critical under Shah 'Abbâs I (996-1038/1588-1629)....
MOLLA — MOMBASA


MOLLA BĀDI, MOLLA BĀSHĪ, MOLLA BĀSHĪGAR [see MOLLA]

MOLLA KĀBIĐ (?-934/1527), a member of the Ottoman dynasty who served for heresy in Safr 934/October-November 1527. Djalalzade Mustafā [q.v.], who was at this time Secretary to the Divān [q.v. and private secretary to the Grand Visier Ibrahim Paša [q.v.], gives the earliest account of the case. He states that "some zealous 'ulama'" brought Kābiīd before the Imperial Divān for preaching in public that Jesus was superior to Muhammad. The wa'aris made the case over to the kādi 'asker [q.v. of Rumelia, Fanarīzade Muḥī al-Dīn Čelebi and the kādi 'asker of Anatolia, Čadiır Čelebi. These two men were unable to refute Kābiidd's beliefs, which he supported with hadīths and Kur'ānic verses, and, "with gestures full of rage", they condemned him to death by extra-canonical (§ift) decree. The Grand Visier Ibrahim Paša was unable to accept this outcome, which was not in conformity with the shāri'a, and dismissed Kābiid, his case apparently vindicated. Sultan Sültemān I [q.v.] had had an enclosed balcony built to overlook the Divān-room, from which he had witnessed the trial unobserved. When the wa'aris entered his presence, he reproached them for allowing the heretic Kābiid to go unpunished. Ibrahim Paša replied that the kādi 'askers had been unable to refute Kābiid by the shari'a and had given their reply in anger. Sultan Paša-zade sat on theGrand Visier's left, with Mewlānā Sa'd al-Dīn. The wa'aris despatched tawīghs to arrest Kābiid. On the following day, when Kemāl Paša-zade and Mewlānā Sa'd al-Dīn appeared in the Divān, the kādi 'asker of Rumelia fled, ostensibly because the shāri'a had had precedence over him, but actually so as not to display his own ignorance. Kemāl Paša-zade sat before the Grand Visier's left, with Mewlānā Sa'd al-Dīn in front. When Kemāl Paša-zade questioned Kābiid, he repeated his beliefs, "adding proofs which he took from ... the Kur'ān and the hadīths", and refused to recant when his two interrogators told him "the true meaning of the verses ... and ... hadīths", and asked him, "Do you abandon your false creed? Do you accept the truth?" At this, Kemāl Paša-zade pronounced a fatwā authorising his execution and handed his case to the kādi. He was executed when he again refused to renounce his beliefs.

It was in response to this case that Kemāl Paša-zade wrote his Risāla fi taḥṣil lafs al-zindik, which defines a zindik as a heretic who, like Kābiid, uses the "Truth"—that is, the Kur'ān and hadīths—to vindicate heresy. Bibliography: Djalalzade Mustafā, Tabākī āl-umānīlīk ve dereğâtı ʿul-umānīlīk, facsimile in Petra Kappert, Geschichte Sultan Sültemān Kānunis von 1520 bis 1557, Wiebaden 1981, fols. 172b-175b; Kemāl Paša-zade, Risāla fi Taḥṣil lafs al-zindik, in Rasāʾil Ibn Kemāl, İstanbul 1316/1898-9, 240-9.

(C.H. Imber)

MOLLA KHÜSREW [see KHÜSREW]

MOLLA KURĀN [see GURĀN, SHARAF AL-DĪN]

MOLLA SADRA [see MULLA SADRA]

MOMBASA (in Arabic script Manbadia, Swa. Mvita), an island and town on the east coast of Africa, lying in lat. 4° S. and long. 39° E. The island is about 3 miles in length from north to south, and nearly the same from east to west. It is so placed in the deep inlets formed by the convergence of several creeks as to be almost wholly surrounded by mainland, only the southeastern angle being exposed to the Indian Ocean. This peculiarity of situation suggested to W.E. Taylor the derivation of the name Mvita "the curtained headland", from Swa. n(ta)ša "point". The more usual derivation from ni’ta "war", seems inadmissible on phonetic grounds. A 19th century creedary Historical Journal of Pate connects it with fila "hidden", either from its hidden position, or from the inhabitants, as it is said, having hidden themselves in the bush during a raid from Pate.

Mombasa town is at the eastern end of the island, and, being at the terminus of the Uganda railway and the only modern port in the Republic of Kenya, is of considerable commercial importance. The latest figure available for the population (1978) is 246,000. The permanent residents are chiefly Swahili and a floating population of labourers from inland tribes. No precise figures are available for the small number of Arabs, Indians and Europeans. The Arabs, Swahili and many Indians are Muslims, the two former being chiefly Sunnis of the Shafi'i rite. There are a number of mosques, very plain buildings, and without minarets. The main Pan stands on the flat roof to give the call to prayer. The origin of Mombasa is obscure. The Perilus of the Erythraean Sea (ca. A.D. 106) records Arab trading stations on the East African coast where the traders intermarried with local women. The race of the native people is unknown, for the Bantu ancestors of the present Swahili population do not appear to have reached the coast before the 5th century A.D. There is no recorded local tradition of the date of foundation of the town, but Stigand (Land of Zinj, 29) reports a Pate tradition which states that the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik b. Marwān (65-86/685-705) sent out Syrians, who "built the cities of Pate, Malindi, Zanzibar, Mombasa, Lamu and Kilwa". There is no evidence, either documentary or archaeological, to support this view. The first documentary record is a somewhat confused report by al-Idrisī, who speaks of it as a small place whose inhabitants work in iron mines and hunt tigers (sc. leopards, for there are no tigers in Africa). Nor are there any iron mines as such, but pig iron is recoverable from ironrich nearby beaches. Here the King of the Zuniḍū had his residence. Some recent excavations on the Coast General Hospital site (1970) produced some ceramic evidence that is dated to ca. 1180-1280, but nothing demonstrably earlier. Because the modern town overlies the ancient town site, excavation has so far been possible. The town was visited by Ibn Baṭṭūta in 1331. Fruit, bananas, lemons and oranges were plentiful, but agriculture was not practised: grain was imported from the Arabian people who were of the Shiʿī rite, "devout, chaste and pious", and their mosques were constructed of wood.

The Swahili of Mombasa, both traditionally and at the present day, are divided into the Thesahara Taifa, the Twelve Tribes. Some also identify themselves as Shirāzial, claiming Persian descent, and most probably have a thin line of descent from traders from the Gulf. Five of the mataifa are named from localities near Mombasa; remaining seven from towns and islands to the north, as far as southern Somalia. There is little evidence of migration from Pemba, Zanzibar or the Tanzanian coast. There seem, however, to have been some connections with Kilwa, for a report made in 1506 by Diogo de Alcâaço to the King of Encyclopaedia of Islam, VII 225
Portugal states that the sultan of Kilwa collected customs dues at Mombasa from vessels that had sailed past Kilwa. Whatever their origin, the *Thenashara Taifa* speak a distinct dialect of Swahili, *Kimvita*, which is the dominant form of the language from Malindi in the north to Gazi in the south. Two of the *taifa*, the *Jomvu* and the *Changamwe*, speak slightly differentiated subdialects. It is with curious prescience, as it might seem, that in 1776 a Mwinyi (or Prince) Kombo of Mombasa wrote to the French Governor of ille de France of Swahili as “my national language”. In structure, the *Thenashara Taifa* group divided themselves into *Thelatha Taifa* (Three Tribes) and *Tisa Taifa* (Nine Tribes). In the 19th century, the *Umâni* sultans recognised these political groupings by accepting a *tamam* (Swa. spokesman; pl. *matamim*), from each of the two. These offices still exist under the present republic, but are largely honorary. Their origins and antiquity are unknown.

There are several recognisable stages in the development of the town. The first is a tradition of a queen, Mwana Mkisi. Then followed a “Shârâzi” dynasty founded by Shehe Mvita, who gave his name to the town. This dynasty died out in the late 16th century, when the Portuguese filled the vacancy by bringing from Malindi a sultan of a “Shârâzi” dynasty. They went on to Malindi, where the Portuguese were defeated was at last acknowledged in December 1698, there were only eleven survivors from what had been a force of some 1,000 men who were said to be under arms. The Portuguese, men, women and children, all told some 250, the choice between Islam or death. The Augustinian missionary, Father Squib, asked for permission to send trading vessels to China, to send a vessel annually to the Red Sea for the pilgrimage to Mecca, and to be made ruler of Pemba. He seized the latter without further ado. He died in 1609, being succeeded by a son, al-Hasan b. Ahmad. He quarrelled with the Portuguese over Pemba; they retorted by demanding the deposit of his entire stock of grain in Fort Jesus. He refused, and was forced to flee to Kilifi [q.v.]; after a brief return to Mombasa, he fled again and was treacherously murdered.

His brother Muhammad was then installed as regent, and his son, Yusuf, was sent to Goa to be educated as a Christian by the Augustinian Order, who had started a mission in Mombasa in 1597. Yusuf was baptised as Dom Jerónimo Chingulia. In 1626 (as recently discovered manuscripts have made clear) he returned to Mombasa. He had had a period of service in the Portuguese fleet, had married a Portuguese wife, and had been solely with her in Goa. A considerable body of evidence sustains his conversion; the claims of the gratuitous insults, affronts and injustices of the Portuguese Captains. In 1631, with the aid of pagan tribesmen known as Mozungulos, he murdered the Captain Leïtac de Gamboa, and fired on the Portuguese town, an area separate, as a map of 1635 shows, from that of the Swahili. Portuguese, both men and women, fled to the Augustinian monastery. At the same time, Dom Jerónimo returned to Mombasa, the capital of the “Shlrazi” sultanate. As Sultan Yusuf b. al-Hasan, and he gave the Augustinian clergy, and to the Christians in the monastery, Africans, Goans, Indians and Portuguese, men, women and children, all told some 250, the choice between Islam or death. The Augustinian Postulature Archives in Rome preserve the *procesus* or ecclesiastical judicial inquiry into their deaths, with a view to their canonisation as saints: it contains the evidence of twenty-three witnesses. At the same time there were minor uprisings elsewhere on the coast, but there was nothing to suggest a systematically-organised revolt. In 1632, when the Portuguese fleet arrived from Goa to recover the town, some 1,000 men were said to be under arms. The Portuguese besieged the town until May 1633 and then withdrew. Sultan Yusuf b. al-Hasan had ostensibly succeeded. But then, quite abruptly, he withdrew to the Red Sea, taking to a life of piracy and pillage. Likewise, the inhabitants fled, and later the Portuguese returned to an empty town. What had started as an anti-colonial uprising with religious overtones ended like a damp squib.

In 1650 the *Umâni* succeeded in expelling the Portuguese from Maskat [q.v.]. A Mombasa delegation shortly sailed for Maskat, asking for aid. During the next half-century the *Umâni* frequently raided the eastern African coast, even reaching as far as Mozambique. Their aim was by no means altruistic; it was to break the Portuguese monopoly of the ivory trade in which Arabs and the coastal folk had collaborated since before the time of the *Peripius*. These raids culminated in the *Umâni* siege of Fort Jesus in March 1696. We possess two detailed accounts of the siege. The Portuguese were assisted by Swahili from Pate, jealous of Mombasa. When defeat was at last acknowledged in December 1698, there were only eleven survivors from what had been a force of some
The ʿUmānīs then extended along the coast as far as Tungi, just south of the River Ruvuma. Governors were placed at Kilwa, Zanzibar, Mombasa, Lamu and other principal towns. When internal dissension rent Mombasa in 1728-9, the Portuguese made a brief comeback. They were expelled by a popular insurrection. The history of the next 140 years is of sporadic and disorganised resistance to the ʿUmānīs. In Mombasa the Mazrui (Swah., Ar. Mazraʿi) virtually became hereditary governors (Swa. mukan). After 1749, when Ahmad b. Saʿid seized 'Umar from the Yaʿriba, the Mazrui proclaimed themselves independent. This was soon stopped, but it did not prevent another attempt ca. 1815. An uneasy tension persisted until 1823, when, at their request, British protection was asked from Captain W.F.W. Owen. This he granted provisionally, in the belief that it would assist in putting down the slave trade. A British Protectorate was proclaimed (1824-6), but shortly afterwards disowned by Whitehall. The British Government by no means wished to quarrel with Sayyid Saʿid of ʿUmān, whose state lay athwart communications with India. Saʿid made his first visit to the coast in 1827, but it was ten years before he was able to gain control of Mombasa from the Mazrui. Soon afterwards he made Zanzibar his principal residence, and Mombasa and Lamu were allowed to control until it was leased to the British East Africa Company in 1887. From then on it shared the history of what was to become Kenya after the First World War.

In the 19th century Mombasa was the centre of a circle of a number of distinguished Swahili poets. Amongst these were Māджīd b. Ḏābir al-Rijebay (ca. 1800-8), Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Razzaq b. Sayyid al-Mahdī (fl. 1865-90), Suʿūd b. ʿAbd al-Muʿāmin (ca. 1810-78), and the well-known Muyakwa b. Mwinyi Haji. The late Sayyid al-Māχūn b. ʿAbbās al-Mazrui, a former kadi of Mombasa, was also the author of an Arabic history of his family, as yet unpublished. For an understanding of modern times, the work by Hyder Kindy, one of the best on the east coast of Tunisia (U.S. Library of Congress), is valuable and illuminating.

In the sphere of archaeology, there is still much to be learnt in Mombasa. J.S. Kirkman’s excavations and clearing of Fort Jesus during 1958-69 are important not only for the study of the fort but because it resulted in a study of imported ceramics, Islamic and medieval, which are still being published. Due to the proximity and special position of three little islands, the anchorage of Monastir is considered the best on the east coast of Tunisia (U.S. Hydrographic Office, Sailing directions for the Mediterranean, i, 9F-16; France, Service hydrographique de la marine, Instructions nautiques, série D (II), Paris 1959, 1969). Fort Jesus, the first fort to be built, was controlled until it was leased to the British East Africa Company in 1887. From then on it shared the history of what was to become Kenya after the First World War.
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days has the right to Paradise" (Abu 'l-Arab Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Tamim al-Kayrawani, Tahâkât 'ulâma' ifrîqiya wa-'l-Tanûs, ed. and tr. Mohammed Ben Cheneb, Classes des savants de l'Ifrîqiya, Algiers 1920, 5, 7, 9, 14, 15; ed. 'Ali al-Shâbûb and Nu'ayyam Hassan al-Yafi, Tunis 1968, 47-8; Tiqjani, Ribab, Tunis 1958, 30-2). Monastir’s fame as the most venerated ribât of the Magrib was less due to its military or political assets, in which the neighbouring Sûsa and Mahdiyya gained primacy, than to this intrinsic religious reputation that made it the permanent home of holy anchorites as well as a contemporary religious retreat of the people of Ifrîqiya (Ibn Hawkål, i, 73) and a favourite burial ground; the last-named function is mentioned especially in connection with Mahdiyya (al-Idrîsî, 3rd climate, 2nd section, see Opus geographicum, 282), and more specifically with the last members of the Zirid dynasty, who were upon their deaths and after the initial ceremonies in the capital transported by sea here to their final resting place (Ibn Khallîkân, Wafayât, Cairo 1310/1892-3, ii, 241; Ibn al-Ashîr, Beirut 1966, x, 512-113). An especially revered sanctuary became the tomb of the Mâlikî imâm al-Mazârî (q.v.), a native of Sicily subsequently active in Mahdiyya and ultimately buried in Monastir (d. 536/1141-2; H. R. Idrîs, 'Abd al-Walîhâb, al-Imâm al-Mazârî, Tunis 1955, 19; H. R. Idris, La Berberie, sentôla sous les Zîrîdîs, Paris 1962, 691-2). The integrity of the principal ribât’s occupants in performing their avowed mission had declined by the time this imâm was charged by the Zîrid sultan to inspect Monastir, and Mazârî described in his fatawa the situation: many of the murdbûn no longer lived inside the ribâb but nevertheless kept receiving the alms (nawfâ'), the countryside became more cultivated, and some of the murdbûn had become hereditary landowners; the people of Monastir engaged in certain practices, had become hereditary landowners; the mosque of Bourguiba (Djâmî Burkiba) and the mausoleum of the president’s family (Turbat al-Burkiba). The economy of the country—modern Monastir has the distinction of being the first town of Tunisia. This circumstance is responsible for the construction of two remarkable monuments of contemporary Islamic architecture: the mosque of Bourguiba (Djâmî Burkiba) and the mausoleum of the president’s family (Turbat al-Burkiba). The economy of

**MONASTIR** in Yugoslavia [see MANASTIR].

**MONDROS**, the Turkish name of a harbour on the Aegean island of Limnî [q.v.] or Lemnos; it is alternatively known by its Greek name of MUDROS or Mondros.

Monastir's claim to fame is that it was the site of the armistice of 30 October 1918 which ended the Ottoman Empire's participation in the First World War. The decision of the Unionist cabinet of Mehmed Ta'afat Paşa [see İTTİHAD WE TERAKKI İMãMYETíYETI] to seek an armistice was prompted by the rapidly deteriorating military position of the Ottoman Empire and its German and Austro-Hungarian allies. By the end of September 1918, Ottoman armies on the Syrian and Mesopotamian fronts had effectively collapsed, while Bulgaria's acceptance of a separate armistice had exposed the Empire to the threat of Entente attack in Thrace; in Western Europe, the armies of Germany and Austria-Hungary were in full retreat. On 4 and 5 October 1918 the Ottoman, German and Austro-Hungarian governments addressed identically worded armistice appeals to President Wilson of the USA; this proved to be the last manifestation of their wartime alliance. Ta'afat's cabinet resigned on 13 October; his successor Ahmad ˙Izzet Paşa established direct contact with Entente commanders, and on 27 October armistice negotiations opened at Mondros on board the British warship *Agamemnon*. The Ottoman delegation was led by the Navy Minister Hüseyin Ra'ûf Bey; the Entente Powers were represented by Vice-Admiral William Edward Jervis, the commander of British forces in the Aegean. The negotiations were brief: Calthorpe was bound by terms previously agreed between Britain and her allies, and the Ottoman side obtained few modifications. The armistice was signed on 30 October, and came into effect on the following day. It was followed within a fortnight by the Austro-Hungarian and German armistices.

The Mondros armistice comprised twenty-five articles, whose chief provisions may be divided into three groups. The first provided for an immediate cessation of hostilities between the Ottoman Empire and the Entente Powers, the demobilisation of the Ottoman army and the surrender of the fleet, the withdrawal of Ottoman forces from Trans-Caucasia and north-west Persia, the surrender of garrisons in Arabia, Syria, Mesopotamia and North Africa, the cessation of all relations between the Ottoman Empire and its erstwhile allies and the expulsion of all German and Austro-Hungarian personnel from its territory (arts. 5, 6, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23). The second group provided for the opening of the Dardanelles and Black Sea Straits, for the occupation by the Entente Powers of the Dardanelles and Bosporus forts and the Taurus tunnel system, and for the future occupation of any other strategic points if the security of the Entente Powers were threatened (arts. 1, 7, 10). The third group gave the Entente Powers access to all Ottoman naval facilities and supplies of fuel and other matériel, together with control of all railway and cable and wireless stations (arts. 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 20, 21).

In theory, the armistice was a ceasefire only and did not preclude the terms of an eventual peace settlement; in practice, this proved questionable. First, the armistice violated previous Anglo-French understandings in not insisting on a complete evacuation of Ottoman forces from Cilicia; this provoked a suspicion that Britain had taken the opportunity to strike a blow at French aspirations in Cilicia, a suspicion reinforced by the fact that the British government had instructed Calthorpe to exclude French representatives from the Mondros negotiations. Second, British forces in Mesopotamia occupied Mawsil after the conclusion of the armistice, thus eventually causing a serious territorial dispute between the Turkish Republic and the British-mandated territory of 'Irâq which was not resolved until 1925. Finally, the exigent fashion in which Britain and her Entente partners attempted to enforce the provisions for demobilisation and the surrender of strategic points in the months following the armistice gave rise to Turkish fears that the real aim was the dismemberment of what was left of the Ottoman Empire in Thrace and Anatolia, and these in turn played a large part in the rise of the Turkish nationalist movement from the spring of 1919 onwards. In the event, the nationalists successfully resisted the armistice's provisions for demobilisation and a withdrawal of Ottoman forces from territories conquered in eastern Anatolia.

MONGKE, fourth Great Khan of the Mongol Empire. He was the son of Genghis Khan’s youngest son, Towiy, the eldest of four by Towiy’s chief wife Soroktani Beki (the other being Kubilai [q.v.], Hülegü [q.v.] and Arig-böke). He was born on 10 January 1209, according to the Chinese dynastic history of the Mongols, the Yuan-shih (W. Abramowski, Die Chinesischen Annalen des Mongke: Übersetzung des 3. Kapitels des Yuan-SHIH, in Zentralasiatische Studien, xiii [1979], 7–71, at p. 16). His principal significance in the history of the Muslim world lies in the fact that it was at his behest that Hülegü mounted the expedition that resulted in the establishment of the Ilkhānate.

His fortunes were linked with those of Batu [q.v.], under whose command he served in at least the early stages of the great invasion of Russia and eastern Europe in 1237–42. On the death of the Great Khan Ögedey in 1241, a long interregnum followed. Ögedey’s son Güyük only gained recognition as his successor in 1246; he and Batu had been enemies since the Russian campaign. Open conflict between them was averted only by Güyük’s sudden death in 1248. A further interregnum lasted until 1251, when it was brought to an end by a coup d’état on the part of Batu and Möngke. In this the senior (Djöctid) and junior (Toolyid) branches of the Cingizid house prevailed over the other two branches, the Čaghaytids and the Ögedeyids, many of whom were killed in the aftermath of Möngke’s ‘election’ and enthronement, which occurred on 1 July 1251. Batu himself had declined election, preferring to remain in his own lands of the Golden Horde; but the price of his support was autonomy in those lands. The Mongol Empire became a Batu-Möngke con-dominium, though see, for a different view, T.A. Allsen, Mongol imperialism: the policies of the Grand Qan of the Yuan-Shih in China, Russia, and the Islamic lands, Berkeley, etc. 1987, 54–63.

After ascending the throne, Möngke despatched major military forces in two directions. His brother Kubilai was sent to begin the subjugation of the Sung Empire in South China, while Hülegü was commissioned to subdue the Lāmis of Persia and the 4‘Abbāsid caliphate. Each of the expeditions, according to the Persian historian Djuwayni, was granted two out of every ten soldiers available in the empire (Djuwayni, iii, 90; Djusayni-Boyle, ii, 607). Both of these campaigns were still under way when Möngke died in China, according to the Yuan-shih in August 1259 (Abramowski, 33). His death precipitated a civil war over the succession to the Great Ilkhānate between Kubilai and Arig-böke, in which the former was victorious in 1264. It was possibly during Möngke’s reign that the Islamic lands under Mongol control first had imposed on them the new ‘poll-tax’ variety of kūbūr [q.v.], though this may have begun earlier (Allsen, op. cit., 147–9).

Möngke, though apparently remaining personally attached to his ancestral Shaminism, was notable for his interest in and tolerance of a wide range of religions. The Franciscan missionary William of Rubruck travelled to Mongolia in 1253–5 and visited Möngke’s court at Karakorum, at which he was a participant in a religious debate between Christians, Muslims and Buddhists. He also gives an account of the dramatic events of 1251 which is strikingly similar to Djuwayni’s and which like his own one doublets relating the events narrated by the victorious side in the dynastic conflict.


(D.O. Morgan)

MONGOLIA. Muslims in the modern Mongolian People’s Republic.

The sole Muslim communities of the Republic live today within the Turkish-speaking Kazakh [see KAZAK] (Mo. Hasag) and Choton (Mo. Hoten) groups. According to the 1960 census, 36,700 Kazakhs lived in the westernmost aimak or administrative division of the Republic, that is in existence since 1940 as the Bayan Ölgii aimak; the aimak is also called Hasag aimak, ‘that of the Kazakhs’. These Kazakhs of Mongolia are linguistically, culturally and historically closely linked with the Kazakhs of the Kazakh SSR for the Soviet Union, but at present only partially acknowledge themselves as Sunni Muslims. The mosques (Mo. laln süm) of the Kazakh Muslims (Mo. lal, Tibetan kla-klo ‘barbarians, Muslims’) in the administrative centre of the aimak, Ölgii, is now no longer used for religious purposes. The Muslim ethnic group of the Choton (census figure not available) are settled to the south of the Uvs Uul aimak in existence since 1931 in the northwestern part of the Republic. The ancestors of the Chotons probably belonged to the section of the Muslim Turkish population of Eastern Turkestan (modern Sinkiang or Xinjiang in western China) who were in the 18th century deported by the West Mongolian Oirat-Dörböt and who settled in Mongolia. To what extent the Chotons are reckoned among Muslims today is unknown.


(M. Weiers)

Finally, it may be noted that there are Muslims of Mongolian stock and speaking languages of the Mongolian family—presumably the remnants of ethnic migrations or deportations of earlier times—in the province of Kansu [q.v.], or Gansu in the Chinese People’s Republic. These comprise the small group of Bao’an (ca. 9,000) in north central Kansu, and the more numerous Dongxiang (ca. 300,000) in the autonomous country of that name in northwestern Kansu (see R. V. Weckes (ed.), Music peoples, a world ethnographic survey, London 1984, i, 187, 236).

(M. Weiers)

MONGOLS, the name of a tribe whose original home was in the eastern part of the present-day Mongolian Peoples’ Republic. In the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries, under Čingiz Khan [q.v.] and his successors, they established by military conquest the most extensive continuous land empire known to history. At its greatest extent, it stretched from Korea to Hungary, including most of the mainland of Asia apart from India and the south-east of the continent. What is perhaps a form of the Mongol name has been found in Chinese sources of the T'ang Dynasty (A.D.)
MONGOLS

618-907), but they became prominent only in the 6th/12th century, when north China was ruled by the Chin ... Langlois, Jr. (ed.), China under Mongol rule, Princeton 1981, 20).
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definitive formation as a people appears to date from the
time of the Liao Dynasty (A.D. 907-1125), who
ruled in Eastern Mongolia and north China. The Liao
emperors were Khatans, related ethnically and
linguistically to the Mongols (on the Liao, see K.A.
Wittfogel and C. Feng, History of Chinese society: Liao
907-1125, Philadelphia 1949) and on the Mongols in
this period, O. Lattimore, The geography of Chingis
The sequence of political events in the history of
the Mongol Empire is dealt with in other articles; see
especially Cingiz-Khan; Cingizids; Bato; Batiyids;
Chaghatay Khan; Chaghatayi Khânate; Hulagu;
Ilkhanids; Jâhân. This article is concerned with more
general themes: the effects of the conquests, particu-
larly in the Islamic world; institutions; and
organisation.

1. Effects of the Mongol conquests.

The testimony of contemporary writers is
unanimous when it describes the horrors that accom-
panied the Mongol invasion of the Khârazm-Shâh's
empire in 616/1219-23. The most important of
these historians are Ibn al-Athir (in vol. xii), NasawT
H.G. Raverty, 2 vols., Lon-
don 1891-5) and Djuzdjam
(Tabâkât-i Nâsîrî, ed. A.H. Habibi, 2 vols., 2nd ed.,
Kabul 1342-3/1964-5; tr. H.G. Raverty, 2 vols., Lon-
don 1891-5). These are supplemented by local histories
such as Sayfî's Ta'vîg-nâma-yi Hârât (ed. M.Z. al-
Siddiqi, Calcutta 1944). Staggeringly high figures are
quoted for the numbers of people alleged to have been
massacred by the Mongols when they sacked the great
cities of Khurâsân: Harât—1,600,000 (Sayfî, 60) or
2,400,000 (Djuzdjamî, text, ii, 121); Nishâpûr—
1,747,000 (Sayfî, 63). Such examples are typical. They
should not, however, be interpreted literally. Considerable
uncertainty exists over the possible size of
the populations of such cities in the mediaeval
period, but it seems unlikely that Khurâsân could have
possessed cities that were so much larger than the
capital of the Sung Empire in South China, Hang-
chou, which contained perhaps a million inhabitants
in the mid-7th/13th century (see J. Gernet, Daily life
It is probable that the normal population of the cities
of Khurâsân was considerably swollen at the last
minute by influxes of refugees from the countryside.
But even if the chroniclers' fingers ought not to be
approached as though they were statistics arrived at
scientifically, they are certainly evidence of the state of
mind created by the character of the Mongol invasion.
The shock induced by the scale of the catastrophe had
no precedent; this must imply that the death and
destruction which produced that shock had no prece-
dent either. Immediate shock will not suffice as a total
explanation, however. Later writers such as Djuwaynî, Rashid al-Din and Hamd Allah Mustawfî
Kazwînî, recounting events of which they were not
themselves contemporaries, do not attempt to
minimise the extent of the disaster. Nor, despite the
fact that they were all officials in the Mongol govern-
ment of the Ilkhanate, do they suggest that their
predecessors had exaggerated the degree of Mongol
destructiveness.
The sources naturally concentrate their attention,
the massacres in the cities. The effect of the
Mongol invasions on agriculture, especially in Persia,
is likely in the long run to have been more serious.
Persian agriculture was, in the absence of great rivers
on the plateau, heavily dependent on irrigation by
means of kanâts [q.v.]. Some of these underground
water channels were destroyed during the invasions,
but more significant is the fact that a kanât quickly
crass to operate if it is not constantly maintained.
Hence if peasants were killed in large numbers, or fled
from their land and stayed away, that land could well
suffer substantial damage simply through neglect of
the kanâts. If the agricultural hinterland of the cities
was markedly reduced in extent as a result of destruc-
tion, neglect or a permanent reduction in the labour
force, it might prove difficult to support those cities
adequately and therefore to rebuild them to anything
approaching their size. The question of the impact of
the later invasion by Hulêgû on the agriculture of
'îrâk is a rather different one, since 'îrâk irrigation
was river-based. The part played by the Mongols in
the decline of the fertility of the land between the
Tigris and the Euphrates has been much discussed
(see e.g. R.M. Adams, Land behind Baghdad, Chicago
and London 1965, and the reservations on Adams's
methodology expressed by A.M. Watson, A medieval
green revolution: new crops and farming techniques in the early
Islamic world, in A. L. Udovitch (ed.), The Islamic Mid-
dle East, 700-1900: studies in economic and social history,
London 1983, 86-9). Nevertheless, the following population figures for
the door of the Mongols' predecessors and suc-
cessors as rulers of 'îrâk, the Ilkhan may well have
contributed much to decay by allowing the irrigation
channels to be neglected. In terms of actual loss of life,
there seems no reason to doubt that Hulêgû's invasion
of the Islamic lands was a much less severe blow that
Cingiz-Khan's had been. Again it is impossible to
arrive at reliable figures. Hamd Allâh Mustawfî's
estimate of the death toll (800,000) at the sack of
Baghdâd in 656/1258 is often quoted (Ta'vîg-i guzîdâ,
ed. A. Nawâî, Thcran 1336-9/1958-61, 589); but
this seems improbably high, and is perhaps refuted by
Hulêgû's own estimate, in a letter of 660/1262 to
King Louis IX of France, of more than 200,000 (P.
Meyvaert, An unknown letter of Hulagû, Il-Khan of Persia,
to King Louis IX of France, in Visior, xi [1980], 256).
It seems likely, then, that the traditional view of
the appalling immediate effects of the Mongol invasions
should be accepted, at least as far as Transoxania and
Khurâsân are concerned (for the contrary view, using
20th century parallels to suggest that the destructive
impact of the Mongols has been much exaggerated,
see B. Lewis, The Mongols, the Turks and the Muslim
polity, in his Islam in history, London 1973, 179-98 and
324-5). The devastation was not, however, universal.
South Persia, possibly unattractive to the Mongols
because of its climate and, in terms of Mongol
demand, the limited areas of pasture to be found there,
escaped virtually unscathed. Similarly, it is now
thought that the destruction resulting from the
Mongol invasion of Russia in 635-9/1237-41, though
serious in its immediate effects, was unlikely to contain little if any damage (see J.L. Fennell, The
crise of medieval Russia 1200-1304, London 1983, 86-
9). It is clear that the havoc wrought by the Mongol
campaigns in the lands of the Chin Empire of north
China was not matched when, under the Great
Khâns Mongke and Kubilai, they conquered the Sung
Empire to the south. There they were concerned to
acquire new territory as far as possible undamaged.
Nevertheless, the following population figures for
China, if they are accurate, remain to be explained:
over 100 million in Sung and Chin times, declining
to 70 million in the 1290s and 60 million a century later
(J.D. Langlois, Jr. (ed.), China under Mongol rule,
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According to Rashid al-Din, the results of such maladministration were a disastrous failure (see K. Jahn, Paper currency in Iran, in Jnl. of Asian History vi/2 [1970], 101-35).

Ghazan on his accession declared his conversion to Islam, and the Mongols of Persia duly followed his example, at least in name. The shock which the Islamic world had suffered, in that the Mongol conquests had brought infeudal rule over a large part of the Dār al-Islām, was thus alleviated. (Indeed, one unobtrusive result of the conquest, following the conversion of other Mongol rulers to Islam, was an extension of the boundaries of the Dār al-Islām, notably in the lands of the Golden Horde and in Central Asia.) Ghazan’s conversion, coupled with the celebrated programme of administrative reforms which he promptly initiated, no doubt marked a considerable improvement in Persia’s fortunes. The reforms dealt with such matters as the rates and methods of payment of taxes; the reorganisation of the Yam, the postal courier system; the reformation of the coinage and of weights and measures; the activities and payment of kādās; the offer of incentives to encourage the recultivation of land that had fallen out of use; and the employment of a form of the idkur to provide a means of paying the army (on Ghazan’s reforms see A.K.S. Lambton, Landlord and peasant in Persia, London 1955, ch. 4; Spuler, Mongolen, Leiden 1985, I.P. Petrushevsky, in Camb. hist. of Iran, v, ed. J.A. Boyle, Cambridge 1968, 494-500; and idem, Zemledel’ i agrarnoe otnoshen’ia v Irane XIII-XVII v., Moscow-Leningrad 1960, 53-62). The texts of many of the reforming edicts (urfat) are preserved by Rashid al-Din. They are certainly convincing evidence that Ghazan was aware of which abuses required the attention of the government. What cannot be stated with any degree of certainty is the extent to which, and for how long, the reforms were actually implemented. It is probable that the reforms had at least some beneficial effect, and that this effect, albeit decreasingly, continued to be felt after Ghazan’s early death. But throughout the Ilkhanid period, increasingly substantial quantities of property were made into akāf, which may suggest both that there was a lack of real security of tenure (despite Ghazan’s efforts) and that people had little confidence in the justness of Mongol government even after it had become Muslim.

2. The Mongol army.

The central and most essential institution of the Mongol Empire was its army. The nature of steppe nomadic society was such that normal life doubled as a process of military training: e.g. Mongol hunting practices were reflected in military tactics (see Djwayni, i, 21). All adult male Mongols below the age of 60 were liable for military service; there were in principle no Mongol civilians. The Mongols were thus able to mobilise a formidable force composed exclusively of cavalry, which was highly trained and could consist of an extremely high proportion of the available Mongol manpower. This is part of the explanation for the very large numbers given by contemporary sources for the size of Mongol armies. Nevertheless, there are other relevant factors. The extreme maneuverability of the Mongol forces may have caused observers to exaggerate the numbers involved, as may such expedients as the mounting of dummies on spare horses (each Mongol soldier went on campaign with a string of five or more horses). The Secret history of the Mongols estimates that in 1206 Chingiz-Khān had an army of around 105,000 men; and according to Rashid al-Din (drawing on a now lost Mongolian source, the Ilkhan dīwān, the army in Mongolia proper at the death of Chingiz was 129,000 strong). (For the argument that the chroniclers’ high figures should be taken seriously, and that the Mongol conquests were won by huge numbers rather than by military efficiency, see J.M. Smith Jr., Mongol manpower and Persian population, in JESHO xviii/3 [1975], 271-99; idem, ‘Ayn ji'ālt: Mamlūk success or Mongol failure?, in HJAS, xlv/2 [1984], 307-45).

Organisationally, the Mongol soldiers were grouped in multiples of 10, rising to the tūmen (tūmān) of 10,000—a system that had long been conventional in Asian steppe armies. It is not probable that tūmens usually had as many soldiers as the theoretical number would suggest (see e.g. C. Hsiao, The military establishment of the Yuan dynasty, Cambridge, Mass.
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The Mongol cavalryman relied chiefly on the standard horn and sinew compound bow of the steppes, which had impressive range and power of penetration. Conquest of the cities of the sedentary empires required also the enlistment of siege engineers from both China and the Islamic lands. Auxiliary troops of non-Mongol origin were used, especially in China. After the conquest of China, they provided infantry and garrison troops. In Persia, native soldiers were made use of for such duties as the provision of garrisons and the guarding of passes.

One further possibility is that 'Great Yasa' was at first a 1% levy on the nomads' flocks and herds, but later the term is used to denote a poll-tax payable by the conquered sedentary population. It is possible that the Mongols may have derived this latter usage from the Uyghur Turks, who exercised a permissive influence on the administration of the early Mongol Empire. 

One of the indispensable institutional foundations of the Mongol Empire is generally said to have been the 'Great Yasa of Chingiz-Khan', allegedly a comprehensive legal code laid down, in all probability, in 1206, though perhaps supplemented later. The custody of this code was entrusted by Chingiz-Khan to his adopted brother Shigi-kutuku. The code has not survived, but it may be reconstructed, it has been believed, from fragments that are quoted in a variety of sources (see especially V.A. Riasanovsky, Fundamental principles of Mongol law, The Hague 1965). Many difficulties are, however, involved in holding this view. The main primary source, the Secret history of the Mongols, appears in the relevant passage to be concerned with the keeping of a record of ad hoc judicial decisions and with the beginnings of a kind of case law rather than with the creation of a legal code; and it does not use the term yasa (jasaq: Secret history, §203, tr. F.W. Cleaves, Cambridge, Mass., 1982, 143-4. Elsewhere in the Secret history, jasaq means an individual order or decree). So far as the supposed fragments are concerned, it has been shown that all of those of significance derive ultimately from one source, Djuwaynī (see D. Ayalon, The Great Yasa of Chingiz Khan: a reconstruction, A, iii, 1971, 97-140). Examination of Djuwaynī's material (especially 17-18) shows that he was recording the writing down for consultation of Chingiz-Khan's precepts on such matters as military training, communications and taxation; there is no reference to a general legal code.

The belief—certainly to be found reflected in later sources— that the existence of the Great Yasa is probably to be explained as having been founded on a knowledge of the unwritten Mongol customary law, the evolution of which began long before the time of Chingiz-Khan and continued after his death. In addition, there may well have been some recollection of Chingiz's maxims (tilig, bili), which were preserved and respected; Raqīj al-Dīn records them at length, though he has nothing at all to offer on the contents of the 'Great Yasa'. One further possibility is that written records of certain legal cases (yarghu-nama), which we know to have been made and preserved for future reference (see Muhammad b. Hindihāgh Nakhdjāwānī, Dastur al-kalīb, ii, ed. A.A. Alizade, Moscow 1975, 29-35) may have given rise to the notion that Mongol law was written down, despite the absence of convincing contemporary evidence that anything of the kind was in fact done. Mongol customary law was no doubt enforced, and in the Islamic world continued in uneasy co-existence with the shari'a, but precisely how this work is difficult to recover from our sources (for the above view, see Morgan, The 'Great Yasa of Chingiz Khan' and Mongol law in the Ilkhānate, in BSOAS, xi/1 [1986], 1-27; the most usual opinion is well represented by P. Ratzhevsky, Die Yasa (Jasaq) Chinges-khans und ihre Problematik, in Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des alten Orients. v. Sprache, Geschichte und Kultur der altasiatischen Völker, Berlin 1974, 471-87; idem, Chingis-Khan, sein Leben und Wirken, Wiesbaden 1983, 164-72).

4. Taxation.

This may be dealt with briefly, see Kharāgān ii. In Persia, and kończt. Many terms are used in the sources for taxation, but the principal taxes of Mongol origin seem to have been three in number. Kūtbūr [q.v.] was at first a 1% levy on the nomads' flocks and herds, but later the term is used to denote a poll-tax payable by the conquered sedentary population. It is possible that the Mongols may have derived this latter usage from the Uyghur Turks, who exercised a permissive influence on the administration of the early Mongol Empire (see T.A. Allsen, The Yuan Dynasty and the Uighurs of Turfan in the 13th century, in M. Rossabi (ed.), China among equals: the middle kingdom and its neighbors 10th-14th centuries, Berkeley 1983, 263, 278 n. 141). The precise meaning of kalan, the other Mongol tax most commonly mentioned (and abused) in the Persian sources, remains unclear (for an attempt at definition, seeking to show that kalan was a general term used to cover pre-Mongol, Islamic taxation, see J. M. Smith Jr., Mongol and nomadic taxation, in JHAS, xxx [1970], 46-85). The most likely explanation would seem to be that it was in fact a general term for occasional exactions of a specifically Mongol rather than Islamic character, imposed on the sedentary population by the Mongols and including some kind of corvée. The third of the most important taxes was tanhaq, a levy on commercial transactions whose prominence testifies to the importance in Mongol eyes of trade.

The purpose of such taxes was the maximum possible degree of exploitation of the conquered population. This exploitation was normally limited, if at all, only by the consciousness consideration that enough should be left to the peasants to permit their survival and thus a further year's payment of taxes. Mongol taxation was more a pragmatic series of exactions, as seemed appropriate and profitable, than a fixed
system, despite the willingness of some modern historians to discern the existence of such a system. The burden imposed by the specifically "Mongol" taxes was the greater in that the conquered people of the Islamic lands were also required to continue payment of the old pre-Mongol taxes. As in other fields, the burden may well have become for a time more supportable as a result of the reforms of Ghazan.

5. Communications.

The vast extent of the Mongol's empire made it necessary for them to establish an effective network of communications. Such a network, the Yam, was duly set up: according to the sources by the second Great Khan, Ögedey, rather than by Ögedey himself (Secret history, §279, tr. Cleaves, 225; Rashid al-Din, ii/1, ed. Alizade, Moscow 1980, 121-2, 143-4). The Yam was designed to facilitate the travels of envoys going to and from the Mongol courts; for the transportation of goods (especially on the route between North China and Mongolia); for the speedy transmission of royal orders; and to provide a framework whereby the Mongol rulers could receive intelligence. It was also frequently, if illegitimately, used by officials and private individuals of influence, a practice that was forbidden so often as to suggest that such prohibitions were of limited and temporary effect.

Post stations were erected throughout the empire at stages equivalent to a day's journey: about every 25 or 30 miles, or more in desolate areas, according to Marco Polo (Travels, tr. A. Ricci, London 1931, 153). Responsibility for the maintenance of the facilities fell to the local army units; horses and supplies were contributed by the population of the area, the incidence of exactions being determined on the basis of the transport of goods (especially on the route going to and from the Mongol courts; for the transportation of precious metals and jewels, for the administration of their empire was a pragmatic approach towards the administration of an empire that included a large sedentary sector. The most marked influence in the empire's early decades was exercised by the Uyghurs and the Khitans. The Mongols speedily adopted both the Uyghur alphabet for the writing of Mongolian (previously an unwritten language) and elements of Uyghur chancery practice. The Khitans, who were probably even more influential. During the initial stages of the empire's administrative evolution, the most important all-purpose Mongol official was the darughachi. Study of his role (see e.g. Buell, Sino-Khitian administration in Mongol Bukhara, in Jnsl. of Asian History xiii/2 [1979]) has left little doubt about its Khitan origin. This is merely one example of such institutional borrowing (see further Mongol Empire, in JRAS [1982], 124-36). The Khitans provided personnel as well as administrative machinery; the careers of a number of them who entered Mongol service have been traced (see de Rachewiltz, op. cit.; Buell, Sino-Khitian administration).

After they had conquered Persia and China, the Mongols became the rulers of great sedentary societies that possessed complex administrative traditions of long standing. In Persia, the Mongols permitted a considerable degree of administrative continuity with the past to be maintained. Prior to the setting up of the Ikhnâne, non-Persians frequently held the highest governmental offices, and even after the time of Hülegü, members of minority groups, such as the Jews, were permitted to hold such high offices as the khans of the Ikhnâne, the administration of Persia seems to have lasted for a long time that of members of the established Muslim Persian bureaucracy. The most conspicuous example of this was the Diuwayni family. When the Yâhûb ibn-Isân Shams al-Dîn Diuwayni was executed in 683/1284 (his brother the historian having died of natural causes in the previous year), members of the family held high governmental offices virtually without a break for around 80 years, serving Khârâzm Shâhâns and Mongols in turn. Our sources leave us with the impression that, by and large, the administrative machine continued to work in the traditional fashion, and that the Mongols were reasonably content to leave the task of administration to their Persian officials, so long as they showed themselves capable of securing the required revenues and carrying out taxation. It should however be remembered that this impression is based largely on the works of Diuwayni, Rashid al-Dîn, Waṣṣâf and Hamd Allah Mustawfî Kazwînî, all of whom were Persians and members of that same bureaucracy. The Mongols themselves left no written sources on the history of their rule in Persia.

The administration of China was not left in the hands of native officials to the same extent as that of the Ikhnâne. Lower-ranking officials were retained in office, but there were no Chinese equivalents to Shams al-Dîn Diuwayni or Rashîd al-Dîn. The Chinese were excluded from the highest positions, which were reserved for foreigners: Middle Eastern and Central Asian Muslims, Khitans, Uyghurs, Europeans. This policy may have been adopted (as Marco Polo, himself one of its beneficiaries, suggested) because the Great Khâns regarded foreigners as more trustworthy than the Chinese since they had no local loyalties (Travels, tr. Ricci, 127). The traditional civil service examinations, which tested candidates' knowledge of the Chinese classics, were not held until 715/1315; and they never, under the Mongols, recovered their former importance as a road to high office in the state.

Overall, it may be said that the Mongols were prepared to adopt almost any institutional arrangements and to employ any potentially useful.
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MONEY [see nãrî; sîkra].
MONK [see kânî].
MONKEY [see kîrê].
MONOGAMY [see nîkãh; zawâjî].
MONOPHYSITES [see nâsârâ].
MORALE [see kîrê].
MONOTHEISM [see nãhâr].
MONASTERY [see tawnî].
MONTICELLO [see mawwim].
MONTENEGRO [see kâra daghî].
MONTH [see tawîrî].
MOORS, in Arabic al-Mârî, a rather vague term,
used until the 19th century in virtually all Western
European languages, to indicate the ancient
Muslims of Spain and the inhabitants of the
Mediterranean ports of North Africa. The origin of this is not yet clear. It derives either from Semitic mahwûrīm “the people of the West”, or from Berber (Rinn, in RAfr., xxix, 244 ff.). The
Greek word Mîzîqîzîrîtîs appears for the first time in
Polybius (iii, 33,15), in earlier times the term Ἀρβας having been used to indicate all inhabitants of North Africa [see infra, I]. After the description of Carthage in 146 B.C., the Latin word Mauro indicates a group of relatively sedentary tribes who lived between the Atlantic and the rivers Moulouya and Chelif in the Roman provinces of Mauretania Caesariensis and Mauretania Tingitana [see TANGA]. Later, the Latin word Maures passed into Greek in the form of Μάρος (Paulus-Wissowa, xiv [1950], cols. 2340-31), and both terms were then used to indicate, in a rather general way, the Berbers. In Spain, Maouri became Mores, and it was under this name that the inhabitants of the Peninsula designed the Muslim conquerors during the whole period of the Muslim domination (711-1492). The term Mores, which has been adopted into the various languages of Western Europe (Mauren, Maures, Mauiri, Molen, Moors, Moren, etc.), thus has a geographical meaning, i.e. indicating the people coming from the African coast, rather than an ethnographical one, for the conquerors were Arabs and Berbers, the latter both arabicised and non-arabicised. The arabisation of the latter took place in Spain, where the mixture of Roman and Arab elements led to a kind of symbiosis which expressed itself in a true bilingualism, which in its turn created a certain depreciation connotation, even when the Moor was represented as “noble”, like Othello. In some translations of the Bible (e.g. Isa., xi, 12), the term “land of the Moors” indicates Ethiopia, and it was perhaps under such influences that in mediaeval Europe the term was also used for all those whose colour lay somewhere between light-brown and black. In heraldry, Moor indicated a black, and everyday life knew expressions like Moorish coffee, etc.

On the other hand, the adjective “Moorish” indicated also, in a vague but recognisable way, an artistic style which was thought to have originated from the Arabs, or even from the Muslims in general. In architecture, the Moorish art could indicate the Alhambra in Granada [see QABSA], the Giralda in Sevilla [see TSIBLIVA], and the mosque in Marrakech [see MARRAKESH]. The earliest phase of Renaissance architecture in Spain, usually called the Plateresque (from platero “silversmith”, because its rich ornamentation resembles silversmith’s work) is said to have been influenced by Moorish art. In other fields, the term referred to miniatures in Arabic manuscripts, like those of the Makāninī of al-Harīrī [q.v.], to lustre painting and, in general, to art objects fashioned in Muslim countries of European countries under Arabo-Muslim influence, like Sicily, the Balkans, and especially Spain. During the long Arab occupation, furniture in the so-called Mudéjar style evolved, in which the form was essentially European but the decoration oriental. A type of cabinet known as varguena was often inlaid with ivory in a Moorish manner.

In modern times, the term Moors is also found outside of Mauretania [q.v.]. In Mali [q.v.] the word is used to indicate the Arabo-Berber group. In northern Senegal [q.v.] there are stock-raisers or traders known by this name. The Muslims of Sri Lanka (Ceylon [q.v.]) estimated at about 900,000 out of a total population of 13 million, are often named “the Ceylon Moors”. They are partly descended from Arab seafarers who, some time during the 2nd/3rd century, settled at a place near the site of the modern port of Colombo, called Caledon by Ibn Baṭṭūta. Until the arrival of the Portuguese in 1505, the Arabs had enjoyed a virtual monopoly of the foreign trade of Ceylon. In the Philippines [q.v.], more precisely on the island of Mindanao, the term “Moor” (from Word War I, 1901-13) is used for a series of scattered bands, which took place between American troops and Muslim groups, who were fighting for religious rather than for political reasons. Finally, the Spanish word Moros designates the various Muslim populations of the Southern Philippines, especially in the Sulu archipelago and on Mindanao. By extension, the term is also used for any of the Austronesian languages of the Moro peoples.

Bibliography: Given in the article. See also Encyclopaedia Britannica and Encyclopedic Italiana, s.v.

(M. E. Lévy-Provençal-[E. Van Donzel])

MORÁ. Turkish for Morea, the usual name in mediaeval and modern times for the peninsula of the Peloponnesus (which itself appears in Arabic geographical sources in forms like the B. B. b. n. of Ibn Hawkal, “land of the Moors”, see above), under such influences that in mediaeval Europe the term was also used for any of the Austronesian languages of the Moro peoples.

Encyclopedia Britannica and Encyclopedic Italiana, s.v.

(E. Lévy-Provençal-[E. Van Donzel])

MORA. Turkish for Morea, the usual name in mediaeval and modern times for the peninsula of the Peloponnesus (which itself appears in Arabic geographical sources in forms like the B. B. b. n. of Ibn Hawkal, “land of the Moors”, see above), under such influences that in mediaeval Europe the term was also used for any of the Austronesian languages of the Moro peoples.

Bibliography: Given in the article. See also Encyclopaedia Britannica and Encyclopedic Italiana, s.v.

(M. E. Lévy-Provençal-[E. Van Donzel])

MORA. Turkish for Morea, the usual name in mediaeval and modern times for the peninsula of the Peloponnesus (which itself appears in Arabic geographical sources in forms like the B. B. b. n. of Ibn Hawkal, “land of the Moors”, see above), under such influences that in mediaeval Europe the term was also used for any of the Austronesian languages of the Moro peoples.

Bibliography: Given in the article. See also Encyclopaedia Britannica and Encyclopedic Italiana, s.v.

(M. E. Lévy-Provençal-[E. Van Donzel])
spring 1263 of 6,000 Turkish mercenary cavalrymen in the service of the Emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus's step-brother, the sebastocrator Constantine (whose troops also included Christianised Muslim mercenaries, tourkopoloi [q.v.], used against the Frankish occupiers of the Morea (see A. Savvides, Late Byzantine and Western historiographers on Turkish mercenaries in Greek and Latin armies, in Festschrift for D.M. Nicol; idem, The origins and role of the Turcopole mercenaries in the Morea in the course of the Byzantine-Frankish war of 1263-4 [in Greek], in Acts of the Fourth International Pefio... Congress, Corinith 1990). Troops like these often returned to Anatolia, but over the years some of them settled down in Morea and became Christians. In the early 14th century there are mentions of combined Catalan-Turkish raids on the Morean coasts, and there can be little doubt that the Turks stemmed from the maritime principalities (beyliks) of western Anatolia [see AVDI; MENTESHE; OGHULLARI].

Ottoman incursions began from ca. 1358 onwards, but definite progress by the Ottomans began in 1387-8 and is associated with the ghazi leader, possibly himself of Greek descent, Ewrenos Beg [q.v.], during the reigns of sultans Murad I and Bayezid I [q.v.]. At the outset, Ewrenos roamed the Morea with the consent of the Frankish protectorate [see v. v.]. Theodoros I Palaeologus, in the hope of dislodging the Frankish Navarese Military Company, but soon changed sides in the continually-changing pattern of Byzantine-Frankish relations there. By the end of the century, both Theodore and the Navarese had to acknowledge Ottoman suzerainty and pay tribute to Bayezid. However, in the years after the latter's defeat at the hands of Timur at Ankara in 1402, the sultans Suleyman I and Mehmed I [q.v.] maintained peaceful relations with Manuel II Palaeologus. But fresh devastations of the Morea began in 1423 under Turakhan Beg, sent by Murad II to invade it as a punishment for Manuel's support of the "false" (Dizyme) Mustafá Celebi [q.v.]; the Hexamiton, Manuel's six-mile long rampart across the mouth of the isthmus, with the fortifications known to the Turks as the Çesme Hisarı, failed to keep back the invaders.

Over the following years, the Byzantines strengthened their position in the north of the Morea and the Venetians in the south at Navarino, Modon and Koron [q.v.]. The crusade of Varna in 1444 emboldened the despots of the Morean despotate Palaeologus, the future last Byzantine Emperor, to refortify the Hexamiton, but in 1446 it was again breached by Murad's artillery and stormed by the Janissaries; it was never again repaired, and the despotate of Morea became an Ottoman vassal state. The Morea was again invaded by Turakhan in 1452, with the aim of preventing the despot from sending aid to the beleaguered Constantinople (for the conquest of which, see MEHMETED III), and in 1456, tributes owed to the Ottomans having fallen into arrears, Mehmed and his commander Ömer Beg annexed the Florentine duchy of Athens. Two years later, in 1458, the sultan decided to send a massive army into the Morea, occupying one-third of the peninsula, now placed under the governorship of Ömer, and imposing an even heavier tribute on the Palaeologi. Mehmed's final invasion of 1460 is recorded in great detail by the Greek and Turkish sources. In the spring, the Greek renegade Zaganos Pagha [q.v.] was sent to raid Patras and Achaia, and gradually, the Byzantine towns all fell, the last stronghold to surrender being Saliemunik under Constantine Graetzas Palaeologus (July 1461), who then sought refuge in Naupactus (cf. Savvides, Naupactus from the early Byzantine years to the Ottoman impact of 1499 [in Greek], in Acts First Aetolian-Akarnanian Congress, Agrinio 1988).

Through the mediation of the historian Citoobulus, Mehmedm acted with clemency towards the despot Demetrius, brother of the emperor Constantine XII, and assigned to him the revenues of the islands of Thasos [see TAŞHOZ], Samothrace [see SEMENDERIK] and Lemnos [see LIMNI]. Only the fortress of Monemvasia [q.v.], which placed itself under the protection of the Pope and of Venice, was not Ottoman by the late 1460s, together with the Venetian acquisitions of Modon, Koron, Navarino, Argos and Nauplion, plus the interior parts of the Mainote peninsula where in ca. 1465 the local chieftain Cordesius Cladas began an insurrection against the Ottoman conquerors.


On the Turkish presence in 13th-14th century Morea, inclusive of the raids of the Emirates, see D. Zakythenos, Despotat grec de Morée, rev. ed. Chryssa Maltezou, i, London 1975, 39 f., 70 ff.; J. Longnon, L’Empire Latin de Constan

On the period of the Ottoman incursions until the conquest of 1450/60, see the relevant refs. in the following: Miller-Lamparo, i-iii; H.A. Gibbons, The foundation of the Ottoman Empire... (1300-1403), Oxford 1916; Zakythenos, Despotat...; i-iii; Ch. Mijatovic, Constantine. The last Emperor of the Greeks (1448-53), London 1892, repr. 1968; R.-J. Loener, Pour l’histoire du Pélagonnese au 14e s. (1382-1404), in Rev. Et. Byz., i (1943); C. Amantos, Relations between Greeks and Turks [in Greek], i, Athens 1955; S. Runciman, The fall of Constantinople (1453), Cambridge 1954; i-iii; M. Mistra, Byzantine capital of the Pélagonnese, London 1980; E. Werner, Die Geburt einer Grossmacht. Die Osmanen (1300-1481), Berlin 1966, Ostrogorsky, History 2; J. Barker, Manuel II Palaeologus (1391-

2. Turkish domination (1460-1821) and the Greek War of Independence (1821-33).

The plan which Mehmed had decided on when he entered Morea, was carried through. Except for a few places, the peninsula was now Turkish territory. Zaghianos Pasha was installed as governor of the Morea by the sultan and entrusted with the reorganisation of the peninsula, which had become much depopulated and was a great deal poorer economically. In 1458 and again in 1460 the sultan temporarily combined the Morea with Thessaly for administrative purposes. The Morea is partly suggested by the name *sandjak* by itself with 109 x "sandjas" and 342 "timars. Down to about 1570, the residence of the governor was by turns in Corinth, Londari (Leonari) or Mystra, then in Nauplion and in 1786-1821 in Tripolitza (cf. T. Gritzopoulos, History of Tripolitsa, in Greek, Athens 1972-6; M. Lamprynides, *Nauplia* [in Greek], Athens 1975; S. Runciman, *Mistra*, London 1980). The division of the country under Turkish rule, usual from the middle of the 17th century, into 22 or 25 provinces or *beyliks* is partly suggested by nature and partly a survival of the older Byzantine organisation.

The Turks introduced their own feudal system after their occupation of the Morea so that the Turkish-Muslim element in the country was thus able to come to the fore. Even during the first period of Turkish rule (1458-1687), other factors contributed to this, like the immigration into the Morea of Muslims from other parts of the Ottoman empire, the conversion of Christian Moreots to Islam, etc. While in the north of the Balkan Peninsula and in Asia minor countless Christians adopted Islam either voluntarily or under compulsion, the Christian element in the Morea at the time of the Turkish conquest in the mass remained faithful to the Christian religion. Comparatively few Moreots became Muslims, and these were principally Albanians, who always adopted Islam more readily (cf. thereon: C. Jirecek, *Studien zur Geschichte und Geographie Albaniens im Mittelalter*, Budapest 1916, and also M. Lamprynides, *The Albanians in mainland Greece and the Peloponnesse*, 1320-1821 [in Greek], Athens 1907, repr. 1907; on the Lalian *Turkish Albanians*, cf. J. Vodrasil, *Informations on the Turkish-Albanian Laltists from the Turkish Archives of Macedonia* [in Greek], in *Acts 1st Pelopon. Congr.,* iii, Athens 1981-2, 381 ff.; A. Photopoulos, *The Albanian Turkish Albanians* [in Greek], in *Epetites Hetaerias Elelakon Meloton,* [1983], 419 ff.). As in Asia Minor, Bosnia, Crete, etc., so in the Morea also, members of the nobility and middle classes, especially those of Frankish origin, adopted Islam in order to retain possession of their estates. There were also in the Morea crypto-Christians, as well as people whose Islam was very superficial. These were usually called *murtad* (impure) in the Morea. The Barduniots were also for the most part superficially Muslims (cf. G. Kapasale, *Bardounia and the Turkish Bardounists* [in Greek], in *Peloponnesikia,* ii [1957]). As to the survival of the Greek Moreot element, it has been said, e.g., that Mehmed II's ordinance regulating the relations of the Christian subjects to the Ottoman empire benefited also the Christian Moreots; yet it is wrong to credit him with any such ordinance (cf. Fr. Geise, in *Id.,* xix [1931], 264 ff.). It is, however, a historical fact that the Greek Orthodox Church contributed a great deal to maintain the Christian element in the Morea, as in the East generally (see Runciman, *The Great Church in captivity*, Cambridge 1968). The Christian clergy of the Morea were frequently able to maintain a privileged attitude towards the Turkish officials and thus to further the interests of their co-religionists (on the privileges [Greek *pronomonia*] of Mehmed to the Patriarchate, cf. C. Marazakis, *Islam's privileges in favour of Christianity* [in Greek], in *Hellenika,* ix [1936], 140 ff.; Runciman, *op. cit.,* 165 ff.; refs. in A. Vakalopoulos, *History of Modern Hellenism* [in Greek], Thessalonica 1976, 164 ff.). The Christian Moreots were also often able to avoid having their children taken by the Turks for the *devshirme* [*q.v.*]. After the death of Suleymán the Magnificent (1566), the lot of the Christian Moreots gradually became worse. Overcrowded lands were taken away from them, and land given to his soldiers or allotted to the mosques as *waqfs* or given to private individuals as gifts. During the long period of Turkish rule in the Morea, the largest and best part of the land was in Turkish hands, and as a rule, Christians were not allowed to own large estates. The peasants had to pay over annually the fifth of the produce of the land and pay all kinds of annual taxes.

In the view of the abuses of the Turkish authorities, the Christian Moreots preferred to abandon the fertile regions and retire to barren lands and into the mountains, hence within the period 1460-1821 the mountains of the Morea were predominantly inhabited by Christians. Of the factors which contributed to the survival of Greek culture in the Morea during Turkish rule, special stress must be laid on the political concessions which were made to them by the Ottomans. These lay mainly in the freedom to govern their own communities, although, especially after 1715, the freedom of the Greek community was not infrequently limited by the Turkish authorities, who interfered indirectly in the appointment of local officials. Undoubtedly, those Moreots were better off who lived in towns or villages which were allotted to the Holy Shrines of Islam or to members of the Ottoman ruling family. The town of Dimitzana in Gortynia for example was originally a *waqf* of Mecca under the protection of the sultan's mother (see P. Kontoes-A. Giapoulos, *Album of Gortynia* [in Greek], Athens 1937; T. Gritzopoulos, *Gortynia Arachova and the popular song of Demos the Kleph* [in Greek], 1940; *The Archihechos of Demetiana and Argyrokastron* [in Greek], in *Epetitis Hetaerias Byzantion Spoudon,* xx, 1950; *Varia Arcadica* [in Greek], Gortyniaka, i; 1972; J. Gianniaropoulou, *Various notes on Gortynian Codices* [in Greek], in *ibid.;* G. Karvelas, *History of Demetiana* [in Greek], i-iii, Athens 1972-8; A. Petronotes, *Settlements and architectural monuments in mountainous Gortynia* [in Greek], 1975).

The peace between their Turkish overlords and Christians could only be an uneasy one. In the Morea also there were the so-called "Klephs" who would not submit to the existing government and took up arms against it. Against them the Turks used the Armatoli force, a gendarmerie of Christians organised on military lines (cf. T. Kandeloros, *Peloponnesian*
Armatolism, 1500-1821 [in Greek], Athens 1924; G. Vlachoyannes, Moreot Klephts [in Greek], 1935; P. Rodakes, Klephts and Armatoloi [in Greek], vii, 1975. In the period 1715-1821 the Turks for the security of the country built watchhouses (derbent) in which a garrison was stationed to watch those who passed, especially at the passes. The Derbancia (kalki derbent) between Corinth and Argos and the Derbenia of Lontari, the passes between Arcadia and Messenia (makryplagi; cf. above) were all very important. The Mainots in their wild mountains felt little of the Turkish yoke, and were from 1460 to 1821, in constant rebellion against every foreign power (cf. D. Mexes, Maina and the Mainots [in Greek], Athens 1977). The Porte found itself forced to recognise officially the independence of Maina, in return for which the Mainots were supposed to pay tribute (cf. A. Daskalakes, Maina and the Ottoman Empire, 1453-1821 [in Greek], Athens 1923; C. Passayannes, Mainot dirges and songs [in Greek], 1928; P. Lee Fermon, Mani, London 1959; S. Kougeas, Historical sources for Mainot hegemony, 1774-1821 [in Greek], in Pelopennesiako, v [1962]; id. (ed.) Niketas Nephakos, Mainot historical verses [in Greek], 1964; E. Alexakes, Clans and family in Maina's traditional society [in Greek], Athens 1980; D. Vayakakos, The Mainots of diaspora [in Greek], i-ii, 1980; War and family love in Maina [in Greek], i-ii, 1982). C. Mertzios, Maina in the Venetian Archives, 1611-74 [in Greek], in Lakonikai Spoudai, i, [1972]; J. Kikiras, Dirges as a source of Mainot jurisprudence [in Greek], in ibid., ii [1975]; Th. Papadopoulos, Mainot immigrants to Italy in the 17th century, in ibid., vi [1982]).

For a long period after 1460, when Mehmed II had made the greater part of the Morea a province of his empire, it became more or less a free state where there was no warfare between Turks and Venetians (cf. A. Monferratos, Sigismondo Pandolfo Malatesta. Venetian-Turkish war in Peloponnese, 1463-6 [in Greek], Athens 1914; also the information in J. Alexandropoulos, Two Ottoman registers of the Morea, 1460-3 [in Greek], in Peloponnesiako, suppl. v [1987], 339 ff.). For a considerable fleet assembled in Corfu in 1540 Venice made peace in order to save what was left of her possessions. The majority of the Venetian colonies in the East, including Nauplion and Monemvasia, was the price paid (for the historical background, cf. R. Cessi, Venezia e l'acquisto di Nauplia ed Argo, in Nuovo Archivio Veneto, xxx [1915]). The Turks endeavoured to populate once more their new possessions in the Morea (cf. T. Vrokines, The emigration of Naupliotes and Monemvasiotes in Corfu, mid-16th century [in Greek], Corfu 1905; M. Koliva-Karaleka and E. Moatsou, Settlement of Naupliote and Monemvasian fugitives on Crete in 1548 [in Greek], in Byzant.-Neur. Jahrb., xxii [1983], 375 ff.). About 1550, there were about 42,000 Christian families in the whole of the Morea. We know nothing of the Greek population at this time, but it may be assumed, however, that, then as later, Muslims were in a minority. On the other hand, rich references concerning the Ottoman Morea's economic conditions during Süleyman II's time are provided by several western travellers (cf. Constantina Philopoulou-Desylla, Western Travellers as a source for the Ottoman Empire's economic history during the reign of Süleyman II, 1546-66 [in Greek], Univ. of Athens 1984, 124 ff.). Two Turkish sources of the 17th century are of considerable importance for the history of the Morea. These are the Dhuhan-namâ of Hāddijī Khālija [q.v.] and the Siyāḥ-e-nāmâ of Ewliyâ Čelebi [q.v.], who visited the Morea in 1668 and 1670. The latter's narrative was based on personal observation and enquiry, and what he tells us about Muslim buildings and religious orders and of the Christians is of importance (cf. Siyāḥ-e-nāmâ, viii, Istandbul 1928; Fr. Babinger, GOW, 219 ff.; Fr. Taeschner, in Isl., xvii [1928], 299 ff.). When Ewliyâ Čelebi visited the Morea, various Muslim orders and corporations had settled there, including Süfi orders such as the Bektaşi [q.v.] (cf. F.W. Halduc, Christianity and Islam under the Sultans, Oxford 1929; also refs. in K. Simopoulos, Foreign travellers in Greece [in Greek], iii, Athens 1970-5).

At the end of 1683 another coalition against the Porte, the so-called “Holy League”, was formed by Venice, Poland, Germany, Russia and the Pope. Francesco Morosini was given command of the allied naval forces, capturing Koron. During 1685-6 Old and New Navarino, Kalamata, Modon, Zarnata, Passava, Celafris and Nafplion, as well as other fortified places in southern Morea were taken from the Turks. The Serasker Isma‘îl Paşa was defeated in several battles and had to retire to the interior of the Morea. Hasan Paşa, who was in Maina, negotiated with
Morosini and surrendered voluntarily. The Turkish garrisons of many towns, on the other hand, offered a desperate resistance. It cost the Venetians and their allies much treasure and heavy sacrifices to take Nauplion, but by the end of 1687 the Morea up to Monemvasia was Venetian. By the peace of Carlowitz or Karlovca [q.v.] (26 Jan. 1699), the Porte had to cede the Morea to Venice. For the last period of Venetian rule in the Morea (1699-1715 or 1718), see L. Ranke, Die Venezianer in Morea (1685-1715), repr. in his Zur venezianischen Geschichte, Leipzig 1878, 577-394; cf. also Th. Krzimanz, Venetian rule in Peloponnese, 1685-1715 [in Greek], in Peloponnesiaka, i, 1956; C. Dokos, Peloponnesian ecclesiastical property during the 2nd Venetian rule. Unedited documents from Venetian Archives [in Greek], in Byz. Neungr. Jahrb., xxi [1971-27]; P. Topping, Studies on Latin Greece, 1205-1715, London 1977, Variorum Reprints, nos. IX: Domenico Gritti's Relation on the organization of Venetian Morea, 1680-91 [1974], and X: Premoder Peloponnesos: the land and the people under Venetian rule, 1685-1715 [1976].

The Turkish empire, which had been able to profit a good deal by the warfare in Europe at the beginning of the 18th century, resolved at the end of 1714 to reconquer the Morea. Many Greeks felt that the Venetians had not respected their rights in religious and family matters, were hostile to their own government, and were friendly to the Turks (cf. De la Montray, Voyage, i, 462). Except for a few larger towns which offered a resistance, the land was easily taken by the Turks and so the Morea once again became Turkish (cf. M. Sakellariou, The recapture of Peloponnesos by the Turks in 1715 [in Greek], in Hellenika, vi [1936]; Peloponnesos during the 2nd Turkish Domination, 1715-1821 [in Greek], Athens 1939, repr. 1978; also D. Dehez, Historical notes on Westerners in Peloponnesos during Turkish Domination [in Greek], in Harmonia, iii [1902]; A. Photopoulos, Contributions of Peloponnesian land tenure during the 2nd Turkish Domination [in Greek], in Acts 1st Pelop. Congr., iii, Athens 1981-2, 168 ff.).

The peace of Passarowitz (10 June 1718) ceded Morea finally to the Turks. We are most fully informed about the war from 1710 to 1821 (see refs. above). The extant sources, especially in Greek, enable us to study the period down to the smallest detail. After 1715 many Christians again adopted Islam. A census taken in 1720 gave 60,000 male Christians of 11 years of age and over, whilst the Muslim inhabitants are said to have been in the minority at this time. On the other hand, the Turkish element increased in the period 1769-90, while the number of Christians diminished considerably, as did the total number of the population (cf. P. Topping, The Population of the Morea, 1685-1715, in Acts 1st Pelop. Congr., i, 1976, 119 ff.; V. Panayotopoulos, Population and settlements of Peloponnesos, 13th-18th century [in Greek], Athens 1985; J. Waggast, Settlement, in the south central Peloponnesos, c. 1618, in F. Carter (ed.), Hist. geography of the Balkans, London 1977, 1977 ff.; idem and Helen Frangaki, Settlement pattern change in the Morea, c. 1700-1830, in Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, xi [1987], 163 ff.; cf. also Panayotopoulos, The Venetian census of Peloponnesos in 1700 [in Greek], in Acts 1st. Pelop. Congr., iii, 203 ff.; Family extent and synthesis in Peloponnesos, c. 1700 [in Greek], in Ta Historika, i [1983]). From 1715 to ca. 1780 the Morea was governed by a Pasha, the Morowalesi, who had three _tugha_ and the title of _nezir_, his period of office was indefinite. The _tugha_ usually administered the land and other Pashas, who had lesser rights but were granted two _tagua_. A change was made in 1780. From this date to 1821, the government of the Morea was no longer given to a particular _Pasha_ but to a simple _muhasil_ of the Porte, who was, however, given the title of _Pasha_.

The higher offices were held by a _muhabbeleli_, a _defterkâyi_ and a Christian dragoman ("translator"), the senior Christian official in the Morea, whose main duty was participation to the Ottoman governor's ( _paša_ ) council and the administration of local issues in collaboration with the Greek notables ( _kodjabashis_ ) (cf. A. Photopoulos, The Dragomans of the Morea [in Greek], in Journal of Oriental and African Studies, i [Athens 1989], 49 ff.; also B. Slot, Foreign diplomatic protection of locals in Turkish-dominated Morea. The Dragomans of the Low Countries of Mistra [in Greek], in Lakonikai Spoudai, iii [1977]). Under the official system of administrative divisions, the Morea was divided into 22 districts. The Moreots now came to look to Russia to liberate them from the Turkish yoke. From the time of Peter the Great, the bonds between Greeks and Russians had been growing stronger, and in the middle of the 18th century, Russian propaganda increased very much among the Orthodox of the Balkans. Under Catherine II, the Russians easily succeeded by 1767-8, with the help of Greek agents, in stirring up Greek notables and clergy in the Morea to rebel against the Turks. On 15 October 1768, Turkey declared war on Russia, and Russian fleets appeared in the Mediterranean, but those appearing at Vitylo in 1770 had neither sufficient men, gun or munitions (cf. S. Kougeas, Contributions to the history of the Peloponnesian Revolution under the Orloffs, 1770 [in Greek], in Peloponnesiaka, i [1956]; T. Gritsopoulos, _The Orloffika. The Peloponnesian Revolution of 1770 and its consequences [in Greek], Athens 1967; B. Slot, Orloffika out of Dutch Archives [in Greek], in Lakonikai Spoudai, et [1975]). In February, a treaty of peace was concluded at Kuklok Koynardzi [q.v.] between Russian and Turkey. Full religious liberty and other concessions were granted to the Christian subjects of the Turks. About three months later, the Porte granted a general amnesty to the Christians of the Morea and resolved to clear the land of Albanian bandits. After 1770 the Porte had confiscated a number of Christian estates from 1718 to 1783 (see refs. above). The Porte granted a general amnesty to the Christians of the Morea and resolved to clear the land of Albanian bandits. After 1770 the Porte had confiscated a number of Christian estates from 1718 to 1783 (see refs. above).
struggle for independence (1821-33), London 1973). Soon after the beginning of the rising, the Moreots were masters of the lowlands and even occupied several strongholds. At the end of 1824, however, the Porte communicated to Ibrahim Pasha of Egypt to put down the Greek rising. Ibrahim was able to restore Turkish rule over most of Morea, but he failed to put down the rebellion (cf. Durant-Viel, Les campagnes navales de Mohamed Aly et d'Ibrahim, Paris 1935; E. Prevelakes, Ibrahim Pacha’s campaign in Argolis [in Greek], Athens 1950; D. Vayakakos, Ibrahim against Mavromichales, [in Greek], C. Kotsonis, Ibrahim’s 1st campaign in Lakonia, Sept. 1825 [in Greek], in Lakonikai Spoudai, iii [1977]). In the meanwhile, philhellene movements had made progress in Europe and America, and it thus came about that the cabinets of Europe began to take an interest in the question of Greek freedom (see Woodhouse, The Philellenes, London 1969, and the bibls. in L. Droulia, Philiellenismos, Repertoire bibliographique, Athens 1973). On 6 July 1827, England, France and Russia concluded a treaty in London by which the Morea and other parts of the Greek mainland were to form an independent principality but to pay tribute to the Porte. The Turks insisted on their point of view and declined the intercession of the great powers as regards the rebel Greeks. On 20 Oct. 1827, the combined fleets of the above-mentioned powers destroyed the Turco-Egyptian fleet at Navarino (see Woodhouse, The Battle of Navarino, London 1965). On 18 January 1828, Johannes Kapodistrias came to Nauplion, having been elected President of the Greek Free State by the National Assembly at Troczenze (see Woodhouse, Capodistria, the founder of Greek independence, Oxford 1973; Helen Koukkou, J. Sengones, [in Greek], in vols. ix-xii of the Encyclopaedia of Islam, VII (1936)). In the autumn of 1828 Ibrahim Pasha, the founder of Greek autonomy, was defeated by Charles X at the Battle of Navarino, 20 October 1822, and the Turkish fleet was destroyed. Ibrahim Pasha withdrew to Egypt. After long diplomatic negotiations, Prince Otto, the second son of the philhellenic Ludwig of Bavaria, landed at Nauplion on 6 February 1833 as the first king of Greece. Henceforth the Morea formed a part of the kingdom of Greece (cf. Dakin, The unification of Greece, 1770-1922, London 1972). During the rising of 1821-7 and later, many Moreot Muslims adopted Christianity. To this day, many buildings and inscriptions, and especially place-names, recall the days when the Morea was under the Crescent.


MORA [see MUKHARADJA].
MOBADA [see M. ABU-MADAD].
MORALS [see AKHLAK].
MORDVINS [see BURTAS].
MORISCOS, in modern historical terminology is
used to refer (a) to those Spanish Muslims who under various degrees of duress, were, between 1499 and 1526, converted to New Christianity and (b) to their descendants who continued to live in Spain until the Expulsion of 1609-14. Spanish authors at first referred to them as nusos cristianos/convertidos de moros, etc., New Christians or converts of Moorish origin, and it is not until the second half of the century that the term Morisco became current in this specific historical sense (it always continued to have its general sense of Moorish, as in ’the Moorish dress’). Sometimes the term Morisco is also applied to refugees after their arrival in North Africa and other Islamic lands, where they resumed their Islamic religion, although to a certain extent they retained for some generations a distinct identity. In Arabic such people were described as Andalus (sic), the term Murjakafun is a 20th-century loan word.

History. The first conversions occurred some years after the fall of Granada in 897/1492. The capitulation (publ. by M.A. Ladero Quesada, Los Mudejares de Castilla en tiempos de Isabel I, Valladolid 1969, dot. 50) seemed to guarantee the coming into being of a stable Mudejar [q. v.] minority, such as had existed for centuries elsewhere in Spain. This, however, was not to be. At first, under the first Archbishop of Granada Hernando de Talavera, the settlement was in general respected (although some capitulations were violated, e.g. prohibition on the bearing of arms, fiscal policy). A rapid and massive emigration of the upper classes to North Africa (perhaps under the influence of fatees, e.g. by Ahmad b. Yahya al-Wanghari [s. v.] [al-Mu’ażjar al-mu’rib wa’l-dżimis al-maghrib ‘an fatawa ahl Irakes wa’l-Andalus wa’l-Maghrib (Rabat 1401/1981), ii, 119-41] started. The arrival of the Archbishop of Toledo, Francisco Jimenez de Cisneros, in 1498 marked the abandonment of the initial policy (change of laws of heritage etc., New Christians or converts of vertidos de mows, nuevos cristianos) had had their rights guaranteed in the capitulation, but it seems that Cisneros’ methods to secure their return to Christianity led in December 1499 to a revolt in the Albaicin (al-Makkari, A. Cisneros de Granada, 1498-1504) which spread to the Alpujarras and had to be put down by military force (1501). Massive conversions followed, while many continued to emigrate. In February 1502 the Mudejares of Castile (which included Granada) were offered the choice between conversion, emigration or death (Ladero Quesada, op. cit., dot. 148). We may conclude, from the difficulties placed in the way of those who opted for emigration (they could only leave via the harbours in the Bay of Biscay and had to abandon most of their possessions) that conversion was what the Castilian authorities sought to achieve. In 1515 the new Castilian legislation was made applicable to Navarre when that was incorporated into the Spanish crown. Many Navarrese Mudejar communities took refuge in Aragonese territory, but the lands of the crown of Aragon (Aragon, Valencia) were not to remain long as a refuge. In 1521-2 during the disorders of the Germania, the mob turned against Mudejar vassals who had remained steadfastly loyal to their Christian lords and subjected them to forcible baptism. The validity of such baptism was contested, but a Junta of theologians confirmed it in 1525. In 1526 the general conversion order of all Muslims residing near to the coasts. After 1570, we have to distinguish in Castile Moriscos Antiguos and Granadinos. These latter did not easily integrate into Castilian society. From 1570 onwards several radical repressive solutions were advanced, and there was in government circles already by 1582 a preference for expulsion, but the economic consequences were feared. Some individual members of the clergy, such as the Valencian Archbishop Ribera, also favoured (partial) expulsion. However, other important elements among the ecclesiastical leadership, such as
the Valencian bishops in their meeting of 1608-9, refused to declare the Moriscos collectively apostates and opted for a renewed effort to convert them. It seems that the Valencian did not take legal measures. When the final decision to expel all Moriscos was taken in 1609 (doc. publ. in M. García Arenal, Los Moriscos, Madrid 1975, 231-5) by the Spanish authorities, it was mainly justified on grounds of national security (an alleged Morisco conspiracy with foreign powers). Moriscos at that time numbered about 200,000, probably 35% of the population. Christian lords were indemnified for the losses caused by the departure of their workforce. Between 1609 and 1614 the Moriscos were expelled in phases. Some communities were directly transported via the harbours in the south to North Africa, others crossed to France, and went — sometimes via Italy — to the Ottoman Empire, Egypt, Algeria, but above all to Morocco and Tunisia. (It is known that some Moriscos escaped expulsion and remained in Spain.) Moriscos from Hornachos founded a pirate republic in Sâle which was for some time independent. Tunisia was the preferred place of exile. Important here was the favourable policy of the dey [q.v.] Uqbars. In Portugal, from which the Mudéjares had been expelled (to Castle!) in 1497, no native crypto-Muslim population had been integrated into society.

Religious life. In Radjab 910/December 1504, Ubayd Allah Ahmad b. Bú Dżum' a-al-Maghrawí thumma al-Walâhání allowed the Moriscos in a fatwa to practise takfiyya [q.v.] (see L. P. Harvey, Crypto-Islam in sixteenth-century Spain, in Actas primer congreso de estudios árabes e islámicos, Madrid 1964, 163-73). This fatwa was later translated into Spanish and copied out in al-Jamia [q.v.], which implies that it also circulated among the Moriscos exclusively written in Latin characters (an exception is the Arabic translation of the Lead Books: M.J. Hagerty, The translation of the Lead Books, in Sacred and Profane Texts, Leiden 1988. Studies. Between 1610 and 1618, a number of works defending the expulsion were published; on their influence, see F. Márquez Villanueva, El problema historiográfico de los moriscos, in Bull. Hispanique, lxxvi (1984), 61-135. Bibliographical. M.A. de Bunes, Los Moriscos en el pensamiento histórico, Madrid 1983; M. de Epañola, M.A. ed. M. Pater-

Bibliography (in addition to the literature mentioned above and in al-Jamia): The literature mentioned above is the only one appearing already after the expulsion. Important here was Francisco de Arós and B. Vincent, Historia de los moriscos, Madrid 1978. The bibliography of this standard work is used as a point of departure. Sources. W. Hoenerbach, Spanish-Islamic Urkunden, Bonn 1965; important sources are being published in the Collection de literatura española alfaymad-morisco (directed by A. Galán de Fuentes, 7 vols. have appeared since 1970); R. Kooi, Otman, dir. Ms. II, IV, 701-1, probably copied in Salonica in 1021/1612). The majority of religious works written after the expulsion have an anti-Christian character (see on religious polemic, L. Cardallà, Morisques et Chrétiens. Un affrontement polémique (1492-1604), Paris 1977). Ahmad b. Käsím al-Hadjari al-Andalusí became after his flight from Spain in ca. 1599 interpreter at the Moroccan court. He also was a scholar and a diplomat who visited Northern Europe and wrote a rifá, of which a summary, entitled Kitâb Náṣir al-dín 'alâ 'l-eisân, is extant.

Recopilación de al-Qâdirí al-Andalusí, Arenal, Los Moriscos, Madrid 1975, 251-5) by the Foundation for Islamic Sciences and Arabic Grammar (see P.S. van Koningsveld, Arabische en islamitische Urkunden, Hoenerbach, Spanish-1slamische Urkunden, 1985-6), 113-19; also G.A. Wiegers, H. de la Plegaria musulmana en el "Compendio de Al-Tulayfút", Saragossa 1987; A. Montaner Frutos, El Recomien-

Mostar is listed as a market town and centre of a district in Herzegovina, the southern part of the Yugoslav republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina (population 1895: 17,910; 1921: 18,176; 1961: 35,242; 1971: 47,600). Cevdet Yazmalan, 0-76 (eds) which is dated, according to MUKHARADJA. [see MUKHARADJA].

Specificite du probleme morisque au Portugal, A. L.P. Harvey, Aljamia Portuguesa revisited, Por-

In the early 1470s, Mostar was occupied by the early 1470s, Mostar was

The earliest reference to the settlement itself and its name is an abridged (sigmal) tarih defteri of the wilâyât-i Bosna (Anatürk Kirâplû, former Belediey Kütüphanesi, Cevdet Yazmaları, 0-76) which is dated, according to Şabanović, to the period from 26 January 1468 to 12 May 1469. In the defter Mostar is listed as a market (bâzâr) with the alternative names of “Mosdar” and “Kopriilu Hisar”, and with a total of 16 (non-Muslim) households. Mostar’s territory (wilâyât) at that time included 36 villages. Unlike nearby Blagaj, which had been the administrative centre of the dukedom in the pre-Ottoman period and which, together with Drin and Foča, had become a major administrative centre in the pre-Ottoman period and which, together with Drin and Foča, had become a major administrative centre in the pre-Ottoman period and which, together with Drin and Foča, had become a major

Mostar was the centre of the mulasaartulik of Hersek under its wali A’li Paşa Rizvanbegović (until 1851). A new complex of governmental and residential buildings (Pasha Sarayi, erected from 1833) as well as a summer residence (completed after 1844) are the architectural expression of ‘Ali Paşa’s high-flying political ambitions. Significantaly, he also built a medjidi (1847), founded a (Nakşbandî) dervish convent and erected a türbe (Sheh-Jojino turbe) over the supposed grave of a sheykh who had died more than a century before. With the establishment of a municipal administration (baladîya [q.v.], new street names (1867) and, for the first time, house numbers were introduced. Mostar became the centre of the newly-created Hersek wilâyeti in 1292/1875, and during the year 1293/1876 an official provincial newspaper (‘Neretva’) was published in Mostar. It ceased to appear when the wilâyât of Hersek was abolished by the end of the same year. Herzegovina again became part of the wilâyet of Bosna. On 5 August 1878, Austro-Hungarian troops occupied the town without firing a shot. Mostar
regained its central function when it became the administrative centre of the “Kreis” Herzegovina (“Occupationsgebiet”). In 1884, the railway line from Mostar (M Mostar) reached the town. Mostar’s last two traditional medreses closed their gates in 1924, and its rüştüye school ceased operation in 1925.

Mostar houses three institutions where documents and manuscripts in oriental languages are kept (Arhiv Herzegovine [see H. Hasandedić, Katalog arapskih, tur- skih i perzijskih rukopisa Arhiva Herzogovine, Mostar 1977]; Zavodi za medrese; and Provocinijal hercegovski franjevaca). A small collection of štiglić from Mostar is preserved in the Orijentalni Institut (Sarajevo).

**Bibliography:** In addition to the Bibl. in F. Bajraktarević, IA, art. Mostar, see H. Šabanović, Bosanski pašaluk, Sarajevo 1959; H. Kreševljaković, Kaputanjie u Bosni i Hercegovini, Sarajevo 1954; idem, Etnografski istrazi u Bosni i Hercegovini, Sarajevo 1961; T. Kruževac, Bosansko-hercevinski listovi u XIX. veku, Sarajevo 1978; V. Coroćić, Mostar i njegova srpska pravoslavna opština, Belgrade 1933; H. Hasandedić, Mustafija Čifli ef. Karabeg, mostarski muftija od 1857. do 1867. godine i okupacija Mostara, Sarajevo 1944; idem, Spomenice kulture turskog doba u Mostaru, Sarajevo 1980 (with earlier literature); A. Aličić and H. Hasandedić, Pripadnici trzine, curtija i četvedžija u Mostaru iz 1755. godine, in POF, xviii-xix (1973), 315-71; H. Hasandedić, Die Kämpfe der Äjane in Mostar bis zum Jahre 1833, in SoForsch, xxviii (1969), 123-82.

(M.O.H. URSINUS)

**MOUSUL** [see AL-MAWSH].

**MOULAY** [see MOLAY].

**MOUNTAIN** [see JEBEL].

**MOVEMENT** [see HARA].

**MOZAMBIQUE,** in origin the name of a town, is the legal name of the People’s Republic of Mozambique in south-east Africa. It lies south of Tanzania, and borders on Malawi, Zimbabwe, the Republic of South Africa and Swaziland. The state became independent from Portugal in 1975, and is formally Marxist and atheist, but the constitution “guarantees the freedom of citizens to practise or not to practise a religion.” In 1986 the population was ca. 12.5 m., of whom 13.5%, or 1,685,000, were Muslims, 15 to 20% Roman Catholics, 5% Protestants, and the rest pagan. The Muslims are found chiefly among the coast from the R. Ruvuma to ca. 25°S, and are Swahili-speakers, and inland in the provinces of Cabo Delgado, Niassa and Nampula, being mostly members of the Makua and Yao tribes, each of which has its own language. Disregarding Portuguese orthography, the form of Swahili is close to the Standard Swahili of Zanzibar.

The name Mozambique does not occur in Arabic literature before Ahmad b. Māḥdī (end of 9th/15th century) who writes it as Musambhī; we find it next in the History of Kilwa as Musanbih, a work now ascribed to ca. 1550. In Swahili, it is Musambo or Musambhi. In Arabic literature, and in the 16th and 17th century Portuguese writers, it is simply the name of one town among others, and never the name of the country. The practice of ascribing the name first to the coast and then to the whole area grew only slowly after Mozambique Island became the principal Portuguese settlement in 1568. The earlier name was Bilād al-Sufa, as explained below.

The statement in the Area handbook for Mozambique 1977 ed., that Roman coins of the 3rd and 4th centuries have been found on the coast is without foundation, and has been omitted from the 1985 edition.

There is no literary or archaeological evidence for Greek, Roman or Arab visitors or of imported artefacts antedating al-Mas’udi’s voyage of 304/916, when he visited Kanbalu in Bilād al-Sufa, that is to say, Pemba [q.v.]. He uses the term sufala in a general manner, speaking of the Sufālas of the Zanj as the limit of the Bilād al-Sūdān; and, elsewhere, that “the sailors of Umnām ... travel on the Sea of the Zanj as far as the island of Kanbaulu and Sufala and the Wākw.” In these contexts, sufala may be interpreted as “low-land” or “shoal”. Al-Mas’udi’s contemporaries Buzurg b. Shahrivar appears also to think of it as an area rather than what later was the settlement of Sofala, south of the present city of Beira, which at the turn of the 9th/15th century was ruled by a shykh appointed by the Sultan of Kilwa [q.v.]. The distinctions become yet clearer in al-Idrīsī, who divides the eastern African coast into four sectors: Bilād al-Barbār or (Barābāra), the present Somali coast [see SOMALIA]; Bilād al-Zanj [see ZANG]; the present coasts of Kenya and Tanzania, and the islands opposite them, with a capital at Mombasa. Bilād al-Sufa, also known as Sufala of the Zanj, Ard al-Tibr or Ard al-Dhahab, the “Land of Gold” par excellence; and finally Ard al-Wākw, presumably an onomatopoeic word to describe a land of click-speakers such as the Bushmen (Khoisan). He lists a number of names which he says are names of the Zandj from the 18th century; but the names are very distorted. The only one which has survived the mangling of the copyists is Sayūna/Safuna, which is presumably the Sena of the Portuguese. This, he says, is the capital of the Sufālyyūn, who are pagan Zanj.

The Hudud al-Islam, ca. 372/982-3, did not separate the Zanj from the Wākw, but combines them as Zangayn: Wākaski. It relates that Chinese merchants go there in great numbers to barter for gold, using sign language. Reciprocally, the Sung Annals speak of the reception of envoys from the area in 1071 and again in 1083, apparently with Persian interpreters, and describe their animals, domestic products and coinage. The description of their dress is very similar to that given by the Portuguese 400 years later, as mentioned below. We do not know in detail how the gold trade developed from the hinterland of the Mozambique coast, the present Zimbabwe. The History of Kilwa claims that it was first controlled from Mogadishu [see MAKDISHU], but that Kilwa obtained the monopoly in the 12th century A.D. It is not until the 16th century that Duarte Barbosa’s Book (ca. 1517-18) provides us with a description of the coastal trade place by place. The southernmost settlement of “Moors”—presumably Swahili—was on the Bazaruta Islands. It traded with the mainland, collecting ambergris, pearls and seed pearls for export. Further north at Sofala, the “Moors” spoke Arabic and had been settled for a long time. Coasting vessels from Kilwa, Mombasa [q.v.] and Malindi [q.v.] brought them cotton and silk cloths and beads; they exchanged them for gold “at such a price that those merchants departed well pleased”, and for ivory and ambergris. The local people wore silk or cotton loin-cloths, with cloths over their shoulders like capes, and turbans or caps. This Sofala has long since been eroded and swept away by the sea. Inland lay the great Kingdom of the Mwene Mutapa, and his great town of Zimbabochi (Zimbabwe), the source of the gold. There were further trading centres on the River Cuama and the town of Mangalē, to which much gold came, and the great town of Usangwag, now Asuncion, that is where many merchants, who traded in the same way as at Sofala. The natives spoke their own language,
that of the heathen", "but some speak Arabic". Still farther along was Mozambique, a city on three islands and with a very good harbour, with a "garif" as governor, presumably an appointee of Kilwa.

In 1505 Dom Manuel I had forts built at Sofala and Kilwa, to control the coastal trade and to provide refreshment stations on the way to India. Sofala had an undue reputation for wealth: Camões speaks of a rica Sofala, and Milton of "Sofala, thought Òphir", a false stress as well as a misleading statement. In 1594 Portuguese establishments were set up at Sena, Tete, and Quelimane, where Muslims had long been settled as traders, but outside these settlements and the Fortress of São Sebastião, which the Portuguese had built on Mozambique Island in 1568, the Portuguese.writ never ran more than feebly. An attempt to conquer the Mwene Mutapa in 1570 was a disaster. In the 16th century, he was paramount in the interior, which in the 17th and 18th centuries came to be dominated by the Maravi. On the coast, hereditary chiefs, almost all Muslims, ruled a number of chiefdoms: the most important were at Quitangonha, Sancul, Sangainge and Angoche. The Portuguese paid the chiefs salaries as vassals, while the chiefs regarded their salaries as tribute paid by the King of Portugal. The Portuguese were never more than few in number, as the accounts of the forts at Sofala and Mozambique, published by da Silva Rego up to 1588, show. When the Makua tribesmen came down and attacked Mozambique in 1750, the Portuguese could muster only thirty defenders, and in reality, the Portuguese were dependent upon the chiefs for armed support in times of friction or minor war. It was not until 1895, under international pressure, that the Portuguese instituted friction or minor war. It was not until 1895, under international pressure, that the Portuguese instituted

At the present time (1990) the disturbed state of the country and the fact that the nominal government is not in full control makes any research or accurate assessment of the situation impossible.


MOZARAB. Spanish mozárabe, Portuguesemozarabe, Catalan mosarà, a word of uncertain origin for which two etymologies have been proposed. In the 13th century, the Archbishop Rodrigo Ximenez (De rebus Hispaniae, iii, 22) declared
that the Christians living under Muslim rule after the conquest of 92/711 "Dicti sunt mixti arabes, eo quod mixti Arabibus convivebant". This Latin-based interpretation is the earliest known etymology of the word Mozarab. However, Arabist scholars of the 19th century (following F.J. Simonet) considered it an arabism, derived from musta'rab, musta'rib with the sense of "arabised, one who becomes arabised", an opinion generally accepted.

It is however disturbing to note that Hispano-Arabic texts are quite unaware of this term and never use it to describe the indigenous Christians, who are designated by the names 'adham, nasrani, dhimmii, mu'wshid, musriik or rumi. The first known reference is in a document from Leon ca. 1024, which mentions "muzaraves de rex tiraceros". It would seem appropriate to deduce from this that the name in question is not an original nomenclature, conveyed by emigrants themselves, but a sobriquet. It would thus be an insult, cast by the Christian conquerors against those who preferred to stay rather than flee from the invader and were thus open to the charge of "collaborating" with the occupying power. The Mozarab was thereby considered a dubious element, having suffered the contagion of the Arabo-Muslim enemy; in other words, he was "arabised", "impure", a type of hybrid, of mixed blood hence mixti arabes. This interpretation has the advantage of explaining an aspect of an extreme policy of Alfonso VI towards this group, after the conquest of Toledo in 1085, according in this respect with the directives of the monks of Cluny and the position of Pope Gregory VII who had decided to extirpate the "superstition Toletanae".

The term Mozarab (variants: muzaraves, muztarabes, mozarabes and mozaboros) would therefore have originated in Christian territory and not in the Arab-Islamic zone. It is thus perfectly legitimate to apply it to their artistic manifestations outside the frontiers of al-Andalus (illumination of the manuscripts of the Beatus, chapels constructed in the kingdom of Leon during the 9-10th centuries, etc.) and to their liturgy, which is preserved at Toledo. On the other hand, to insist (as with Simonet, Cagigas, Lévi-Provençal and others) on accepting as authentic Mozarabs only the inhabitants, there being virtually no resistance, with the exception of the battle of the Wadi Lakko [q. v.]. This explains the numerical diminution of the nasara dhimmiyin alone, hindering the understanding and appreciation of the breadth of the historical phenomenon.

The existence and continuing presence of Christians in al-Andalus were among the consequences of the Arabo-Muslim occupation of 92/711 and the manner in which the latter was administered. It is now generally accepted that it is not appropriate to talk of conquest, but rather of the political submission of the inhabitants, there being virtually no resistance, with the exception of the battle of the Wadi Lakko [q. v.]. The absence of resistance and the fact of capitulation imply the preservation of former structures (capped by an Islamic political superstructure) in the sense of mu'tahidun and dhimmiiyyin [see MUTHANA and DHIMMA]. We are fortunate in knowing the text of the "treaty of Tudmir", dated 94/713, which guaranteed the maintenance of the previous order (non-intervention in internal affairs, protection of property, freedom of worship and freedom from enslavement). Those who were covered by the dhimmiiyyin Allah were bound not to give sanctuary to fugitive slaves or to enemies, not to conceal information concerning adversaries and to pay annually a dijaza [q. v.], a sum calculated partly in gold and partly in kind. The maintenance of property in the ownership of those who capitulated is a fact known and confirmed by the case of the possessions of Tudmir, the Bâni Kasi [q. v.] of Aragon, the descendants of Witiza, etc.

The indigenous Christians also retained their administrative, judicial and religious structures. It is thus that we find a Comes/kamis [q. v.] acting as chief representative of his community in dealing with the Islamic state. In view of the fact that the state did not deal directly with individuals as such, but with their community, considered responsible for the economic status of each of its members, the comes found himself invested with fiscal functions (exceptori/mustakhrđ) and judicial functions (censorikâdi l-nasârâ, kâti l-'adham) which he could either exercise personally or delegate. The preservation of religious structures is evident from our knowledge of the existence of numerous churches and convents, the maintenance of the episcopal sees of Toledo, Saragossa, Seville, Cordova, Mérida, Malaga, Escula, Péchina and Elvira, the "voluntary martyrdom" movement, the expedition of Alfonso I of Aragon in 1125-6 against Granada, from which he withdrew followed by 10,000 Mozarabs and the fatwâ [q. v.] of Abu l-Walid Ibn Ruhd justifying the deportation to the Maghrib ordered by the Almoravid Ali b. Yusuf, as well as the conversion of the Mozarab community by the Almoravids.

It is indiscutable that in the 2nd/8th century the overwhelming majority of the population of al-Andalus was composed of indigenous Christians. But the Muslim community very quickly added to its strength through a combined programme of immigration, mixed marriages (Muslim and dhimmiiyyin), and, especially, through the conversion of numerous native muslims [q. v.] and through the mofarabes [q. v.] descendants of mixed marriages. Conversions were conducted, after renunciation of the former faith, according to precise legal formulae, of which we possess examples from the 4th-5th/10th-11th centuries for Christians, Jews and Madjus [q. v.] (Le passage à l'Islam dans al-Andalus, in Actes UEAI [1986], 161-83). This explains the numerical diminution of the nasara dhimmiyin, and with it the weight of the indigenous Christians, of the mofarabes [q. v.] descendants of mixed marriages. The indigenous Christians also retained their administrative, judicial and religious structures. It is thus that we find a Comes/kamis [q. v.] acting as chief representative of his community in dealing with the Islamic state. In view of the fact that the state did not deal directly with individuals as such, but with their community, considered responsible for the economic status of each of its members, the comes found himself invested with fiscal functions (exceptori/mustakhrđ) and judicial functions (censorikâdi l-nasârâ, kâti l-'adham) which he could either exercise personally or delegate. The preservation of religious structures is evident from our knowledge of the existence of numerous churches and convents, the maintenance of the episcopal sees of Toledo, Saragossa, Seville, Cordova, Mérida, Malaga, Escula, Péchina and Elvira, the "voluntary martyrdom" movement, the expedition of Alfonso I of Aragon in 1125-6 against Granada, from which he withdrew followed by 10,000 Mozarabs and the fatwâ [q. v.] of Abu l-Walid Ibn Ruhd justifying the deportation to the Maghrib ordered by the Almoravid Ali b. Yusuf, as well as the conversion of the Mozarab community by the Almoravids.
Romano-Christian personality and its assimilation into Arabo-Muslim society. In this sense, there has been misunderstanding of the testimony provided in 854 by the \textit{Indiculus luminosus} (constantly repeated) regarding the increasing ignorance of Latin. The emphasis and the anguish of Alvarus were not concentrated on this point but, judging by the length and the violence of the paragraph, on Islamisation, and, in a subsidiary fashion, on its historical corollary, arabisation. The real danger felt was cultural: the adoption of clothing, hair-styles, fashions, circumcision, polygamy, dietary restrictions, music, literature etc.

The technique followed by the “suicide martyrs” was simple. In the majority of cases there was first a “provocation”, consisting in insulting in a manifest and public manner either the person of the Prophet, or the Islamic religion, or both. These actions took place preferably during the communal Friday prayers, or even before the bench of the kādd. This constituted the legal crime of blasphemy (\textit{istikhāf}) requiring the execution of the culprit. Four-fifths of the 51 cases recorded belong expressly to this genre. The eight other cases are technically apostasies, the consequences of “conversion by consanguinity”, the \textit{shari'a} stipulating that minors become Muslims \textit{ipsa facta} with the conversion of the father. It was among these former minors who, on attaining their majority, sought to reclaim their Christianity, that there were recruited the majority of lay persons executed for the crime of apostasy (\textit{sītādīd} [see MURTADO]). It may be noted that at least 75% of those condemned were priests or monks and that cases of \textit{istikhāf} were an almost exclusively male phenomenon. With three exceptions, all the known cases took place at Cordova.

This is explained by the nature of the available sources (all emanating from Cordova) and, especially, by the fact that the centre of agitation was located in the capital.

It is clear that the ideologue was the priest Spera in Deo (the principal actors were all his disciples or had been in contact with them). The focus of the movement was located in the monastery of Tabanos (the activity ended of its own accord following the destruction of the monastery by Muhammad I). The agitation and propaganda were, indisputably, Eulogius, who composed the \textit{Memoriale sanctorum} (during the latter’s absence from Cordova, agitation eased, fading away definitively after his execution). Finally, there is the apologist and historian of the movement, Alvarus, author of the \textit{Vita Eulogii} and \textit{Indiculus luminosus}. Naturally, such an extremist attitude could not fail to polarize opinions. On the one hand, there was the small activist group of potential “suicide martyrs”, and on the other, the overwhelming majority of Christians, supporters of the \textit{status quo}, wanting only to live their lives, if possible without drawing attention to themselves and thus causing problems.

The latter position was also that of the Umayyad amirate, seeking, politically, to maintain public order (at the least expense) and, fiscally, to retain the value of its tax levies undiminished. It was in this spirit of continuity that the Council of Cordova was convened in 852, presided over by Recafred, Bishop of Seville, and the exceptor Gomez, representing the Islamic administration. The Council (with the single exception of Saul, bishop of Cordova) condemned voluntary sacrifice as a form of disguised suicide. The dissidents were imprisoned by the ecclesiastical authorities. The execution in 853 of Eulogius marks the end of the “martyrdom” movement.

During the amirate of Muhammad I, the pressure of taxation was intensified considerably. As a result of the new census carried out by the Bishop Hostegesia, it extended to all parishes, even the most remote. There was thus a new reaction against Muslim society but, this time, discontent was to be expressed differently. The movement benefited from the instability caused by the crisis of adaptation of the structures of the primitive Arabo-Muslim conquering society to the conditions of a new situation, the situation created by the growing number of neo-Muslims (\textit{muwallad, muladi}) and their need for integration. There was a series of widespread rebellions, and the Christians seized the opportunity to express their separatist tendencies. It may be noted that the “martyrs” had constituted an urban and religious reaction; now it was the rural areas which were affected, and the manifestations of revolt of a political nature (Ibn Hayyān, Muktasbas, iii; Ibn Hawkal, K. Sārat al-arf). In this sense it is symptomatic that ʿAbd al-Rahmān III, during his first campaigns to recapture rebel-held fortresses (e.g. Juviiles), executed only their Christian defenders, not doubt considered “incorrigible”. But the fact should not be ignored that there was, within Bobastro itself, a significant group of supporters of the \textit{pax islamica}, led by the bishop Ibn Māṣikīm and other Christian dignitaries (Ibn Hayyān, Muktasbas, v, 74, 92, 92, 119, 135) and clearly opposed to the rebellious Ḥafṣūn policy since 300/912 at least.

Simultaneously, a phenomenon of “Umar b. Ḥafṣūn [q.v.] the “symbol and champion of Christian nationalism” [see MULUK AL-ʾARAB], whereas in fact this was a simple political revolt. The conversion of ʿUmar is far from being historically proved (\textit{Precisiones acerca de ʿUmar b. Ḥafṣūn, in Actas Jornadas Cultura Arabe} [1985], 163-75); in addition, he never sought to ally himself with the Christian kingdoms of Spain and remained under Islamic (ʿAbdāzīd and Fāṭimid) sovereignty. His capitulation to the Umayyad caliphate in 303/915 and the surrender of the last Ḥafṣūnids in 315/927 marked the end of Christian political movements.

Henceforward, there was room for only two tendencies: integration of the nasārā dhimmīyyīn into Muslim society or emigration towards the Christian zones. Very soon, the nasārā are seen acting as aides to the authorities (of the caliphate). The bishops of Seville, Pechina and Elvira were sent to the court of Ramiro II with the object of obtaining the release of Muhammad b. Ḥāshim al-Tujībī. Thus in 955 Bishop Recemundus (alias Rabī b. Zayd) was inter palatina officia, ambassador to the court of Emperor Otto I; a little later he was sent on a similar mission to Constantinople. The same Recemundus served as interpreter to John of Gorza and Walid b. Khayzurān for Ordoño IV, and it was Ashbāgh b. Nabil who, in 394/1004, arbitrated in the dispute between Menendo Gonzales and the Castilian Count Sancho Garcia. These Mozarabs also participated in the cultural movement; Rabī b. Zayd composed in 350/961 the \textit{Kitāb al-Anāq} [q.v. \textit{Calendario de Cordova}], and other indigenous Christians collaborated in the translations of the \textit{Materias medicas} of Dioscorides. There is much discussion regarding a supposed Mozarabic Romance lyric which allegedly led, by means of the \textit{khārdjīa} [q.v.], to the appearance of strophic forms such as the \textit{sadgal} and the \textit{muwaṣṣkhīb} [q.v.]. Later, the \textit{dhimmīs} are found acting (for political and fiscal reasons) as the indispensable administrative assistants of the petty monarchs of the \textit{ṣūlas} [see MULUK AL-ʾARAB]. 2. In Spain.

The other alternative was emigration from Andalusian territory. Evidently, for ideological reasons, the nasārā dhimmīyyīn were drawn towards their co-religionists of the north, but there were other motives
too. The Christian kingdoms could only continue to expand by successfully colonising the territories that they had occupied to the north of the Douro. These territories were virtually uninhabited, and it was therefore necessary to repopulate them. One method used was to induce the Asturian mountain-dwellers to leave their traditional homes and settle the land (guaranteeing to them their own law, tax exemptions, rights of tenure and agriculture); the other was to attract immigrants from al-Andalus. Such was the policy which enabled Alfonso III to colonise the conquered territories, of which he built fortresses (Zamora 893), designed to protect the new ‘frontier’. Naturally, the Christian appeal worked most strongly on monks and those with religious vocations, and among the emigrants one was to become Bishop of Orense and others were to found monasteries (San Miguel de Escalada in 913, San Cebrían de Mazote in 916, San Martín de Castañeda in 921, San Facundus-Sahagún in 935) which constituted typical examples of Mozarabic architecture. These emigrants brought with them their knowledge of the language (writing Arabic glosses on Latin manuscripts, disseminating Arabo-Islamic works and composing the Glossarium latino-arabicum of Leiden), constituted the base of the intellectual movement of the “School of Translators of Toledo”, introduced Arabo-Islamic techniques, and supplied al-Andalus with a fragment of an Axumite gold piece, possibly of the 6th century ruler Joal, which has been found, and, together with a fragment of an Axumite gold piece, possibly of the 6th century ruler Joal, which has been found, and, another Arab from al-Kufa who had evidently been contained before it was disturbed in the fuero of Léon. In this sense, it is undeniable that they contributed powerfully to the intellectual and cultural arabisation of the Christian kingdoms.

These emigrants were well aware of the internal political situation of the musáib al-taṣrāḥ. They thus had an innate vocation as ‘experts on Islamic affairs’ and as such, were bound to exert a certain influence over Christian policy in the 11th century. It is thus that we see Sisnando Dividix (Amir ‘Abd Allāh, Tibyān; García Gómez and Menéndez Pidal, El conde Sisnando Davídix y la política de Alfonso VI con los Taifas, in al-Andalus, xii [1947], 24-41), a native of Tentugal, in the service of al-Mu'tādīd [q.v.], and later in that of Ferdinand I, to whom in 1064 he recommended the conquest of Coimbra, of which he was the first governor: “Ego Sisnandu gratia Dei consul comibriensis... et alcis/im dominum Sisnandum Colimbricensem.” He subsequently became assistant and adviser on Islamic affairs to Alfonso VI, and the one responsible for his policy of economic harassment against the Andalusian petty monarchs (the parias). It is evidently he who was behind the surrenders of Toledo and the conditions stipulated for nascent Mudejarism. This is clearly the case, since the firm and insinuative line taken by the monks of Cluny and Queen Constance were to lead to his replacement as governor of Toledo by Pedro Ansurez.

The Mozarabs were by this time no longer indispensable, being replaced demographically by the influx of European emigrants, and the land being no longer neglected but cultivated by the Mudejars [q.v.]. Culturally, they were to be replaced in the future by Cluny and the French influence. In this period that Pope Gregory VII decided to suppress the ancient Visigothic liturgy and chant. In order to do this, in 1077, Alfonso VI resorted to a double ordeal (by fire and judicial combat), of which he did not accept the result, suppressing the ancient Hispanic rite in his dominions in 1080 “for all those who were not Mozarabs or their descendants”. (The Mozarabic rite was to be revived in Toledo in 1500 by Cardinal Cisneros.) Paradoxically, following the seizure of Toledo, it was no longer the kingdom of Castile-Léon which was the centre of the Mozarab movement, the latter migrating towards the Levant (where the Cid exercised a rather more tolerant policy) and Aragon, where Alfonso I was to concede to them the fuero of 1126 (imitated in 1156 by Alfonso VII of Castile).

names of nine Muslim rulers hitherto unknown. They are clearly local, and in the style described by J. Walker as Kilwa type. The obverses have a pious expression with one of the Beautiful Names of God (or a similar epithet), chosen to rhyme with the name of the ruler on the reverse. The script, in floriated Kufic of great delicacy and refinement, resembles certain of the issues of 'Ali b. al-Hasan of Kilwa and of al-Hasan b. 'Ali of Zanzibar, as hitherto described. Together with copper pieces of other rulers, it is possible to reconstruct a genealogy that covers four or five generations. The other finds, which varied in quantity from place to place, all the way from Shanga in the Lamu archipelago to Kilwa in Tanzania, and including Pemba, Zanzibar and Mafia, suggest a local dynasty somewhat resembling the Ayyūbids, who contempornaneously with different members of the family in different capitals. The close resemblance of the coins, scarcely distinguishable in style from one another without close inspection, suggests a single workshop and a short-lived dynasty. Their high standard of craftsmanship may be taken as a reflection of the local standard of civilisation. That the ceramic does not antedate ca. 1050 presents a certain difficulty, that can be overcome if it is accepted that the capital may then have recently moved.

The name Mtambwe is of special interest, because the Bantu root—Mtambwe—is recorded otherwise only in Kenya and as far away as Zaire.


250 MTAMBWE MKUU — MU'ĀHADA

up at the Peace of Carlowitz [see KARLOFČA] in 1699. This and subsequent treaties were contracted in the spirit of Hugo Grotius's Law of Nations, which was considered neutral by both Islam and Christendom. After that, the term mu'āhade was increasingly used, although 'ahd-nâme was still used at times. The general structure of these treaties, however, remained constant (as did other Ottoman documents; see DIPLOMATIC, esp. at ii, 314-15); (a) Praise to Allâh; (b) Blessing of the Prophet Muhammad; (c) The scope and importance of the treaty; (d) Declaration of intent to refrain from any action contrary to the treaty; (e) A detailed explanation of the nature of the treaty; (f) Why the treaty must be observed; (g) Beseeching Allâh to aid the contracting parties in remaining loyal to one another; and (h) Date. These changes in style and structure were reflected in dictionaries of the Ottoman and Turkish Republican eras. Those of Meninski (1680 and 1780) and even Bianchi (1837) merely mentioned that mu'āhade meant "treaty", whereas later dictionaries, such as those of Redhouse (1890), the Kâmis-û Türkî of Sâmî and the Lughat-î Nâdî (both 1318/1900-1) emphasised bilateral features. Official and private usage continued to employ the term mu'āhade during the 1920s and early 1930s (see examples in the Bibli., below). In 1935, the Türk Dil Kurumu's Osmanlîcânad Türkçeyi cop kâirasını translated mu'āhade as andlasma; the latter term (sometimes written andläsmä) generally superseded the former. Still, in 1944, the Türk Hukuk Kurumu's Türk hukuk tâşñası listed the following uses: muahade—treaty; hakem muahedesi—bond of arbitration; ittifâk muahedesi—alliance agreement; ticaret muahedesi—commercial convention; kamet muahedesi—convention respecting conditions of residence and business; sulh muahedesi—treaty of peace; and dostluk muahedesi—treaty of friendship. According to V. Heyd (Language reform in modern Turkey, Jerusalem 1954, 99), on the same day in 1953, three different newspapers in Istanbul used, respectively, muahede, andlasma and pakt for the same agreement. While Ottoman treaties were always in Turkish, they were usually accompanied by versions in European languages, generally French, although English, Italian and other languages were also used at times. Those of the Turkish Republic were in Turkish, frequently accompanied by a translation: into French in the early years, subsequently into the languages relevant to the signatories.

In Arabic, mu'āhada or 'ahd has sometimes been used interchangeably with ittifâk or ittifâksîya (the former may also mean "contract", while the latter means, more strictly, "agreement"). Its employment in the sense of "treaty" appears to have been borrowed from 19th century Ottoman usage by officials, scholars and journals concerned with international relations. Al-Taḥsâwî, al-Taḥriḥât al-şâfiyya, Cairo 1834, i, 77, and Hasan Kâsim, Ta'rîkh mu'lûk fransâsî, Cairo 1264, 305, use mu'āhade to describe the Swiss confederation; but al-Wâsâilî al-Miṣârî, Cairo, no. 92 (1847), 2, employs the term for a commercial agreement, and no. 126 (1848), 3, uses mu'âhade al-ṣulh for peace treaty. In 1870, Butrus al-Bustânî's Muḥâṣī bi l-muḥâṣî (ii, 1491) defined mu'âhada as follows: "The mu'âhada, as used by politicians, is a contract (ittifâk) undertaken by two states, generally referring to defined aspects of commerce, politics (siyâsâ), or other matters; also known as 'ahd-nâmâ." A collection of documents, chiefly from the Arabic-language periodical al-Dhâraî al-Dhârâî, published in Istanbul in seven volumes and entitled Kâmûs al-mu'âhâdât (2267-78) included (v. 1294/1877, 6-15) the text of the
1856 Paris Peace Treaty, rendered as Mu'ahadat sanat 1856. The term mu'ahadah, as employed by officials and journalists in the late 19th century, apparently first entered a political usage in a corpus of official documents, not coincidentally comprising Ottoman treaties since 1740, in an Arabic translation, entitled al-Mu'ahadah al-dawliyya 'llati 'akhadathu 'l-dawla al-'asryya (Cairo 1896).

Later, the term was increasingly employed by Arab states achieving independence or a semi-independent status, as in the 1915 agreements as between Great Britain, al-Idrissi, and Ibn Sa'ud (texts in 'Alam al-Dîn's 'Uhad, 62-3 and 64-6). Since the end of the First World War, the term was employed both for bilateral treaties between Arab states themselves (e.g. the 1931 treaty for the extradition of defectors between 'Irak and Egypt) and with the Powers (as in the 1930 Treaty of Alliance between 'Irak and Great Britain, or between Egypt and Great Britain in 1936), as well as for multilateral treaties (e.g. the Convention and Statute of Freedom of Transit, Barcelona 1921, or the Convention and Statute on the International Régime of Maritime Ports, Geneva 1923). The same applied to Arabic collections of treaties (e.g. by Dîhâni, 1355/1937) or studies in international law (e.g. by Ghânîm, 1961). The term was also referred to by 'Abd al-Man'îsî as having been essentially interchangeably used in connection with secular politics: the authorities of al-Azhar, after due consideration, published a lengthy statement supporting the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty (al-Mu'ahadah takfîmi 'al-îkhâd al-'islami, in al-Ahrâm, 10 May 1979, 1, 10). Arabic treaties are frequently accompanied by translations, generally in French or English.

In Persia, mo'âdeth or 'ad-nâmeh has sometimes meant "star contract" (which also means "contract"), paymân (often employed in the sense of "pact" as well) and recently muwâfat-khân-nâmeh (which also means "agreement"). The term appears in sources of the 5th/11th and 6th/12th centuries in the sense of "alliance" or "agreement" (Nîshâbûrî's Kîsîy al-arbîyâ, 'Avârî al-bayhâdi, etc.) and was later adopted to mean "treaty". By the 19th century, these terms were used interchangeably with farâ'îrîd (which also means "agreement"). The term appears in sources of the 5th/11th and 6th/12th centuries in the sense of "alliance" or "agreement" (Nîshâbûrî's Kîsîy al-arbîyâ, 'Avârî al-bayhâdi, etc.) and was later adopted to mean "treaty". By the 19th century, these terms were used interchangeably with farâ'îrîd (which also means "agreement"). The term appears in sources of the 5th/11th and 6th/12th centuries in the sense of "alliance" or "agreement" (Nîshâbûrî's Kîsîy al-arbîyâ, 'Avârî al-bayhâdi, etc.) and was later adopted to mean "treaty". By the 19th century, these terms were used interchangeably with farâ'îrîd (which also means "agreement").

As a long-standing independent state, Persia has contracted numerous treaties over the years. In 969/1561-2, a mission from the Ottoman Sultan Süleyman came to the Safavid court of Shah Tahmasp I and contracted a treaty (eṣâh-nâmeh) of friendship and an agreement for extradition of political criminals, as a result of which Bâyezîd, son of Süleyman, who had found refuge in Persia, was handed over to the Sultan's representatives. In April 1617, a commercial treaty was signed between Shah 4'Abbâs I and King James I of England. The first treaty with France was signed at Versailles in 1664, followed by a second in 1708. In 1148/1735-6, Nâdir Shah contracted a peace treaty with the Russian Government, according to which the cities of Derbend and Baku were returned to Persia. In the 19th century, several treaties were contracted with Great Britain (political and commercial agreements in 1801, a definitive treaty of friendship and alliance in 1812 and many others) and with Russia (Treaty of Gulistan, 1813; of Türkmançây, 1828; Peace and Friendship, 1828; and numerous agreements) these being the two Powers most actively interested in Persia at the time. However, while most earlier treaties were freely negotiated, the treaty of Türkmançây with Russia was signed under duress and granted to Russia extraterritorial rights, similar to the capitulations in the Ottoman Empire (see îmâlîzâhî, esp. at îii, 1191-2).

As Persia commenced modernisation, numerous other treaties were drawn up; in 1857 alone, treaties were contracted with Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Great Britain, the Netherlands and Sweden, to which treaties of friendship and commerce with other states were added subsequently. Such treaties were usually written in Persian and French and later—since the end of the Second World War—in Persian and English. Traditionally, treaties contracted by Persia had the following general structure: (a) Praise to Allah; (b) A preamble, presenting the signatories and noting the intent of the treaty; (c) The treaty itself; (d) Ratification and validity; and (e) Place and date.


Ottoman treaties were officially published by the Government, along with laws, in Diiit, Istanbul 1289-1302; a sequel was issued in Istanbul 1329-37/1928. Collections: One of the earliest collections of Ottoman treaties is Ahmed Feridun's Me'muajiyi-yi monge'el al-salatin, i-ii, Istanbul 1274-5 (for the 10th/16th century; Feridun himself died in 1516). A sequel was issued in Istanbul 1284; G. Aristarchi (ed.), Negoziamenti di pace fra la Turquia e i popoli di lingua ebraica, vols., Venice 1719-35 (published as the Secreti del commercio, 1692-1735, in English: League of Arab States, Treaty series: Agreements and conventions concluded between member states..., n.p. n.d. [Cairo 1955]). Also in French: Ligue des Etats Arabes, Texte des traites et conventions conclus entre les Etats Membres..., n.p. n.d. [Cairo 1955].


Mu'aḥada — Mu'ākhaṭ


Treaties and treaties relating to Iran: Eduard Hertsla, ed., Treaties, etc. concluded between Great Britain and Persia, and between Persia and other foreign powers, wholly or partially in force on the 1st April, 1891, London 1891 (comprises treaties since 1801); C. U. Aitchison, A collection of treaties, engagements and sanads relating to India and the neighbouring countries, 23, Calcutta 1933; A. Ḥamzawī, Persia and the Powers: an account of diplomatic relations, 1941-46, London n.d. [1946] (with texts of treaties); M. A. Iqberdīriyye, Irving in medīchnārādānītī omeyyānīkūy perūy xexī va-nāhī, Samarkand 1961 (with texts of treaties); A. W. Māzāndārānī, ed., Rāhbaanā-yī waḥdū wa-ahdāhānā-yī ʿIrān, Tehran 1341 gh.; M. Afchar, La Politique européenne en Perse: quelques pages d'histoire diplomatique, Tehran 1973 (comprises France, and most other European powers, including those from several treaties and sanads relating to France).


Mu'ākhaṭ (a.) “brothering”, is a practice found in the early days of Islam by which two men became “brothers”.

The best-known example is the “brothering” by Muhammad of Emigrants from Mecca with Muslims from Medina. This may have happened soon after he reached Medina, but is placed by Ibn Iṣāḥk just before the battle of Badr, accompanied by a list of thirteen such pairs (Ibn Ḥāṣim, 344-6). It is clear, however, from Ibn Ḥabīb (Muḥabbar, 70 f.) that there had previously been some “brothering” at Mecca, and he gives a list of nine sanads relating to this practice (ed.). This is constituted partly by Ibn Iṣāḥk’s statement that Muhammad himself was “brothered” with “Ali and his uncle Ḥamza with Zayd b. Ḥāṣira, and also by a number of statements in the notices of individual Meccan
Muslims in Ibn Sa'd's Tabakat, even though there are some discrepancies. Ibn Habīb goes on to speak of ‘brothers’ and ‘heirs’ to Muhammad’s property but also one of his two wives. The statement of Ibn Hisham (933) that Muhammad ‘brothered’ the later caliph Muawiya’s caliphate the latter claimed died during Mu‘awiya’s caliphate is not to separate from one another in battle, but the word he uses is allafa.

Ibn Hābīb says VIII, 75, was revealed before any one had inherited in this way. There are several accounts of how the wealthy Ansārī Sa’d b. Rabi’ gave his ‘brother’ Abūd al-Rahmān b. ‘Awwī not only half of his property but also one of his two wives. The statement of Ibn Hisham (933) that Muhammad ‘brothered’ the later caliph Mu‘awiya’s caliphate is not to separate from one another in battle, but the word he uses is allafa.

**Bibliography:** Given in the article. See also all the ši‘ī books, in the sections on zahra. (Ed.) Al-Ma‘allaka (a.) a collection of pre-Islamic Arabic poems, generally numbered at seven. The tradition of poetical anthologies is old, and often in much later, times.}

---

Finally, another critic of the opening years of the 6th/12th century, al-Tibrizi, enumerates ten Mu‘allakât by adding to the previous names that of Abīd b. al-Abraṣ. Clearly, the only names common to all the lists are those of Imru‘ al-Kays, Zuhayr b. Abī Sulmā, al-Nabigha al-Dhubyanī, al-‘Āṣa Maymun b. Kays, Labīd b. Rabi‘a, ‘Amr b. Khulṭum and Tarafa b. Abīd. Ibn al-Nabīḥās for his part lists Imru‘ al-Kays, Tarafa, Zuhayr, Labīd, ‘Amr, al-Hārīb b. Hīlīza and ‘Antara b. Shaddīd. These failing varying lists are perhaps to be explained by the evolution of criticism, but more likely from combinations of circumstances involving tribal rivalries. All these persons lived substantially before the coming of Islam, in highly diverse and often antagonistic changes of circumstance: Christian, Jewish, Ghassānid environments, tribal confederations, etc., whose tensions must only have become gradually relaxed, leaving their traces in the literary judgments of the earliest, and often in much later, times.

Moreover, around the same time there appeared the collection of nine poems, adding to Ibn al-Nabīḥās’s selection the names of al-Nabīgha and al-‘Āṣa (e.g. in al-Zawzanī, 5th/11th century). Finally, another critic of the opening years of the 6th/12th century, al-Tibrizi, enumerates ten Mu‘allakât by adding to the previous names that of Abīd b. al-Abraṣ. Clearly, the only names common to all the lists are those of Imru‘ al-Kays, Tarafa, Zuhayr, Labīd and ‘Amr. The personality of each of all these authors is delineated, as far as the evidence allows, and their work analysed in the individual E. articles on them. In general, other poems are attributed to them as well as their Mu‘allaka, sometimes collected together into a divan.

Here we will note only the problems raised by these famous poems, beginning with that regarding their authenticity. The personality of the ‘transmitters’
such as Hammad, the presumed "originator" of the Moolallakat, and the uncertainties which surround their actions lead one to think that the attribution of these poems to persons duly classified and identified should be strongly regarded with caution. The faculties of adaptation even of imagination, by these intermediaries—their poems—do not authorise us to see in the "official" anthologies anything more than the reflection of an ancient poetical situation, expressing itself by poems more or less arbitrarily taken from a much greater and more varied production, at least as representative in any case of the ancient poetic genius.

Out of the lively debate raised up by Tahá Husayn in the nineteen-twenties when, as the first person in the Arabic-speaking environment, he cast doubt on the authenticity of pre-Islamic poetry, a middle position has emerged which is also that of the orientalists: in their form and content, and given that they comprise in part elements almost certainly apocryphal, the Moolallakat must be considered as fixed, if not stereotyped, specimens of a poetic tradition—already very old—vigorously flourishing in different parts of the Arabian peninsula. This tradition was made up of the kasída, comparatively lengthy, with a monorhyme, in the long metres which became classical, and dealing with the limited themes, in various proportions, which are described in the article kasída.


MU'ALLIM NAJDJ, Ottoman Turkish poet, born in Istanbul in 1850 and died there in 1893. He had a career as a school teacher, state employee and journalist, and later in his life was put in charge of the literary section of the newspaper which he owned, Turjimán-ı Hikayat. There, Nadjé seemed to support the poets following the old tradition and clashed with those upholding modern poetry, and after some clashes between him and the modernists, Ahmed Midhat released him from his duties on the newspaper.

At the beginning of his career as a poet, Nadjé wrote modern poetry in a simple language, but then he turned to classical Divân poetry and excelled in its techniques, especially in the use of the ʿarûd metre. Although he seemed to be siding with the old, he was actually caught up between the old and the new trends in Turkish literature, himself writing both modern and classical poetry. He believed that there was no difference between what was good in the East and the West, except that for him, the Turkish national spirit entailed upholding the traditions which included classical poetry.

Some of the themes in his poems are very modern in that they are about common people within everyday surroundings, and in such poems he uses everyday language. Most of his poems reflect his own feelings, with such themes as loneliness, alienation and escape. Although his poems are usually good in structure, with perfect metre, rhyme and harmony, the content is trivial; he lacked imagination and was very simplistic in his views, being only concerned with poetic style. As a reaction to Tanzim poetry that stressed content, Nadjé stressed structure, foremost of them all, the ʿarûd metre. Although he wrote about the problems of modern poetry, he did not follow the old ones. He was likewise concerned about the relations between ʿarûd metre and the Turkish language, and worked on harmonising them.

His works include collections of his poems Aşir şair (1883), Q Randolph (1884) and Furūzân (1885); essays, Moolallakat (1884) and Dümüme (1887); memoirs, Qarşî-i Hadsch, al-Qasıda (1889); a book, Heder (1920); a book on literary terms, Isâm-ı edebiye (1889); and an unfinished dictionary, Lughat-ı Nadjé (1890).

relations. Also, we can read in the *Luma*-, of Abu Ishak al-Shfrazf, the Shafic and Ashcarf author (d. 476/1083), that the *mu‘āmalāt* in their detailed prescriptions (fikhi-*mu‘āmalat*) are dependent on rational examination (nazar) and argumentation (istidāl). However, the decisions with regard to this regulation are dependent on *ṣiğma*.

The concept of *ṣama* is often attested in the Kur‘ān, but that of *mu‘āmalāt* is absent. If we have recourse to the *L.A.*, xi, 476, we read there that *mu‘āmalā* in the language of the people of ‘Itrāk is *mukāsil* [q. v.] in the language of the people of the Hijāz. The *Lidin* thus retains the meaning relating to transactional relations in agriculture as being specific to the term *mu‘āmalā*.

In other words, a practice concerning lands acquired in the strict sense of transaction, is a subterfuge under-*mudama* but that of *mukāsil* in the modern language. In fact, the merchant operated as a lender. This custom, Schacht states, was already in this period, at least in the Hidjaz, the term *mudama* (Introduction, ii, 476, we read there that *LA*, the *dmala* but that of *mu*).

However, the decisions with regard to this (istidāl). In other words, a practice concerning lands acquired in this context, the *mu‘āmalāt* are the manifestations of a certain etiquette regulated by a deontology in response to juridico-moral considerations. This deontology supplies solutions to the problems of conduct posed by socio-economic situations. There is, according to al-Qhāzīlī, continuity between the cultural concept of *dād* and the juridico-religious (fikhi) concept of *mu‘āmalāt*. It is the subject of the second rubā of the *Ihya*, the first dealing with the *shādāt*, the third with the *muḥkāmt* and the fourth with the *muqīydt*. Also, the *mu‘āmalāt* are integrated into a rigorously structured body of ethics. Finally, the constitution of this code of conduct of the Muslim calls for knowledge of the states of the soul (*kāl*) which contain monistic and the qualification (*Ihya*, iv, 306; *Lauot, Politique*).

Ibn Khaldūn himself was to stress the sociological aspect of the question, insisting on the fact that this problematic situation is dependent on reasoning. According to this author, the science of *mu‘āmalāt* represents a branch (farā) of *ilm al-*hikāt which forms part of rational, positive (‘ulūyya, tahlīyya) knowledge as opposed to traditional, scriptural (‘ulūyya wa’lla‘īdīyya) knowledge, in which Ibn Khaldūn ranks ‘hadīth, fikh, the *wāsīl al-fikh* and *kalām* (*Mukaddimā, 129 f. and especially 484). These two types of knowledge are diversified and refined in proportion to the development of civilisations. In this sense, Ibn Khaldūn is a forerunner of the modern theories on the matter.

According to the former Muhammad ‘Abdul (d. 1905 [q. v.]), followed in this by his disciple Rashīd Ridā (d. 1935 [q. v.]), only the general principles of *mu‘āmalāt* were revealed. Also in Kur‘ān, II, 188, and IV, 29, God forbids men from mutually robbing one another. The jurists derived detailed consequences from it (Arnaldez, 27). This way of looking at things is adopted by the moderns, both Sunni and *Shī‘ī*. The latter also have their reformers, represented by al-Wāḥidī al-Bihbāhānī, who are reacting against the *Akhbārī* school. This viewpoint is taken up by contemporary authors such as the Pakistani Muhammad Iqbal and K. Faruki and only recently by the Egyptian judge M. al-*Aṣhāwī*. Reviving the tradition of Shaykh ‘Ali ‘Abd al-Rāziq (d. 1963), al-*Aṣhāwī* published a short work entitled *al-Islām al-riyādī*. The fundamental idea of this work is to distinguish clearly between the perennial value of cultic prescriptions (*shādāt*) established by revelation and the relative character of juridical relations between men (*mu‘āmalāt*) subject to the requirements of history (cf. *Anawati, unpUBL. communication to the UEAiCongress, Budapest 1988*). Despite the attempts of certain contemporary jurists to return to an obscurantist literalism, we may say that in all the Islamic countries there is a clear tendency to revive religious jurisdiction with regard to *mu‘āmalāt* (*Colloques, 118–19*).

As for that which related to the manner in which this discipline is conceived by the different juridical schools, we can say that, if the divergences regarding
the ḫidābāt are very few between Sunnī and Ismāʿīlī Shiʿis, they are well-known as regards the maʿāmulāt. This is true especially for the transactions dealing with marriage, divorce and inheritance. It will be noted in this regard that the Ismāʿīlī practice differs as much in this regard that the Ismāʿīlīs have a distinct code and legal terminology. Moreover, this code and terminology, which he describes may have been used as ciphers, according to T. Fahd (loc. cit.). But the genius of Islamic civilisation itself and its strong literary bias, brought a concern with word games, literary conceits, paronomasia, riddles, acrostics, etc. [see lughz]. Out of all these strands arose an interest in and an employment of codes for secret communication within the caliphate, at a period when distances were great, roads were dangerous and messages could not safely be left en clair. Handling secret messages and codes, the use of invisible inks and other methods of concealment, have had to be part of the training of the secretary or kātib [q. v.].

Mediaeval Islamic society was heir to much of the heritage of previous cultures like these, seen in a marked interest of antiquarian scholars in secret writings, unknown scripts and numerology. This is exemplified at an early date in the K. ʿUsāl al-mustākhām fī maʿrifat rumūz al-akhām attributed to Ibn Wabshiyya (flor. 3rd/9th century [q. v.]); some of the ciphers which he describes may have been used as ciphers, according to T. Fahd (loc. cit.). But the genius of Islamic civilisation itself and its strong literary bias, brought a concern with word games, literary conceits, paronomasia, riddles, acrostics, etc. [see lughz]. Out of all these strands arose an interest in and an employment of codes for secret communication within the caliphate, at a period when distances were great, roads were dangerous and messages could not safely be left en clair. Handling secret messages and codes, the use of invisible inks and other methods of concealment, have had to be part of the training of the secretary or kātib [q. v.], and we know, for instance, that the Ghaznavid chancery under Masʿūd b. Muhāmid sent letters (muʿāmmā-nāma) in code (Bayḥākī, Taʿlīḥī al-Mawṣūlī, ed. Ḥānī and Fayyād, 318). It was not, however, apparently until Mamlūk times that the Arabic language became a major topic of study, and the scientific, numerical ciphers based on the substitution of one letter for another came into fashion. Ethiopian Egypt, according to the phonetic structure of the language (see C.E. Bosworth, account the characteristic combinations of letters in the language (see C.E. Bosworth, The origins of Muhammadan jurisprudence, Oxford 1950; idem, An introduction to Islamic law, Oxford 1964; E. Tyan, Histoire de l’organisation judiciaire en pays d’Islam, Leiden 1960, 1938-1943; J. Wakin, The function of documents in Islamic law, New York 1972; see also the Bibliography: Given in the article. For an excellent general work on codes and the history of cryptography begins in late mediaeval and Renaissance Italy, and soon becomes part of the common stock of diplomacy and intelligence-gathering. The Ottomans used codes and secret writing, as did the rulers of Persia. Thus a work on codes and secret writing, called al-Durar al-muntakhaba, was published at Istanbul in 1221/1806-7 by one Mehmed Hafṣī; whilst three works on cryptography, cryptanalysis and the use of codes for private and state correspondence respectively, were composed in the late 19th and early 20th century Persia by Mirzā Mahmūd b. Yūsuf (the Miḥfīṣ al-rumūz, the Kaʿfī al-ʿasrār-i ṇāṣīrī and the K. Nāṣīḥī al-rumūz wa-ramz-i Muhāmiddī, Tehran 1313, 1319, 1320 AH), who was awarded the lākāb [q. v.] of Miḥfīṣ al-Mulk by Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh Kāḏār for his services to the government as an encoder and decipherer (see Cl. Huart, rev. in JA, Ser. 10, vol. ix [March-April 1990], 360-2).
their use, see D. Kahn, The codebreakers, New York and London 1967. (C.E. BOSWORTH)

MU'AMMAR (a.), appellative of legendary as well as historical persons—who are alleged to have lived to an exceptionally great age.

Like Judaism and other ancient religions, Islam knows a category of people, almost always men, who are characterised by extreme longevity granted by God. These persons walked the earth immediately following the Creation and are believed to have done so intermittently until today (for a 20th century example see H. St. John B. Philby, Arabian Nights' Entertainments, London 1948, the 23rd photograph between pp. 224 and 225). Whereas for Jews Methuseelah is the longest living patriarch, for Muslims this is Noah. Definitions of how old a person must be to deserve the appellative differ widely. Since the Prophet Muhammad is credited with the statement that people who reach the age of seventy are especially blessed, this age is sometimes taken as starting point for the appellative to be applicable (cf. Goldziher, Abhandlungen, ii, pp. xxix f.), although the lower limit of eighty years is also given. Usually the lower limits fluctuate between one hundred and one hundred and twenty, while there is not really an upper limit. Various mu'ammarun are believed to have reached ages of three to six hundred years, but reports about still longer living persons have emerged through the centuries in all the regions of the Islamic world.

Still the most complete survey of mu'ammarun today is I. Goldziher's study with which he introduced his edition of one of the oldest collections of poetry attributed to various long-lived poets, sc. Abû Hātim al-Sijistani, d. 255/869 [q. v.], Kitāb al-Mu'ammarin, in his Abhandlungen zur arabischen Philologie, ii, Leiden 1889. (Abû Hātim's is not the oldest work on this subject, the Hayyānī, i.e. Adī, d. 206/821 [q. v.], is credited with a book on mu'ammar.) The poems preserved in this anthology deal with descriptions of the hardships of old age—often heralded by the greying of hair and beard—mixed with outbursts of nostalgia about lost youth and vigour. Verses of this sort constitute a separate genre in Arabic poetry practised by many poets of all times, also by those who do not (yet) deserve the appellative of mu'ammarun.

Apart from the richly annotated edition of this poetry and the accompanying akhbar, Goldziher gives a general introduction to the phenomenon which can be summarised under the following headings: a survey of the oldest mu'ammarun from pre-Islamic history: tribal patriarchs, princes, heroes and sages; the different ways in which old age is said to debitlate; a list of works written and compiled after Abû Hātim in which there are occasional references to, as well as special chapters about, mu'ammarun and their poetry; and the alleged role played by mu'ammarun in the evolution of guids (futuwa [q. v.] in Islam, which by means of long-lived patrons seek to project their origins back to a time long before the advent of Islam.

Goldziher also devotes space to the position of alleged mu'ammarun in the religious theorising of Sunni and Shi'i scholars. For the Shi'a, this boils down to the spreading of the belief in a hidden place from where he will emerge one day as the expected mahdi [q. v.] to rule the world once more with justice. The mu'ammar phenomenon is added here to bolster the doctrine and to lend the alleged re-emergence plausibility (cf. Abhandlungen, ii, pp. lxxi ff.). In this way Shi'a doctrine benefited from the ancient lore of the mu'ammarun, doctrine and folklore mutually strengthening each other.

Sunni Muslims have also made considerable use of the belief in the existence of the long-lived. Mu'ammarun, legendary as well as historical persons—the latter not necessarily themselves responsible for the advanced ages they are alleged to have attained—are depicted as having played an important role as transmitters of Prophetic traditions. This is especially attested in the earliest development of Kūfān isnāds, but on a lesser scale also in that of Baṣran isnāds. From the canonical collections it appears that hadīth transmission in Kūfā is connected in particular with Companions whose names are closely linked to Kūfā, among whom Ibn Mas'u'd [q. v.] is the most famous and prolific. Well, in the isnād strands from the Prophet, whose words are transmitted by a Companion via one or two other authorities, to the "common link" (for this term, see Bibli.), Ibn Mas'u'd's traditions required the names of two or three of Kūfā's distinguished jurists, e.g. Ibrahim al-Nakha'i (d. 96/714 [q. v.]) before the time gap between Prophet and "common link" was properly bridged. Ibrahim was born too late (cf. 50/670) to assume—or be placed in—the position of direct pupil of Ibn Mas'u'd (d. 323/625-2), so one more transmitter had to be inserted between them to create an uninterrupted isnād; this position was mostly filled by a member of Ibn Mas'u'd's so-called "circle", e.g. Alkama, Masrūk, al-Sawad b. Yazīd and several others. It is here that mu'ammarun make their appearance. For the Shī'īs: Prophet > Ibn Mas'u'd > one of his circle > Ibrahim > "common link" acquired eventually large numbers of alternative strands supporting more or less the same mates, parading instead of five names only four: Prophet > Ibn Mas'u'd > a mu'ammar > "common link". Sometimes this mu'ammar was a historical person who claimed to have reached an advanced age, this claim being eagerly emphasised after death by his pupil, the "common link", who profitted from this age. At other times the mu'ammar was a fictitious person, wholly invented, complete with his allegedly advanced age at death, by the "common link" who pretended to have heard his traditions. The early sources yield in all a dozen or so names of persons populating Kūfān isnāds whose ages at death mark them as ma'ammarun, two of whom may have been historical personalities, the rest fictitious. In Baṣrān isnāds there are only two such mu'ammarun, but both were probably historical while one of these was even a "common link" in his own right. For their names and dates, see al-Dhahabi's Ahl al-ma'ā fa-sā'īdan, and WZKM (1991).

In the course of the 2nd/8th century the mu'ammar phenomenon lost its usefulness and popularity, but it never died out completely. There is even one legend about a mu'ammar who was some 700 years old when he died, Bābā Ratan [q. v.] (cf. J. Horovitz, Bābā Ratan, the Saint of Bhatinda, in Journal of the Punjab Historical Society, ii [1913-14], 97-117, an Indian saint revered by adherents of several local religions. The Muslims of the region maintain that he was already alive at the time of Muhammad and once did him a good turn. Ibn Ḥadjar (Isfāba fi tānāz al-sarkāba, ed. Bagjāwī, ii, 923-29) duly included him among the Companions.

Bibliography: Given in the article. Fundamental is Goldziher's work. Virtually all centenarians from ancient times until his own day are mentioned by Dhahabi, Ahl al-ma'ā fa-sā'īdan, ed. J. Sublet, in Cahiers d'onomastique arabe, i (1979), 99-159; G. H. A. Juynboll, The role of mu'ammarun in the earthly development of the isnād, in WZKM (1991); for the technical hadīth term "common link", see idem, Muslim tradition. Studies in chronology, provenance and
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Among his pupils are mentioned Hisham b. Amr al-Fuwātī [q.v.] and above all Bishr b. al-Muţammar [q.v.], the founder of the Muţazīlī school in Baghdād. One of his famous disputants was al-Nazzām [q.v.]. According to the Fīrāšt of Ibn al-Nadīm, he wrote four treatises on central themes of his philosophy (Kitāb al-Maţānī, Kitāb al-Iṣṭidā, Kitāb al-dalīl li yatāgazzā, al-Kawī bi l-ţarād wa l-ţanāh), but also on natural sciences (Kitāb ʿUlat al-karasāṭi wa l-mirrātī, “On the principle of the steelyard and the mirror”; Kitāb al-Layl wa l-nabar wa l-amāwīl, “On night and day and their end (?))

The only sources on Muţammar's philosophy are preserved in later sources which give us a fragmentary idea of his doctrine, which is not yet clear in all details. Determining the contents of his time, especially of Dirār b. Amr [q.v. in Suppl.] and al-Nazzām, on God, His creation and man. Like Dirār and other Muţazīlī, he presupposes the concept of God's transcendency; however, he refrained from the systematic development of a negative theology as we find it in Dirār. God's willing and knowing is endlessly effective and not determinable or definable as something effected by God. Against Abu l-Hudhāyll al-biltā [q.v.], they cannot even be identified with God himself. Muţammar's doctrine of God as endless active power which is not reflected in His creation is taken over by his pupil Highgām b. Amr al-Fuwātī. It was the starting-point of his theories on substance (qabah, dā'im), accidents (a'rād), nature (jaḥ, sāḥa) and maţānī. As God's endless power is not reflected in the visible world, he has not created the accidents, the phenomena, but the substrates, the substances in which by nature inheres the accidents. Contrary to Dirār and similar to al-Nazzām, who here replaces the doctrine of the God-created "cause" (sāhab) as taught by the Shī'ī Highgām al-Hakam [q.v.], nature appears to be a causal principle which causes "accidents", the "generations" (mutāvallāhāt) and "forms" (hayāt) of substances. Different from al-Nazzām, who interprets the world as a conglomerate of perceivable accidents, which inhere in the primary substance, the atom: it already contains profundities which become visible in the combination of depth, which become visible in the combination of these dimensions, length, breadth and depth, which become visible in the combination of three dimensions, length, breadth and depth. Man's actions appear to be a strange mixture of "Platonising" ideas, preformations and "Aristotelian" conceptions of matter, of substance void of identity.

This becomes evident in Muţammar's definition of the primary substance, the atom: it already contains ideationally three dimensions, length, breath and depth, which become visible in the combination of eight to each other identical atoms to a cube. This is a further development of Dirār's explanation of substances as a conglomeration of "accidents"; of "parts"; apparently it was not taken up by later Muţazīlī (cf. Daiber, Muţammar, 333 ff.).

The theory here described of determining maţānī as constituents of God-created substances and their accidents which inheres in them by "nature" becomes the basis for Muţammar's theodicy and his doctrine of free will. The world in which we live is a causal effect of nature and not based on God's predestination. Consequently, man is gifted with free will: he can decide about his actions which, however, are determined by the causality of nature. Man's actions appear to be accidents of his God-created substance. Here, too, Muţammar differs from the more "materialistic" explanation by Dirār and his "school" of man as a conglomerate of perceivable accidents. We find some similarities to al-Nazzām and his pupils (cf. Daiber, op. cit., 342 ff.). Muţammar's theory of free will seems to be more expanded in the teaching of his pupil Bigh r. Muţammar (cf. Daiber, op. cit., 399 ff.): it is already a serious attempt to develop the theory of Highgām b. al-Hakam and his contemporary Dirār concerning man's actions as created by God and "acquired" by man who has freedom of choice, to a more complex doctrine which differentiates between man's free will, the causality of nature and the createdness of substances in which accidents inheres by the necessity of nature. Al-Nazzām considered nature as something created by God; Muţammar, however, could classify nature as an independent factor, as a principle which regulates the causality between the "forms" (hayāt) of substances, their accidents on the one hand and the determining, determined endless chain of maţānī on the other hand.

Muţammar's doctrine is a lively mirror-picture of continuing discussions on the relation between God, man and world; it influenced the Muţazūlī school of Baghdād in a decisive manner and contributed to the development of the Muţazīlī theory of the createdness of the Kur'ān which during the reign of al-Ma'mūn was propagated as official dogma of the state [see al-Ma'mūn's campaign]. God's omnipotence, on the one hand, is not defined and appears as endless power of acting which is not reflectable in actions, accidental realisations; it is not identical with the spoken or written
word, the Qur’an, which can only be classified as an accident, as accidental action of that substance in which it inheres as heard or written word.

In his theory of the Inamate, Mu’ammur follows the formal attitude of the contemporary al-Darārī b. ‘Ammar and Abu ‘l-Huğhayl al-‘Alalāf; ultimately it can be traced back to Wāṣil b. ‘Aṣūr (on whom cf. now Daiber, Wāṣil Ibn ‘Aṣūr als Prediger und Theologe, Leiden 1988, 8, 14 ff.). Mu’ammur refrains from any judgment on the question which party of the participants in the Battle of the Camel was right; at the same time he follows the pre-Islamic tendencies of the ‘Abbasids.

Bibliography: For the sources more details and older studies, see H. Daiber, Das theologisch-
philosophische System des Mu’ammur Ibn ‘Abbad as-
Sulamī (gest. 830 n. Chr.), Beirut-Wiesbaden 1975
(= Beiruter Texte und Studien 19); J. van Ess, in
Isl., ivii (1981), 293-309; Daiber, ibid., 310-20;
R. M. Frank in BfOr, xxxviii (1981), cols. 737-58;
Daiber, Gott, Natur und menschlicher Wille im früh-
islamischen Denken (Inaugural lecture, Free Univer-
sity Amsterdam 1978); idem, in Saeulcum, xxix
(1978), 361-3; W. Montgomery Watt, Der Islam, ii,
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MU’AMMAR [see MU’AMMAR].

MU’AMMAR, AL-MU’AMMARĪYYA [see AL-‘ABBĀD — MU’AN’AN]

MU’AN’AN (A.), a technical term in the science of hadith [q.v.]. It is used to indicate that established transmission methods, e.g. as indicated by terms such as hadādhān, akhbaran or sami’ta, are not known to have occurred, or have not been observed, between the transmitters of one or more links in an isnād [q.v.]. The method described by the term mu’an’an solely consists of the preposition ‘an “on the authority of”.

Isnāds with one or more times the preposition ‘an between two transmitters are called mu’an’an isnāds. Closely connected with this sort of isnād and often dealt with in the same breath is the so-called mu’an’an isnād, which introduces the transmission communicated by an older to a younger authority simply by means of the conjunction anna, “that”, similarly without which introduces the information transmitted.

The term mu’an’an, or at least discussions about the phenomenon, can be traced to relatively early times. Allegedly the first great rāgīl expert, Shu’ba b. al-
Hādījādī (d. 160/777 [q.v.] from Baṣra, is reported to have said Fulān ‘an fulān (aya bi-hadīth) (“Someone on the authority of someone [else] does not constitute a [proper] hadīth” [q.v.]). It is also alluded to in the Risāla of al-
Shāri‘i (d. 204/820 [q.v.]) (ed. A. M. Schäfer, 378-80). The an’ana issue first receives a good deal of atten-
tion in discussions among hadīth experts referred to in the introductory chapter with which Muslim b. al-
Hādījādī (d. 261/875 [q.v.]) begins his edidion col-
lection, the Sahih. The third and final part of this introduction (ed. M. F.’Abd al-Bākī, i, 29-35, translated in JSAl, v [1984], 293-302) is devoted to a discussion on the admissibility of isnāds with one or more links being described merely by ‘an. Muslim mentions one self-styled hadīth expert (ba’d mungahili al-
hadīth), whom he does not identify, as having stipulated that the mere use of ‘an is sufficient to assert the reliability of the transmission procedure between each pair of transmitters in an isnād. Rather, this expert insists that sama’, “hearing”, should be established between pairs of transmitters in the case of every single isnād in which ‘an occurs. Muslim, on the other hand, declares himself to be content with ‘an, as long as contemporaneity (mu’asan), and hence even encounter (likā), may be deemed likely on the basis of the fact that both transmitters are known to have been reliable (ghabas) and as long as no-one is suspected of having committed taddīl [q.v.], a rather vague term indicating a wide range of different ways of deceit in tradition transmission. Muslim’s argument in favour of his kienent stance vis-à-vis mu’an’an isnāds is simple and direct. In the case of the reputed hadīth experts of old has ever stipulated the discarding of such isnāds, as can be proven by the occurrence of dozens and dozens of traditions supported by such isnāds in all the prestigious collections known at the time he makes the statement, traditions which have never caused anyone to doubt their historicity. He has this argument fol-
lowed by an extensive list of such traditions.

The “pseudo-traditionist”, as Muslims calls his anonymous opponent, was tentatively identified by mediæval Muslim scholars as Ibn al-Madīnī (d. 239/853 [q.v.]) and/or al-Bukhārī (d. 265/870 [q.v.]) (see for instance Ibn Radjab, op. cit., 317; Ibn al-
Sālāb, Mukaddima, 158; cf. Goldziher, Muham-
medanische Studien, ii, 248, Eng. tr., ii, 228-9); but this seems unlikely for three reasons: firstly, because the text in Muslim’s introduction speaks consistently of only one man who propagated these ideas and not more than one; secondly, because all the tradition collec-
tions preceding that of al-Bukhārī, as well as al-
Bukhārī’s Sahih itself, in addition to those collections compiled later, are riddled with mu’an’an isnāds; and thirdly, because it is hard to accept that rivalry such as there may have been among collectors like Muslim and al-Bukhārī would have been of the magnitude that the former called the latter a “pseudo-expert”.

There are reports which claim that Muslim felt respect for his older colleague (see al-Sam‘anī, Kitāb al-
Imād, iii, 272; Ibn al-
Sālāb, Mukaddima, 158; cf. Goldziher, Muham-
medanische Studien, ii, 248, Eng. tr., ii, 228-9), but this seems unlikely for three reasons: firstly, because the text in Muslim’s introduction speaks consistently of only one man who propagated these ideas and not more than one; secondly, because all the tradition collec-
tions preceding that of al-Bukhārī, as well as al-
Bukhārī’s Sahih itself, in addition to those collections compiled later, are riddled with mu’an’an isnāds; and thirdly, because it is hard to accept that rivalry such as there may have been among collectors like Muslim and al-Bukhārī would have been of the magnitude that the former called the latter a “pseudo-expert”.

The matter of admissibility of mu’an’an isnāds never seems to have been settled definitively, but the overall majority of hadīth scholars bracketed them with mut-
tasīl (uninterrupted) isnāds. On the other hand, the phenomenon has never again given rise to wide-
ranging discussions violent enough to upset the applecart. Until the present day, these isnāds are dealt with in books dealing with technical terms in the science of tradition and are invariably marked as acceptable, as long as the conditions, also formulated by Muslim, are met: ghabas who are each other’s con-
temporaries, on whom there rests no suspicion of taddīl, can be considered to be honest when they claim that they have something “on the authority of” someone else; mu’asan is almost a guarantee for likā. It must be realised that if those rejecting the admissibility of mu’an’an isnāds had had their way, Islam’s canonical tradition literature would have attained a mere fraction of the bulk it actually did attain. Reading between the lines of Muslim’s chapter of his introduction on this issue leaves the reader with the impression that Muslim himself was aware that that might have happened.

Bibliography: Muslim b. al-Hadījādī, Sahih, ed. M. F.’Abd al-Bākī, Cairo 1955-6, i, 29-35; Muslim’s introduction to his Sahih. Translated and
MU'ANAN' — MU'ARRAB


MU'ANAN' [see MUJADDAD]

MU'ARAB (A.) "opposition". This term indicates in Arabic literature imitation or emulation; the poet composes his work in the same rhyme and metre, and in doing so, often tries to surpass the original. The imitating of someone’s work was also used sometimes as a deliberate act of homage. The concept of nakā'id ("plecemic or context or reported poems") among others. Dżāfīr and al-Faraḏzādkī (q.v.), however, is not regarded as an emulation or imitation, although poems which are based on this idea are often composed in the same rhyme and metre. In his book concerning the history of nakā'id in Arabic literature, Ahmad al-Shāyībī (6 ff.) attempts to delineate the various, related concepts of mu'arāda, nakāda (q.v.), maṣāḥa (q.v.) and muḥ̱aṣara. A synonym of mu'arab, which is used by al-Hākim al-Naysabūrī, is dakhil (see AL-HATIMI, Hilyat, 1979, ii, 28 ff.). The concept of mu'arāda was in use as early as the period of the Ḫālīsīya, when the two poets Imruʾ al-Kays and Tarāfa b. al-Abd (q.v.) competed with each other in a description of a horse (two poems in the rhyme b). One Īmm Džandād acted as their arbiter (Aḥānī, vii, 128, and v, 194). A separate period is occupied by the mu'arab of the Kurān. It is likely that the imitating of the Kurān in this manner was regarded by most Arabs as a blasphemy. One such imitation of the Kurān, by al-Mutanabbi (q.v.), relates to his supposed pretensions to being a prophet. The seventeen-year-old poet composed, in the year 332/943, a large number of "bahr ("admonitions"), which imitated Kur'ānic verses from the Median period. One verse appears to have been preserved (F. Gabrieli, Studi su al-Mutanabbi, Roma 1972, 5-6; R. Blachere, "Un poete arabe du IVe siecle. Abou t-Tayyib al-Mutanabbi, Paris 1955, 67; al-Badī', al-Sabīh al-Munabbi, an ṣan'ahiyat al-Mutanabbi, Cairo 1963, 55 ff.). Another poet, al-Ma'arrī (q.v.) is rebuked for imitating the Kurān. His Kitāb al-Fusul wa l-jāhīyāt, which relates cryptic verses and allegories, caused his contemporaries to accuse the poet of attempting to criticise the Kurān. (Moustapha Saleh, in BEl., Or., xxii [1969], 142, 146; P. Smoor, Kings and Bedouins in the palace of Aleppo, Manchester 1985, 215-16). On the other hand, many poets are said to have imitated another work by al-Ma'arrī, called the Mulkā al-sabīl, and written in rhymed prose. In this context, we may point to the Āḥāmān b. al-Kalām by Ibn al-Qāhir al-Kalāfī (see Saleh, op. cit., 150-1; Ihsān A'Bābhās, Taḏrib al-Nakāl al-adabī 2nd ed., Beirut 1978, 509 ff.). This author realised that he could not surpass his example.

In the field of literary theory, Abd al-Kāhir al-Djurjānī (q.v. in Suppl.) in his Dalā'il al-ṣiḥāž is generally regarded as the first to have developed original ideas about the mu'arab. Von Grünbaum (Kritik und Theorie, 1972, ed. see also 122) says that al-Djurjānī interprets the concept of mu'arab as a stylistic imitation of a certain passage with the purpose of surpassing the predecessor. According to al-Djurjānī, the explanation which says that mu'arabāta intends the substitution of every word by a synonym is to be rejected. At present, however, the originality of al-Djurjānī's remarks is given a more limited value, since his thoughts are to be placed within the context of his time (see Lidia Bettini, Lingua e retorica nel V secolo, in Quaderni di Studi Arabi, vi [1988] (Atti del XIII Congresso dell'U.E.A.I.)).

E. Wagner (Abū Nuwas, Wiesbaden 1963, 246 and 333) gives examples of mu'arāda by the 'Abbāsid poet Abū Nuwas (q.v.) and of those taken from him.

The concept of mu'arab is also frequently found in Andalusian poetry, e.g. in the work of Ibn Ḥafṣā, (q.v.); apart from quotations of complete hemistichs (muṣāmmān), especially from the Eastern poets, he also uses real mu'arāda in which he imitates Andalusian poets such as Ibn Sārā (Diwān, ed. Ghāzī, 366, no. 306). The Hebrew Andalusian poets also imitated Eastern Arabic poetry. In this way we can draw attention to the "fever poem" of Moses ben Ezra, which is composed in the same rhyme and metre as the "fever poem" by al-Mutanabbi (see D. Šemay, in Tahrīs, xxviii [1959], 397 ff.). There are also Hebrew imitations of Arabic muṣāwallāt (q.v.).

In his book Das Muaṣṣarah (Weimar 1897, 227-8), M. Hartmann showed that in the 7th/13th century especially, the mu'arāda was a popular form of art among the Arabic muṣawwāt bāhīt poets.


MU'ARAD (A.) "collation" [see MUKABALA].

MU'ARRAB (A.) denotes an arabised loan or foreign word. During their intensive study of the Arabic language, the Arab philologists did not fail to notice that numerous lexemes in Arabic are of foreign origin. They were called mu'arāb (from 'arabā "to arabicize'", 'arabā, with the same meaning, occurs also), and often also dakhīl "intruded, penetrated". A difference between the two terms cannot be determined. In its literal meaning, mu'arab comprises only the loan words which were integrated into the Arabic of pre- and early Islamic times (kalām al-'arab al-fusahī), while those of the post-classical period are called muṣawwāl. However, the term muṣawwāl does not only refer to loan words, but to all kinds of linguistic neologisms which came up in post-classical Arabic. The difference between mu'arāb and muṣawwāl is not taken into consideration by all philologists, and so mu'arab often is the general term for "loan word, foreign word". Al-Su'ūṭī, in his Muzhir, consistently
classifies the Arabic lexicon, with the exception of the truly Arabic lexemes which were passed down, into three periods: al-mu'arrab, i.e. loan words which have penetrated into Arabic during pre- and early Islamic times (Muzhir, al-nau' 19); al-alfāz al-islamiyya, i.e. neologisms and loan words originating from Islam (al-nau' 20), and al-muwallad, i.e. neologisms and loan words of the post-classical period (al-nau' 21).

Even the oldest Qur'ān interpreters, Ibn 'Abbas and his pupils, are said to have recognised the foreign origin of words which occur in the Qur'ān, like stillāt, minākā, yāmān, tār, ābāriyya, i.e. loan words (al-Djawallī, Mu'arrab, 5.1). More or less elaborate statements about the mu'arrab are given by almost all philological authorities, in the first place al-Khālīl, who already expounds criteria to identify foreign Mu'arrab, Djawallī, 5.1). More or less elaborate an, like origin of words which occur in the Kurān, the later philologists may be mentioned as aμdjamī. Of the later philologists al-Khalīl, al-Djameel, and his pupils, are said to have recognised the foreign words. In his Kitāb al-Mu'arrab min al-kaldm al-ārabiyya, Abu Mansur al-Djawalī, who summarises the knowledge of his predecessors in his Kitāb al-Mu'arrab min al-kalām al-ādīgami. Of the later philologists who may be mentioned Abu Mansur al-Djawalī, and al-Djawalī, who deals with the theme in several of their works, as well as the Ottoman scholar Ahmad Kamal Bāghāzāda and the Egyptian Shihibā al-Dīn al-Khāfīfī, each of whom composed a work on loan words in Arabic. The loan words which have penetrated into post-classical Arabic (muwallad) are occasionally treated in the works that deal with the "language errors of the common people" (al-Djawalī, al-Muhadhdhab). Here, al-Djawalī must be brought into prominence with his work Takmilat al-mātha la ma taghlību fī l-ā'īma, but Ibn Kutayba too devotes a chapter of his Abāb al-kalīb (326 ff.) to this theme.

The Arab scholars deal with the question from which languages the loan words originate—especially mentioned are Persian, Syriac, Greek (vouniyya), Ethiopian, Hebrew (Coptic and Nabatean) (al-Djawalī, al-Muhadhdhab)—and with the degree and way in which they were integrated. They distinguish phonemic and morphemic aspects. Sibawayh states that Persian g is represented in Arabic by ð or k, Persian p by b or f, and Persian š by s. He notes that the ending -ān, which goes back to Middle Persian -ān, occurs in Arabic as -ān or -ān. He also distinguishes between loan words which were borrowed unchanged (like ibritisām, dajurr) and others which were adapted to the noun system (like dinham, dagwar). From the methodological viewpoint, later scholars hardly surpassed Sibawayh since they, because of their one-sided orientation towards Arabic, did not lend enough weight to the knowledge of the languages of origin. Most of them were familiar with Persian only, and consequently wrong judgments are often found. The Arabic philologists mention three criteria to determine the foreign origin of a lexeme: it has not been integrated into the noun system; it shows certain phonemic combinations which are excluded in authentic Arabic roots, a viewpoint which had already been discovered by al-Khālīl (cf. Muzhir, i, 270, 6 ff.); and finally, can it be derived from a verbal root? In the latter case, some philologists consider the integration of a loan word as completed, so that it has become part of the 'ārabiyya (cf. al-Muhadhdhab, i, 157; al-Djawalī, al-Muhadhdhab, al-Mutawakkili, excerpt from al-Mu'arrab, 59; al-Djawalī, Mu'arrab, 5, 7).

The numerous loan words existing in Arabic already in pre-Islamic times originate mainly from Aramaic or Persian. It is occasionally difficult to determine whether loan words come from Semitic languages which are older than Arabic, because formally they cannot be distinguished from lexemes which are genuinely Arabic, cf. kataba "to write", which, as a cultural term, is of Northwestern Semitic origin, while kataba in the meaning of "to sew together" may belong to the authentic Arabic lexicon. Borrowings from Greek or Latin have usually come into Arabic through Aramaic, cf. zaqūq < Greek zōyppos; Kār < Aram. kāṣafr, Lat. castra. Iranian words too have often reached Arabic via Aramaic. With Islam, there came a series of Judeo-Christian religious terms, originating from Hebrew, cf. salāt, zaqāt and jadaka. Christian religious notions were taken from Ethiopian, too, from which derive however also many a word of everyday language, e.g. dżiuk and mulsim. The rise of Turkish dynasties has left relatively few traces in Arabic, with the exception of the Ottoman domination whose influence is shown by a greater number of borrowings. The basic truth for all loan words is that those which do not fit into the morphemic system of the Arabic language show in the long run the tendency of being replaced by Arabic neologisms. Thus arithmātikī, "arithmetic", was replaced at an early stage by 'ilm al-hisāb, in the same way as utamūbi, "automobile", is in our days replaced by sayyiq, whereas fasāfa, "philosophy", (with faylaf < Greek φιλοσοφία) or tafālīf, "to phone" (with tilifān) have become integral elements of the lexicon.

Mascara is a small Berber town of considerable antiquity. According to al-Bakri (Masdlik, tr. de Slane, rev. Fagnan, 160), it included among its inhabitants people who came from Tahert (Tiaret), some of whom went and settled at Ifgan, a day's journey to the south-east when this town was founded by Yezid b. Khumam b. Sâfî al-Hârî, in the year 388/994-95. Ibn Hawkal (tr. Kramers-Wiet, 87) and al-Idrisi (Opus geographicum, 251) mention Mascara as a large, well-watered village rich in fruits. The Almohads seem to have built a fortress there. The Zayyânids of Tlemcen kept a governor and a garrison there. Leo Africanus (tr. Epaulard, 338) notes the importance of the market which was held at Mascara, "one of the towns of the Beni Rasid" (Banû Rashid), where one could buy, along with cereals in large quantities, cloth and articles of harness manufactured in the country. The rulers of Tlemcen drew considerable revenues from it: 25,000 ducats according to Leo, 40,000 pistoles, according to Marmol (Africa, ii, 356).

The Turks established themselves at Mascara in the 16th century and placed a garrison there. In 1701 they made it the capital of the Beylik of the west, which had hitherto been the city of Annaba in Dâhra. The bey who lived there till Oran was reoccupied by the Algerians in 1792. During this period, Mascara, which had hitherto only been an insignificant place, began to look like a regular town. The beys built two mosques and a madrasa, a wall and a kasha and brought in a water-supply. The manufacture of burnuses and ha‘îîs, celebrated throughout the Regency, enriched the inhabitants. This prosperity began to decline after the beys left Mascara and especially after the risings, which broke out in the province of the West in the beginning of the 19th century. The Darkâwî Ibn Šârîf seized the town in 1805 and held it for a time. In 1827 it was attacked by the marabout Muhammad al-Tûjâni. Supported by the Hâghîmî, he gained possession of the suburb of Bâb ‘Affî, but was killed by the Turks when preparing to storm the town itself. At the end of the Turkish rule, ‘Abd al-Kâdir [q. e.] who had been proclaimed Sultan by the tribes of the plain of Ghrîs, established his seat of government at Mascara, but rarely lived there. A French expedition in December 1836, led by Marshal Clauzel, occupied Mascara, which the French abandoned next day, after burning down part of it. The amîr returned to the town and held it till 30 May 1841, when a column under Marshall Macaulay occupied it finally for the French. Mascara, then half in ruins, had only a population of 2,840 inhabitants.

Bibliography: Cés-Caupenne, Mascara, Paris 1856; Gorgués, Notices sur Mohammed el Kehri, in Rev. Africaine (1857); Lespinasse, Notice sur les Hachem de Mascara, in Ibid. (1877); Correspondance des capitaines Daumas, Algiers 1912; Tableau des Etablissements français dans l’Algérie, year 1839; Guides Bleus, Algérie-Tunisie, index s.v. (G. Yver)

MUÂTTILA [see tâ‘îl].

MUÂWADA (A.), barter, exchange.

1. Mu‘âwada, barter, is historically an early form of the exchange of commodities between two parties and the predecessor of buying and selling (bay‘); Roman law, empieto-venditio. In course of time, sale developed out of exchange when, with the coming of money, a sum was given in place of the goods which the other party had to give in return. In Islamic law we find the following four kinds of sale:

a. Exchange of one thing for another. This is the primitive method of exchange (mu‘awada). Exchange is a transaction in kind. Payment takes place "hand upon hand" (padm bi-yad).

b. Exchange of a thing for a definite sum (qaman). By qaman (gold or silver) a sum of money is meant. Here we have a sale in the proper sense of the word [see bay‘].

c. Exchange of one definite sum (qaman) for another. In the case of gold or silver being exchanged for each or one another. This is called jarf (money-changing).

d. Exchange of a claim (dayn, debt) for a definite sum. The main business under this head is the salam or salaf [q. e.].

2. Mu‘âwada is a subdivision of the form of agreement called sulh. According to Ibn al-Kâsim’s definition, 338, and other fiqh, such an agreement is either sulh al-ibrid, reduction of debt (not paying it out), or sulh al-mu‘âwada, exchange of debts. Ibn al-Kâsim thus defines the latter: "And the exchange, i.e. the composition, is the ceding of one’s right to a third person, e.g. when someone claims a house or a part of it and he allows this claim and concludes an agreement with him by which the debt is paid in some definite thing, e.g. in clothes." In this case the creditor (sulh al-ibrid), the thing claimed by him which the debtor is unwilling to give up, takes another to wipe out the disputed debt. An agreement may also be made about a legal claim instead of a thing. The following is a practical illustration. Zayd has a legal claim against ‘Amr. ‘Amr raises a claim against Zayd. Each of them abandons his claim in sulh al-mu‘âwada and the demands are cancelled.

3. Lastly, mu‘awada is a technical term in the general Islamic law of contract, on which there is no comprehensive study taking full account of the sources. A contract (zakd) may be based on a one-sided or a mutual obligation (contractus unilateralis or bilateralis). The latter form, which is the basis for mutual obligations, claim and counterclaim, is called mu‘awada in Islamic law. Examples of contract of this sort are those of sale, lease, marriage, etc.


O. Spiess

MUÂWIYÂ I a. Abî Sûfîan, the founder of the Umayyad dynasty of caliphs based in Syria (although not, as is often asserted, the first Umayyad caliph: that was ‘Uthmân b. ‘Affân [q. e.], his second
MU'AWIYA I

cousin), ruled as generally acknowledged caliph from 41/661 to 60/680. His father was Abu Sufyan (Sakhr) b. Harb b. Umayr al-Akbar (q. v.) and his mother was Hint bint Abd Shams. He is sometimes referred to as Ibn Hind and Ibn aktil al-akbâd, “the son of the liver-eater” (cf. below).

The sources provide conflicting reports of the date of Mu'awiya's birth and of his age when he died: he is said to have been born 3, 7 or 13 years before Muhammad's call to prophethood, conventionally set in 6/622. He was born in Kufa, in 610 A.D. (Ibn Hajar, Isba, Cairo 1328, iii, 433), and to have been aged 73, 75, 80 or 85 years when he died in Radjab 60/April-May 680 (al-Tabari, ii, 198, 199-200; see also Wellhausen, Arab kingdom, 139. Several different dates in Radjab are proposed; it can be added that Theophanes, Chronographia, ed. de Boor, 356, believed him to have died on 6 Artemisios 144/665 (al-Tabari, ii, 14-17). The extent of numbers in Kufan political alignments, and the abandonment in Syria, and the abandonment of maritime warfare in the Mediterranean—an activity increasingly manifest in 'Irak, Egypt and Medina in the course of the early 30s/650s, Mu'awiya's Syro-Djaziran domain remained immune from such inconveniences, with the single exception of Abu Dharr al-Umayr b. Sa'd al-Ansari (al-Tabari, i, 2737 [note e], 2798, 2866); but on the other hand, Uthman put Mu'awiya and Umayr b. Sa'd in charge of (confirmed their appointment over) “Syria” and al-Djazira respectively (al-Baladhuri, Futih, 183). The solution seems to be that Hims, Kinnasrin and al-Djazira were distinct from “Syria” at this stage (pace Hishâm b. Ammâr; on the one hand, they did lie within Mu'awiya's remit until Umayr stood down or was dismissed, when they were made over to Mu'awiya by Uthman (who had by then also made Faiqân over to him) (al-Tabari, i, 2866 f., citing Sayf; al-Baladhuri, Futih, 183-4). According to Sayf, this bringing together of Syria (now in the conventional sense) and al-Djazira under the sole control of Mu'awiya took place two years after Uthman's accession (sûgamtâm 'a-l-Shâm 'alâ Mu'awiya li-siâhat mîn imámâr Uthman; al-Tabari, i, 2867), which would give us late 25/646 or early 26/647; and al-Wâkidî knew that it had taken place by 31/651-2 (al-Tabari, i, 2865).

While expressions of discontent with Uthman and the representatives of his caliphal authority became increasingly manifest in 'Irak, Egypt and Medina in the course of the early 30s/650s, Mu'awiya's Syro-Djaziran domain remained immune from such inconveniences, with the single exception of Abu Dharr (q. v.), who was quickly stifled. This was a front where there was plenty to do: Mu'awiya had held it energetically against the Byzantines, establishing strong garrisons along the coast and instituting a maritime warfare in the Mediterranean—an activity earlier forbidden by Umar (al-Tabari, i, 2820-4; al-Baladhuri, Futih, 152-3). His firm government and continuing presence in Syria provided an element of stability. In addition, Syria had been the main Arab front in the time of Abu Bakr and, for much of the time, of Umar, with the result that the fighting men sent there had been made up largely of cohesive Arab clan groups loyal to campaign; by contrast, those whom it had been possible to muster for the secondary front of 'Irak had for the most part been a miscellany of tribal oddments. This, together with the retention of the existing jund system in Syria, and the abandonment of any idea of establishing a single garrison city at al-Djâbiya (q. v.) (or anywhere else) meant that each administrative unit was occupied by cohesive groups, whereas there was a mélange of diverse groups in the Úka (see M. Hinds, 'Kûfân political alignments', in IJMES, ii [1971]). Arab newcomers could be accommodated in the appropriate jund, and tensions of the
kind arising in Kufa were obviated by the fact that the position of the tribal leaders was already established. In addition, it is possible that Mu‘awiya may have taken the opportunity to assert his own influence in Syria. He called together the Ansab al-ashraf, the Syrian early-comers whose standing was studiously avoided by Umayyad court poetry (P. Crone and N. Acar, Umayyad court poetry and the actual frontier had been more in the area of Dhu ‘l-Ka‘a on learning that Uthman had been killed [al-Tabari, i, 3085-6]). By the time when, after the Battle of the Camel [al-Tabari, i, 3249-54, 3397], it was summi by Khalifa b. Khayyat in one sentence: “the year of [unification of] the community” (e.g. al-Tabari, ii, 199; Khalifa, Ta‘rikh, 187), that is conventionally regarded as having marked the beginning of Mu‘awiya’s caliphate. Instead of, or in addition to, consolidating Sufyanid rule. Externally, there was a call for a cessation of other operations against the Byzantines, see DHAT AL-DHAMMA, “the year of [unification of]

Concerning the battle itself, it will be sufficient here to note that, against the widely reported view that the Syrians were losing, whereupon Mu‘awiya ordered the raising of the masjids and the call for a cessation of hostility (Hinds, The Siffin arbitration agreement, in JES, xvii [1972], 93-4), there can be set the non-Muslim contention that it was the Syrians who won this battle, a contention which is moreover corroborated by Umayyad court poetry (P. Crone and M. Hinds, God’s Caliph, Cambridge 1986, 69). As for the subsequent arbitration (see A‘li b. A‘rābī Tālib, at 1, 383-4; Hinds, The Siffin arbitration agreement), it is best summed up by Khalifa b. Khayyat in one sentence: “the arbiters agreed on nothing” (Ta‘rikh, 174). In Dubr ‘l-Ka‘a 37/April-May 638 ‘Amr and the Syrians acknowledged Mu‘awiya as caliph (sallamā sulayhi bi ‘l-Kha‘ifa: al-Tabāri, i, 3359 ult.; 3396; ii, 199).

Four more years were to pass, however, before Mu‘awiya was able to enjoy general recognition as caliph. His immediate goal was achieved relatively easily; Egypt was reconquered in 38/April-May 638 and ‘Amr was formally taken over as governor there two months later (al-Tabari, i, 3407; al-Kindi, al-Wuldt wa ‘l-kudrat, 31; Wellhausen, Arab kingdom, 93-8). This constituted a blow to the prestige of ‘Ali, who was by then preoccupied with Khādirijīt [q.v.] in Irāk; and although Mu‘awiya’s attempt to subvert Baṣra in the same year through the agency of Ibn al-Hadrami [q.v.] failed, ‘Ali’s position in Irāk grew weaker, while his control of territories further east was largely non-existent (Wellhausen, op. cit., 99, and note in particular al-Tabari, i, 3449). Mu‘awiya waited, limiting his activities to small roving expeditions against the fringes of Irāk and into the Hijāz and the Yemen (Wellhausen, op. cit., 100), and may have gone so far as to make a truce with ‘Ali in 40/660-1 (al-Tabari, i, 3453; Wellhausen, op. cit., 101); if so, it was presumably at the very beginning of that year (May 660), for in July 660 there took place at Jerusalem a formal ceremony of allegiance to him as caliph (T. Nöldeke, Zur Geschichte der Araber im 1. Jahr. d. H. aus syrischen Quellen, in ZDMG xxix [1875], 95-6; al-Tabari, ii, 4; Wellhausen, op. cit., 101-2). Any plans ‘Ali may have had to march against Mu‘awiya were cut short by the Battle of the Masts on 40/14 January 661 (Wellhausen, op. cit., 102-4). The subsequent succession of al-Hasan b. ‘Ali Tālib [q.v.] was a short-lived affair, for Mu‘awiya now moved on Irāk with an army; al-Hasan settled for compensation in return for abdication and Mu‘awiya entered Kufa in Rabi‘ I or Dhu ‘l-Qa‘da 1/14 July 661 (Wellhausen, op. cit., 104-12). It is this year, the so-called ‘im or sanat al-djamā‘a, “the year of [unification of] the community” (e.g. al-Tabari, ii, 199; Khalifa, Ta‘rikh, 187), that is conventionally regarded as having marked the beginning of Mu‘awiya’s caliphate. Thereafter, Mu‘awiya had much to do in order to consolidate Sufyanid rule. Externally, there was above all the matter of Byzantium. In the Mediannean he had already successfully challenged Byzantine seapower: in addition to having dealt with Cyprus [see KURUS] and raided Rhodes and Sicily, he had in 655 been in command of an Arab fleet of 200 vessels that had resoundingly defeated Constans II’s fleet of 700-1000 vessels at the Battle of the Masts (on this and other operations against the Byzantines, see AL-SAWARI in Suppl. and R.-J. Lièp, Die Byzantinische Reaktion auf die Ausbreitung der Araber, Munich 1976, 60 ff.). On the land frontier to the north, he had, as early as 646, advanced into Anatolia as far as Amorium (see A-MMURYA), but further progress had been limited and the actual frontier had been more in the area of Adana by the time the onset of war with ‘Ali had forced Mu‘awiya to come to terms with the Byzantines on the basis of payment of tribute (Theophanes, Chronographia, 347). Now, however, he busied himself with settling Syrian coastal towns and improving their fortifications; Alexandria too was completely fortified (the work was completed by 670), and Egypt once more became the springboard of expansion into North Africa. The land offensive westwards was accompanied by an aggressive Arab policy at sea following the death of Constans II in 668. An expanded Arab navy raided as far as Sicily in 669, while the army in North Africa advanced as far as Kaysaria (al-Kayrāwān) and forayed into what is now Algeria. Rhodes and Crete were overrun in 672 and 674 respectively and
the naval expeditions that followed amounted to a seven-year blockade of Marmora and Constantinople—a fact that came to an end shortly before Muʿāwiya’s death, when the Arab fleet was beaten off with Greek fire in 679. The same period witnessed regular annual incursions by land into Anatolia—incursions that had the advantage of providing booty and keeping the Arab army in trim. But late in his reign, Muʿāwiya once more may have had to enter into arrangements involving the payment of tribute to the Byzantines, this time in order to cope with the jumbo-fleets.

Muʿāwiya’s death then took place. His successor was his son the地段. The use of pre-existing bureaucratic machinery, run by indigenous elements, meant that

Mutawakkil, the naval expeditions that followed amounted to a seven-year blockade of Marmora and Constantinople—a fact that came to an end shortly before Muʿāwiya’s death, when the Arab fleet was beaten off with Greek fire in 679. The same period witnessed regular annual incursions by land into Anatolia—incursions that had the advantage of providing booty and keeping the Arab army in trim. But late in his reign, Muʿāwiya once more may have had to enter into arrangements involving the payment of tribute to the Byzantines, this time in order to cope with the jumbo-fleets.

Muʿāwiya’s death then took place. His successor was his son 268

Internal, Muʿāwiya was faced with the task of defining and running a Syria-based caliphate capable of pulling together the sundered parts of the Arab domain and maintaining authority over an unruly tribal soldiery. In the Ḍajjira and the East, matters were particularly complex because the first conquests there had involved a double invasion of Arabs. The relatively united troops that resided in garrison cities under leaders backed by Medina were mainly Arabs from settled and semi-settled backgrounds; but their conquests were paralleled or, at times, even spearheaded by incursions of nomadic Arabs over whom the military leaders appointed by the caliphs had little or no control. In the Ḍajjira, the nomadic Sulāmīs and other Khayyātīs had engendered and set up local confederacies, though Muʿāwiya had settled tribesmen of Muṣṭar and Rabīʿa on abandoned land in that region, permitting them to engage in agriculture, during the caliphate of ʿUthmān (al-Baladhurī, Futūḥ, 178); and the situation had been further complicated by the influx of Khāns and Baṣrīs hostile to Ali who “abandoned their ḥajra in favour of the Ḍajjira in the course of the civil war (al-Libān, i, 2673; al-Baladhurī, Anṣāb al-ṣagrī, ii, 297–8; al-Mīkārī, Ḥabīṣ al-Sittf, ed. H. Čair, Cairo 1382, 12, 146; al-Yākūbī, Taʾrīḫī, ii, 218; al-Khushṭābī, Taʾrīḫ al-Rakka, ed. Nīṣānī, Hamā 1937, 43; al-Dhābībī, Taʾrīḫī, ii, 222; P. Crone, Slaves on horses, Cambridge 1969, appendix i, nos. 13, 14, 16, 19). According to Sayf, Muʿāwiya responded by detaching Kinnāsīn-Ḫajjira from Hims and setting them up as a settlement (al-Tanzimīr al-ṣaḥīfī, ed. Nīṣānī, Hamā 1970, 31 ff.). Within the Ṣafwīn Ḍajjira, it is, however, attributed to Ṣaʿīd I elsewhere (al-Baladhurī, Futūḥ, 132).

In the case of ʿIrāq, few of the ʿAbāmah and Bakrīs who had participated in the conquests settled at Kūfah and only relatively small numbers settled at Baṣra; for the most part they either returned to their own neighbourhoods or pushed on into the remoter parts of Ḥijrah or beyond, to the Khuzūs, Fars, Kirman and Sīstān. They had neither the desire nor the need to settle in garrison cities or other centres; and they were decidedly against any authority seeking to impose itself from outside. But the tightening up of control over the garrison cities themselves was also problematic. The basic problem here was that there were too many Arabs competing for too few resources, the lack of immigration controls having produced Arab over-population. Ṣaʿīd b. Abīal ṹāqīr [q. v.], Muʿāwiya’s virtually autocratic viceroy in the Ḍajjira in the East, dealt with this problem in a way in which permitted him also to consolidate the conquests made in Khuraṣān. He weeded out the ḏawāʾs lists of Kūfah and Baṣra, reorganised the tribal groupings, and moved an estimated 50,000 tribesmen and their families to Khuraṣān in 51/671; these tribesmen were settled in the villages of the Marw oasis and were used to extend the Arab conquests in Khuraṣān as far as the river Oxus (M.A. Shaban, The ‘Abbāsid revolution, Cambridge 1970, 31 ff.). Within ʿIrāq, Ṣaʿīd presided over a reorganisation which included confiscation of the jāzāfūt, eristwhile Sāfīn lands and other lands that had since the time of ʿUmar been locally regarded as the collective property of the original conquerors (S.A. al-ʿĀli, al-Tanzīmāt al-ṣagrīyya wa l-ʾiḥtisābīyya fi l-ʾāṣaṣra, 2nd edn., Beirut 1969, 141; Hinds, Khāṣīṣ political alignments, 350, 367); and old-guard opposition to this was stifled by the exemplary execution of the veteran Ḥuḏr b. ʿAdī [q. v.]. At the same time, new tribal alignments (ṣagrīf) were very much ready to toe the Sūfyanī line formed the basis of the power structure.

The nature of this ʿṣagrī-structured power base has been described by Crone (Slaves on horses, 31–3, and, in more detail, The Mawṣūl in the Umayyad period, Univ. of London Ph.D. diss. 1973, unpbl., 27 ff.). Their ʿṣagrī was usually carried over from the Ḍajjīh period and they therefore represented “the continued efficacy of pre-Islamic tribal stratification”; since individual ʿṣagrīs [q. v.] were too small to function as autonomous units, some re-shaping had been essential: the tribal groupings at Kūfah had originally been ʿaḥār, then they were asbaḥ, and under Ṣaʿīd they were turned into arbaʿ; at Baṣra they were asbaḥ. Sometimes existing confederacies accounted for these divisions, though sometimes new ones were formed specifically in order to break up such confederacies. The divisions themselves were like semi-artificial ḍābā’il and, indeed, the ʿṣagrī of the Umayyad period are sometimes styled Ṣaʿīd’s kalām. The creation of these divisions engendered much rivalry for leadership, both between the divisions and within them, and also refusals to submit to particular leaders, as for example by the early Khāṣīṣ or Ḥuḏr b. ʿAdī. The balance was thus a delicate one. Equally delicate was the role of the individual ʿṣagrī as an intermediary in the Sūfyanī power structure, supporting and in turn being supported by the ruling authorities. The ʿṣagrī would come together in the governor’s maqūṣīs and would be present at the Friday worship when the governor came face-to-face with the tribesmen; the governor’s own ʿṣagrī [q. v.] was drawn from the tribesmen and currently by 2672.

The governors of the provinces were drawn from among kinsmen of the caliph and people who were otherwise close to the caliphal family circle. In Medina, the governors were Umayyads: in Mecca, Umayyads and then a Makhzūmī; in Egypt, ʿAmr b. ʿAṣ and then notably Maslama b. Muḥāllad [q. v.], who was one of the more important ʿAmrīs who had stuck with Muʿāwiya; in Ḫurāsān, whom Muʿāwiya had adopted as his brother by the process of istīlāh (Wellhausen, Arab kingdom, 121). The governors functioned as the link between the caliph and the ʿṣagrīs of the provinces, and the preference for kinsmen helped “to secure the impermeability of the state...vis-à-vis the qablas” (Crone, Mawṣūl, 29). The principle, in short, was one of indirect rule, with a good deal of provincial autonomy. The governors of the Sūfyanī period had full civil and military authority within their huge provinces: the amīr or ʾamīl (the terms seem to have been indistinguishable at this time) organised the army, conducted expeditions, led the worship, built mosques, administered justice, maintained order, ran the information network, appointed sub-governors (also called amīrs or ʾamīls), supervised the entire taxation system and (in principle at least) sent the surplus to Damascus. The use of pre-existing bureaucratic machinery, run by indigenous elements, meant that
he managed to hold his kingdom together without ever having to resort to using his Syrian troops; and his contemporary John of Phenec, a Nestorian monk of north Mesopotamia, gives a more glowing testimony when he says, “Justice flourished in his time, and there was great peace in the regions under his control.... Once Mu'awiyah had come to the throne, the peace throughout the world was such that we have never heard, either from our fathers or from our grandparents, or seen that there had ever been any like it” (S. Brock, *North Mesopotamia in the Late Seventh Century*, Book XV of John Bar Petha'ayi, R. Mélèze, in *JSAT*, ix [1987], 61). The fact that his system of indirect control was “vulnerable in both structural and temporal terms” (Crone, *Slaves on horses*, 33) is more apparent to the modern historian than it was to contemporaries.

In Syria itself, Mu'awiyah’s position was underpinned by his troops, who were above all from the confederacy of Kudai'a [q.v.]. The leading tribe of Kudai'a was Kalb [see Kalb b. Wara'a] camel-breeding nomads of the Syrian desert who had earlier been employed by the Byzantines under Ghassanid leadership to defend the Syrian limes against the Sassanids and the Lakhmids; they were accustomed to military discipline and had become Monophysite Christians. They stood aside when the Arab conquest was under way, but, having taken the oaths of allegiance, joined up with the Arab power structure by Mu'awiyah, who married Maswir b. Bahdal b. Kalb-al-Kalbiyya [q.v.], the daughter of Bahdal b. ‘Umayr [q.v.] of the Harb clan, which was the khalifa of Kalb; this Maswir became the mother of Mu'awiyah’s son Yazid [q.v.]. On this basis, Mu'awiyah built up a strong confederacy in which his Kalbi and other Kudai'is support was welded with that of immigrant tribesmen stationed in central and southern Syria, mainly Kinda from the midlands of southern Arabia. The leaders of the resultant confederacy were successively Malik b. Bahdal and his son Hassán b. Malik [q.v.], and the arrangements included the awarding of stipends at the highest level to each of 2,000 men, together with privileges of consultation and precedence in the majlis (al-um ul'mah al-nadhib al-majlis), which was the fact that he represented a continuation of the early Arab practice of choice by acclaim, of protest that such an oath of allegiance marked a break with past Arab practice of choice by acclaim, and Mu'awiyah did his best to grease the palms of others—notably members of Banû Hâshim—who might have been assailed by qualms. Nonetheless, his initiative met with resistance, notably on the part of Abd Allah b. al-Zubayr [q.v.], and the House of the Prophet [Al-Murâd, v, 200 = §1963].

Towards the end of his life, Mu'awiyah had the oath of allegiance taken to his son Yazid as his successor (see Wellhausen, *Königdom*, 140–3; Lammens, *Le califat de Yazid Ier*, in *AFOB*, v/1 [1911], ch. vi). It was not simply that Yazid was of noble birth, mature years and acknowledged judgment; most important of all was the fact that he represented a continuation of the link with Kalb and so a continuation of the Kalb-led confederacy on which Sufyânid power ultimately rested (a point overlooked by Ibn Khaldûn in his celebrated defence of Mu'awiyah’s action, *Tar, i, 173*). From the main elements that made up the confederacy there was, understandably enough, no sign of protest that such an oath of allegiance marked a break with past Arab practice of choice by acclaim, and Mu’awiyah did his best to grease the palms of others—notably members of Banû Hâshim—who might have been assailed by qualms. Nonetheless, his initiative met with resistance, notably on the part of Abd Allah b. al-Zubayr [q.v.].
empire for those who had rejected him, the Quraysh" (Rodinson, Muhammad, 295). At the same time, the transfer of the caliphate from Medina to Syria, the introduction of hereditary succession and the growth, however modest, of the state apparatus suggested that Mu'awiyah had transformed the caliphate into a monarchic institution of the Persian or Byzantine type, the very institution that the Muslims had been sent to destroy (Lammens, Études sur le règne du Calife Omayyade Mu'awiyah Ier, Paris, London and Leipzig 1968, 191-5; Crone and Hinds, God's Caliph, 113). But even so, Mu'awiyah's image is ambivalent (G.R. Hawting, The first dynasty of Islam, London 1986, 42); he was seen, not just as the man who perverted the caliphate into kingship, but also as a clever and successful ruler, and there is considerable admiration for him in the sources. Attempts at dispassionate analysis of his reign were rare, however. To Ibn Rusţid, his caliphate represented a shift from the ideal constitution to a timocratic one (Avestros' commentary on Plato's Republic, tr. E.I.J. Rosenthal, Cambridge 1956, 223); and to Ibn Khalid it was a stage in the inevitable transformation of ishābiyya into mulk (Tbar, i, 176). But more commonly, Mu'awiyah was either cursed or venerated, the legitimacy of his caliphate being a far more important issue than its historical nature (cf. Pellat, Le calife de Mu'awiyah, in Sl, vi [1956]; M.A.J. Petersen, Twenty Years in Early Arabic tradition, Copenhagen 1964; I. Hassan, Recherches sur Mu'awiyah ibn Abu Sufyân, Jerusalem 1982 (in Hebrew, unpublished). (M. HINDS)

MU'AWIYAH II b. YAZID b. MU'AWIYAH I, last caliph of the Sufyanid line of the Umayyads, reigned briefly in 684-3.

When Yazid I b. Mu'awiyah [q.v.] died at Huwâwîrân in the Syrian Desert in Rabî I 64/1258, he left behind three young sons by free mothers: Mu'awiyah and his brother Khâlid b. Yazid [q.v.] cannot have been more than 20 years old, Mu'awiyah's age being given by the sources variously at between 17 and 23. Most of the surviving Sufyanids were in fact young and inexperienced, with their leadership qualities unproven. Yazid had had the bay'a [q.v.] made to Mu'awiyah before his death (see Lammens, Le califat de Yazid Ier, Paris 1921, 112, 425 ff.), and Mu'awiyah succeeded in Damascus with Kalbii support, but not recognised in the lands acknowledging the anti-caliph 'Abd Allâh b. al-Zubayr [q.v.]. The name of Mu'awiyah's mother is not recorded, but she was a member of the powerful Kalbii group; those sources (e.g. Muhammad b. 'Abdîb, al-Mubâbbir, 22; etc.) making him the son of Umm Hâshimî Fâhita bt. Abî Hâshîm confuse Mu'awiyah's mother with that of his half-brother Khâlid.

The length of Mu'awiyah's reign is given in the sources as from 20 days up to 4 months, but the fact that virtually nothing is known of his reign, a duration of at most one or two months seems likely. It is known that the Christian Sârîjân b. Movâghhabân, who had been the Kurâshî head of the Kays group, al-Dabhân b. Kays al-Fihîr [q.v.], subsequently to be vanquished at Mardî Râ'hî [q.v.] by Marwân b. al-Hakam, and al-Walîd b. 'Utbâ, son of Mu'awiyah I's only full brother and probably the eldest living Sufyanid.

Some of the very few incidents recounted for his reign by the historians must be regarded as fabricated for political or sectarian aims, hence unreliable. Thus the report of 'Awâna in al-Tabâri, ii, 468 (but not in al-Wâkidî's account at ii, 577) and in al-Baladhûrî, Fatûtî, 229, that he abdicated the throne (tabara'a min al-khâlah) before his actual death, stems from subsequent Sufyanid propaganda to confuse the fact that the Mu'awiyahs succeeded the Sufyanids; it was probably for this reason that Mu'awiyah's name does not appear in some of the lists of caliphs, e.g. Khâlîf b. Khâyût, Târîkh, ed. Shuyâl Zakkâr, Damascus 1987-8/1967-8, 1, 318. Likewise, the assertion that he was an adherent of the Kadarîyya sect may have resulted from a later belief in an abdication, which would have been in accord with Kadarî beliefs on human responsibility as a factor in political behaviour [see Kadâriyya, at IV, 369b]. Of Shî'î inspiration is the report in al-Yâ'sûbî, Târîkh, ii, 302-3, that, at the meeting of Syrian leaders at the opening of his reign, Mu'awiyah denounced the tyranny and perfidiousness of his own father and grandfather and their maltreatment of the 'Alids, the true inheritors of the Prophet (see Lammens, Mu'awiyah II, in Études, 192-202). The attribution to Mu'awiyah of the transfer of the caliphate from Medina to Syria, given ironically because, as several sources explain (e.g. Ibn Kutayba, Mu'awiyah, ed. 'Ukkâshâ, 352; al-Tabâri, ii, 428-9; al-Masûdî, v, 168-9 = §1932), it was especially applied to weak persons, is equally suspect; Mu'awiyah does not in any case seem to have left behind any progeny.

What seems definite is that, on his accession, Mu'awiyah remitted one-third of the taxation due, and a Latin chronicle of the Byzantine period states that Mu'awiyah followed in the same commendable ways of conduct as his father Yazîd (Lammens, Mu'awiyah II, 177-8, 179). But his ill-health compelled him to remain within the palace of al-Khâlîfâ', the dâr al-imâra of Damascus constructed by Mu'awiyah I (see Ibn 'Asâkir, tr. N. Ellissef, La description de Damas d'Ibn 'Asâkir, Damascus 1959, 228), leaving the practical conduct of affairs to al-Dabhân and not emerging from his residence till he died. It seems likely that his authority was only recognised in Damascus and southern Syria, and even possible that, already before his death, some of the partisans of the Umayyads may have started to look elsewhere for a more energetic ruler.

The exact cause of Mu'awiyah's death is unclear. It may have resulted from jaundice (al-yâfûr), indicating a liver complaint, or it may have been the result of a sharp outbreak of plague which ravaged 'Irâk and Syria at this time and which could also have carried off al-Walîd b. 'Utbâ (al-Tabâri, ii, 468; Ibn 'Asâkir, ms. Zâhîriyya, notice on Mu'awiyah b. Yazîd). Mu'awiyah had either refused to nominate a successor (al-Tabâri, ii, 577) or, more probably, had never had time to hold a ceremony of bay'a. Al-Walîd b. 'Utbâ recited the funeral prayers over Mu'awiyah but seems himself to have died before he could assert a claim to the throne; and Mu'awiyah's uncle 'Uthmân b. 'Anbasa b. Abî Sufyân, who enjoyed some support among the Kalb of the province of Jordan, went to join his mother's brother 'Abd Allâh b. al-Zubayr in the Hindîj, where his claim to the caliphate had already been raised. Mu'awiyah's death thus not only meant the complete end of the brief accession so long anticipated, but also that it had begun in the Hindîj by Yazîd against the rebels but led also to the temporary collapse of Umayyad power.
in its own heartland of Syria, where only the resolute
behaviour of Marwan b. al-Hakam [g.v.], from a
parallel branch of the Umayyad family, was to secure
the situation for the dynasty.
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the article): Ibn Sa‘d, v. 27; Baladhuri, Ansâb, iv b,
62-5; Tabari, ii, 429-32; Mas‘udi, Murâjî, v, 168-70
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**MU‘AWIYA II — HISHÂM**

b. ‘ABD AL-MALIK, Umayyad prince. As the eldest son of Highâm
[g.v.], caliph from 105 to 125/724-43, he was designated heir presumptive by his father, but died
prematurely, at a date variously located between 117
and 119/735-7, at about thirty years of age. Although
he did not himself accede to the throne, he was the father of ’Abd al-Rahmân [g.v.], known as al-Dàghîl,
who remained its ruler in a dynasty founded in Damascus by Mu‘awiyâ b. Abi Sufyân [g.v.]. Mu‘awiyâ b. Highâm, who had thirteen sons,
was thus the ancestor of the umirs and caliphs who
reigned at Cordova until the 5th/11th century [see
UMAYYADS OF SPAIN].

Bibliographical information concerning him is scanty. His mother was probably an umm walad,
and his father had him participate in about a dozen sum-
mer expeditions (šaj¿a) from 106/724 onwards.

**Bibliography:** Mußab al-Zubayrî, Nasah Kuryâg, ed. Lévi-Provençal, Cairo 1953, 168; Ibn
Hzâm, Qamhàt ansâb al-Arab, ed. Lévi-
Provençal, Cairo 1948, 84-5; Tabari, index; Ibn al-
’Imâm, Shâdhdhârî, 1, 156-7; S. al-Munajjîd, Mu‘jam Bani Umayya, Beirut 1970, s.v. and index.

**MU‘AWIYA II — HUJDÂDÎ (Khâdijî in the
Qamhàt of Ibn al-Kalbi, Tab. 240) b. DAFNA
AL-SÂKUNI AL-TUJÎNî, Abû Nu‘aym or Abî ‘Abd al-
Rahmân, Companion of the Prophet who took
part in the conquest of Egypt and remained in the
country with the Muslim occupying forces.

He was an UhÎmân, much attached to the
memory of Uthmân b. ’Affân and hostile to ‘Ali b.
Abî Talîb; also, when Muhammad b. Abî Bakr [g.v.],
who had been involved in the murder of Uthmân,
arrived at Fustat in mid-Ramadan 37/24 February
658, in order to govern Egypt in the name of ‘Ali, Ibn
Hujdâdî showed him violent hostility, in which he
was joined by Maslama b. Mukhallad. Muqâhalbâd [g.v.], who was,
like him, the leader of a powerful contingent ready to
rend support to potential rebels. Meanwhile,
Mu‘awiyâ b. Abi Sufyân, still merely the governor
of Syria, but pre-empting the decision of the two
arrowbearers appointed after Sîfîn and engaged in the
effort to avenge the murder of Uthmân, appointed
’Amr b. al-‘Âs [g.v.], governor of Egypt. To prevent
him accomplishing his mission, the son of Abî Bakr
mobilised his troops, among whom was the actual
murderer of Uthmân, Kinsâna b. Bilhîr, who was
killed in battle; abandoned by his army, the titular
governor took flight, so that ’Abd al-Rahmân was able
to enter Fustat. Ibn Hujdâdî took part in the hunt for
the fugitive, whom he discovered in hiding; he
received orders from ’Amr to conduct him to Fustat
out of respect for his brother ’Abd al-Rahmân, who
was among his ranks, but he refused and killed his
adversary, placing his skin in the hide of a donkey and
setting fire to it; it is also said that he sent his head to
Mu‘awiyâ b. Abî Sufyân and that the latter paraded it
through the streets of Damascus.

These events, which took place in 38/658, have
engaged the main interest of historians and biographers, but Mu‘awiyâ b. Hujdâdî also achieved
renown through actions concerning the Maghrib. He
is in fact credited with three expeditions in Ifrikiya. In
the course of the first, which took place in 34/654-5,
he ‘took possession of numerous fortresses and gained
a considerable quantity of booty. He established
a garrison-camp near al-Karn and resided there
until his return to Egypt’ (Ibn ’Abd al-Hakam, partial
ed.-tr. A. Gateau, Algiers 1957, 56/57); it was on
this occasion that he awarded his troops ‘in the form
of a special gratuity (nafala), half of the booty, having
taken a fifth for himself’ [see QAMHÀT]. The site of
al-Karn, which is a hill 171 m. in height ‘12 km
to the north-west of the present town of al-Kayrawân
on the road from Djâblû’ [see AL-KAYRAWân, i] may be
considered as having determined the choice of loca-
tion of the capital of Ifrikiya. The early historians—
such as Ibn ’Abd al-Hakam or al-Bâkî—describe
him as a warrior who distinguished himself in the
courageous capture of Djâblû by ’Abd al-Malik b.
Marwan or by the leader of the expedition himself.
The other mission, which took place in 40/660-1 (or 41, with the conquest of Bizerta [see BANZART],
or 45) and finally in 50/670, with the support of a contingent from Medina com-
manded by ’Abd al-Malik b. Marwan, again led
Mu‘awiyâ b. Hujdâdî to al-Karn, which was to some
text degree his operational base. Al-Tabari (i/1, 84, 93)
states that he was appointed governor of Egypt in
47/667 and dismissed in 50/670, but in fact it was his
comrade-in-arms Maslama b. Mukhallad who held
this function. He died shortly afterwards, in 52/672,
but historians such as Ibn al-’Âthîr (s.a. 58) or Ibn Taghribardî (Nûjam, i, 151) describe him receiving
bountiful honours, in Damascus in 58/678, from
Mu‘awiyà b. Hujdâdî whom he had appointed as
refusal to accept appointment by the nephew of the
caliph, ’Abd al-Rahmân b. Umm al-Hakam, as
governor of Egypt; there is evidently some confusion
here, the cause of which is unclear.

**Bibliography:** Besides the sources quoted, see
Baladhuri, Futuh, 221, 227, 228, 235, 237; Tabari,
i, 340 ff.; Mas‘udi, Murâjî, iv, 421-3 = §1726; Ibn
’Abd al-Barr, Istí’âb, commentary on the Ijâba, iii,
406; Ibn ’Idjârî, Bayân, i, ed. Colin and Lévi-
Provençal, Leiden 1948, 15, 16; Bâkîrî, Muqâhîb,
ed.-tr. de Slane, index; ’Askâlânî, Ijâba, no. 8062;
Mâlikî, Rîyâd al-nâfîs, ed. Mu‘nis, Cairo 1951, i,
17-18; Ibn Nâdi, Mu‘alîm al-imâm, i, 39-40; Ibn
al-’Âthîr, i, 398; Ibn Taghribardî, Nûjam, i, 110 ff.,
139; Ibn Khûdîn, Berhêrî, i, 210, 307, 308, 315,
324; Ibn al-’Imâm, Shâdhdhârî, i, 54, 57.

**MU‘AWIYA II — UbAYD ALLâH** [see arô
UBAYD ALLáH].

**AL-MU‘AWIWIDHATÀN**, “the two stûras of
taking refuge [from evil]”, the name given to the two
last stûras (CXVII and CXIV) of the Kur’ân, because
they both begin with the words kal: a‘udhu bi-rabbî ... against
...”, and are pronounced as prayers intended
to dispel evil from a person’s body and to expel the
device of magic, etc. The plural al-mu‘awiwidhât is
also found equally applied to these two stûras and to
the preceding one, set forth in the form of a creed; this plural appears especially in al-Bukhari (da’surah, bāb 12) in regard to the Prophet, who recited these sūras when he was about to go to sleep. The mu’awwddhatān are considered to be Meccan, although they are also considered as having been revealed at Medina in order to frustrate an attempt to lay a spell on the Prophet (on the use which he made of them, see al-Bukhari, loc. cit.; Ahmad b. Hanbal, Musnad, iv, 155). They have to be continued, employed to avert the evil eye (Lane, Man- ners and customs of the modern Egyptians, London 1899, 259).

Bibliography: Given in the article, but see also the dictionaries, s.v.

AL-MU’AWYAD [see hisjām hi].

AL-MU’AWYAD BIL‘LAH MUHAMMAD, the name of two Kāsimi Zaydi imāms of Yemen.

1. Ibn al-Imām al-Mansūr bīllāh al-Kāsim, known best as the imām in whose time the Ottoman Turks were expelled from Yemen after a continuous presence of a century (945-1045/1538-1635).

Born in 990/1582, widespread recognition of his scholarly and leadership capabilities assured him unchallenged election to the imāmat upon his illustrious father’s death in Rabi‘ I 1029/February 1029. One of Imām Muhammad’s first acts was to renew the ten-year truce which his father had lately concluded with Mehmed Pasha, the governor of the Ottoman Turks still occupying numerous centres in Yemen. This agreement was upheld until early 1036/late 1626 when, following the execution of an eminent supporter of the imām by Haydar Paşa, the current Ottoman governor, assaults on several Ottoman strongholds were mounted by the imām’s forces. Indigenous support for Imam Muhammad proved considerable, and before the year’s end the Turks had lost all of their holdings in the central and northern highlands except San‘ā’, their main base, which was under close investment. With the surrender of both San‘ā’ and Ta‘izz during 1038/1629, the Ottoman forces remained confined to Zabīd and Mocha in the Tihāma, despite their substantial augmentation with reinforcements. A series of abortive truces with the imām enabled the surviving Zabīd Ottoman garrison to survive at Zabīd until mid-1045/late 1635, when Kānsīth Paşa, the last Ottoman governor, capitulated and departed from Yemen, followed shortly by most of the remaining Ottoman soldiery. Imām Muhammad died at Shahara, his capital, in Rājdab 1054/September 1644, the sources reporting his demise in a spell on the Prophet (on the use which he made of these sūras in Suppl.) used to lay a spell on the Prophet, who recited these sūras when he was about to go to sleep. The mu’awwddhatān are considered to be Meccan, although they are also considered as having been revealed at Medina in order to frustrate an attempt to lay a spell on the Prophet (on the use which he made of them, see al-Bukhari, loc. cit.; Ahmad b. Hanbal, Musnad, iv, 155). They have to be continued, employed to avert the evil eye (Lane, Manners and customs of the modern Egyptians, London 1899, 259).


Although during his time Yemen freed itself from foreign rule, thereby becoming the first Arab country to secede from the Ottoman empire, Imām Muhammad entrusted all military affairs to his capable brothers, principally to al-Hasān (d. 1048/1639), al-Husayn (d. 1050/1640) and Ahmad (d. ca. 1060/1650), while he devoted himself to scholarship and to leading the Zaydi community. Al-Hibālī (Mu‘allaqat, 137-9) has identified and located thirteen works of his authorship, mainly legal opinions and interpretations based on Zaydi dogma.

2. Ibn al-Imām al-Mutawakkil ‘alā ‘Ilāh Ismā‘īl b. al-Imām al-Mansūr bīllāh al-Kāsim, who succeeded Imām al-Mahdi Ahmad (d. Dūrāfī 1102/June-July 1618) and held the imāmat until his death on 3 Dūrāfī 1102/27 April 1686, possibly from poisoning. Unwarlike, and distrusted by his brothers and cousins among his brothers and cousins. The favour shown to him by the prince wanted him deported. Al-Mu‘ayyad, who was on good terms with the imām’s father, was not deterred from propagating the Fatimid doctrine publicly. After the vizier al-‘Adī’s death in 433/1041-
2 he journeyed to Ahwáz, restored an old mosque, inscribed the names of the Fatimid imāms on the mihrāb, and read the dhulāta in name of the Fatimid caliph al-Mustanjir (Sirat al-Mu'ayyad, 54-5). On his return to Shiraz he found a hostile reception from the new vizier, following on account of the 'Abbāsid caliph's pressure and of intrigue at his own court against al-Mu'ayyad, Abū Kālidjār was obliged to withdraw his support and advised him to leave the city. Probably at the beginning of 435/1043, he migrated secretly to Ahwáz and stayed with amīr Mansūr b. al-Ḥusayn al-Asadi on his estate for seven months. The amīr's intervention on behalf of al-
Mu'ayyad might have reconciled the prince, who was also in Ahwáz, but the death of Djalāl al-Dawla in 'Abān of the same year made it impossible, as Abū Kālidjār renewed his claims to the throne in Baghdād. Consequently, al-Mu'ayyad left for Nadjaf and Karbāla3. After spending a year in al-Mawālī, he arrived in Cairo in 438/1046, but failed to get an audience with the imām until 'Abān 29, 439/February 18, 1048.

Despite his superior accomplishment and great literary ability, al-Mu'ayyad did not find favour with the courtiers until 444/1052-3 when he was appointed to the chancery. In 446/1054-5, after receiving information through a Byzantine source that Toghril Beg had entered into a secret agreement with the Byzantines against the Fatimids, he corresponded with al-
Basāṣīrī, a Turkish slave who had become a military commander in the last years of the Büyūd dynasty, promising Fātimid aid and encouraging him to conquer Baghdād. The following year he was sent as a Fātimid plenipotentiary in this matter to Irāk with money, exquisite robes, horses and weapons. By way of Damascus and Aleppo he went to al-Ḳalība and handed over to al-Baṣāṣīrī an investiture from al-
Mustanjir. His intense efforts at dealing with numerous amīrs and military leaders resulted in the formation of a coalition under the leadership of al-
Basāṣīrī who inflicted a bloody defeat on the Ṣafādījīd army at Singār in 448/1057, and al-Mustanjir was acknowledged in al-Mawālī. However, a lack of further support from Cairo and the greed of military leaders led to al-Mu'ayyad's withdrawal from the battle.

He returned to Cairo in 450/1058 and became dā'ī al-du'ūlī, but his good fortune did not last long and he was briefly vanished by a vizier to Jerusalem. He was in direct communication with the Yamānī dā'īwā, since the Yamānī dā'ī al-Kādī Lānak b. Mālik, the Ṣubayyid emissary in Cairo, had stayed with him during his sojourn (454/1062-7) in Cairo and had given special instructions from the imām to deal with the Karamānīs. He died in 470/1077 and was buried in the Dār al-Imām.

His al-Ma'ājdīyā al-Mu'ayyadiyya (vol. i; ed. Mustafā Ghālib, Beirut 1974; a compendium compiled by dā'ī al-
Hāmīdī, ed. Muhammad ʿAbd al-Kādīr, Cairo 1975 in 5 vols. is considered to be the apotheosis of Ismā'īlī learning.

Bibliography: For a full description of his works and sources, see I. Poonawala, Biography of Ismā'īlī literature, Malibu, Calif. 1977, 103-9. (I. Poonawala)

AL-MU'AYYAD SHAYKH (AL-MALIK), Circassian Mamlūk sultan. He was born to Egypt by the Dulkādirīd Mālīk Shāh (732/1380-1), and bought by al-Zahir Bārkūk (q.v.) whence his nīshāb of al-Mamlūkī al-Zāhīrī.

He was then about 12 or possibly (following Ibn Taghīzādī, some 10 years older, and was in due course emancipated and promoted in the sultan's entourage. In 802/1400 he was appointed governor of Tripoli by al-Nāṣir Farādī (q.v.), and spent the next 12 years in Syria, holding various appointments. He was deeply involved in the factional politics in which the Zāhīriyya, while generally opposed to Farādī and his Nāṣirīya household, were also at odds amongst themselves. In 812/1410 Shaykh allied with his rival, Nawrūz al-Hāfīzī al-Zāhīrī, and ultimately they defeated and deposed Farādī (Mubarram 815/May 1412). With the caliph al-Mustaṣīnī as nominal sultan, the realm was partitioned, Nawrūz retaining Syria, while Shaykh ruled Egypt as al-tālek al-ʿāsīrī. This settlement was overturned when Shaykh usurped the sultanate in 815/1412. Nawrūz refused to recognise his title, and endeavoured to organise the Syrian governors against him.

This led to Shaykh's first Syrian campaign (817/1414), when Nawrūz was lured out of the citadel of Damascus to his death. The ensuing settlement of Syria proved ephemeral, as the governors appointed by Shaykh conspired against him, and the sultan led a second campaign (818/1415) to suppress their revolt. The third campaign (820/1417) was very different in its purpose and scope. Shaykh advanced to Aleppo, which became his base for operations in the northern marches. Two Turcoman principalities were here the immediate neighbours of the sultanate: the Ramaḍānīds (Ramaḍān-oghullari [q.v.]) dominated Cilicia [q.v.] from Adana [q.v.], while to their east were the Dulkādirīds (Dhū L-Kādir [q.v.]) of Elbistan [q.v.], with whom they made a military commander at Marāsh and Malāta [q.v.]. Greater powers flanked these client-states: westwards the Karamānīs (Karamān-oghullari [q.v.]), and eastwards the Turcoman confederacies of the Ak-Koyounlu and the Kara-Koyounlu [q.v.]. Shaykh's immediate aim was to capture Tarsūs, which had been taken from his Ramaḍānīd client by the Karamānīs. Nāṣir al-Dīn Mehmed Beg. This was achieved, while the main thrust of the expedition was developed towards the east with an offensive against Elbistan and the Dulkādirī forresses, most of which surrendered, at least temporarily. The Karamānīs and the growing power of the Kara-Koyounlu under their chief, Kara Yusuf, continued to be Shaykh's chief anxieties. In 812/1418, fearing that fighting between the two Turcoman powers threatened Aleppo, he appealed for a fatwā justifying dhikrā against Kara Yusuf, who however withdrew. An expedition accompanied by Shaykh's son, Sārim al-Dīn (al-Sārīmī) Ibrāhīm, invaded Karamānī territory in 822/1421. Kayseri surrendered, and Shaykh's suzerainty was recognised. Mehmed Beg withdrew as the sultan's army advanced to Konya, Niğde and Laranda. Here, however, the decision was taken to return to Aleppo. The expedition, like that of Baybars in 675/1276, had demonstrated the limitations and impermanency of Mamlūk ascendency in Anatolia. There were no further campaigns in Shaykh's reign, although in his last months he was again preparing an expedition against Kara Yusuf.

These transient victories partially masked the unsound condition of Egypt. The currency was unstable. Epidemics of plague were recurrent. A serious death resulting in bread riots occurred in 818/1415-16, while in 820/1417-18 the ustādār Fakhīr al-Dīn b. Abī ʿl-Farādī carried out extortionate levies in Lower Egypt, which he followed with a punitive expedition against the Arabs of Upper Egypt. The booty then acquired (including enslaved free women) was disposed of by an enforced purchase at arbitrarily fixed prices (tarīb).

Shaykh suffered from a condition in his legs which
at times made walking impossible, and his health deteriorated throughout 823/1420. On 15 Dżumādā al-‘Awwal 823/27 June 1420, al-Sārīmi Ibrāhīm died, leaving no obvious successor to the sultanate. Shaykh designated his infant son, Ahmad (born 2 Dżumādā al-‘Awwal 822/27 May 1419) as his heir. Shaykh himself died on 9 Muharram 824/14 January 1421, and was buried in the Mu’ayyad mosque, which he had built by the Zuwayla Gate. Less than a year later, al-Muzaffar Abūl Mū’ayyad Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Abū Bakr b. Muḥarram b. Abū Bakr b. Abū Bakr al-Dāwla has as his secretary and then in Amasya (he became, as a young student of the famous poetess Mihn Khatun), Mu’ayyid al-Dawla had as his secretary and then in Amasya as a seven year-old boy, and became a member of his circle. It is to this period that his relations with the gifted youth and theologian, acquainted with prince Bayezid, the younger son of Sultan Mehemmed Fatih and after his father’s accession, he received an order for the execution of the two chief culprits, one of whom was Mu’ayyad (this bākṣ-ti ‘erfī is given in Feridūn, Manṣūra-yi mandżu-bīlī, Istanbul 1274/1857-8, i, 270-1). From a note by Mu’ayyad in a book bought by him during his stay in Ladik in Rabi’ I 882/June 1477 (the Zidī of Şems al-Din) the date is exactly fixed (the date in Feridūn should therefore be altered from 884 to 883; cf. Husam al-Din, Medjmu‘a-yi mu‘nsheht, Istanbul 1306/1888-9, 116; M. Shīrāzī, Ḥāfez-ī ‘erfī, Istanbul 1295/1878, 165; Mely Merid Ţüreyvā, Šūqī-lī ‘o‘thmānī, iii, 130; Sāmī, Kāmīs al-‘alām, iv, 30, 70-1; von Hammer, Gesch. der Osm. Dichtkunst, i, 305; Gibb, HOP, ii, 29-31; I, art. Mu‘eyyed-zade (M. Tārīyī Gōbglīnī).


MU‘AYYID AL-DAWLA, AbbāS Manṣūr Būya b. RūK AN-DAWLA HāSAn, Bułyid ruler in İsfāhān, Ravy and most of Djībāl 366-73976-84. His father RūK AN-DAWLA had before his death partitioned his lands between Mu‘ayyid al-Dawla (in İsfāhān, Ravy and their dependencies) and another son Fakhir al-Dawla ‘AbbāS [q. v.] (in Hamādat and Kurdis Djībāl). In the event, Mu‘ayyid al-Dawla acknowledged the overlordship of their other brother, ‘Adud al-Dawla [q. v.] of Fars, and with the latter’s support prevented Fakhir al-Dawla from assuming control in the greater part of his allotted territories. Coins minted at Ravy during the years 366 to 373 bearing the names of ‘Adud al-Dawla and Mu‘ayyid al-Dawla show that the latter generally controlled this city. Only after Mu‘ayyid al-Dawla’s death in ‘Dūrğān whilst campaigning against Fakhir al-Dawla’s allies the Ziyārids and Sāmānids (Shīb‘ān 373/January 984) was Fakhir al-Dawla able to recapture his paternal lands and control the whole of the northern Buļyid amirate.

When Mu‘ayyid al-Dawla had as his secretary and then
vizier the famous Sāhib Ismā'īl b. 'Abdābīd [q.v.], and the latter is said to have got his sobriquet "the companion" from his long contact with the Bāyūd prince [see Ibn 'arbīa]

Bibliography: See the general sources for Bāyūd history (Miskawayh, Rūḍhārwaṭī, Sibṭ b. al-Dīwāzī, Ibn al-Āṭīr); G. C. Miles, The numismatic history of Rayy, New York 1938, 166-70; Zambauer, Manuel, 213. (C. E. Bosworth)

AL-MU'ΑZZAM, AL-MALIK, the title of several Ayyūbid princes. Among these the most important and intriguing figure is doubtless al-Malik al-Mu'āzzam Sharaf al-Dīn ʿIsā b. al-Malik al-ʿAdīb Abī Bakr b. Ayyūb b. ʿAbdādī b. Marwān. Born in Cairo in 576/1180, he was made ruler of Damascus in 594/1198, a position which he retained until his death from natural causes in 624/1227. Al-Mu'āzzam's career as prince of Damascus, especially its last six years, illustrates with extraordinary clarity the political dynamics of the Ayyūbid confederation's middle phase between the death of Sālah al-Dīn in [q.v.] in 589/1193 and the rise of al-Sāliḥ Ayyūb in 637/1240.
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Mu'azzam in effect detained him as a hostage for nearly ten months (Djumada II 624/May-June 1227), until his unexpected death in 'Ain 'Ika'da 624/November 1227 averted open civil war, and perhaps catastrophe for the Ayyubid confederation.

With a sudden power vacuum in Damascus, which al-Mu'azzam's son and successor al-Nāṣir Dāwūd could not fill, al-Kāmil, al-Aghraf, and Frederick were quickly able to settle matters to their mutual satisfaction. Jerusalem was turned over to the Emperor under a ten-year-truce, the helpless al-Nāṣir Dāwūd was evicted from Damascus in 626/1229 and made lord of Transjordan, and al-Aghraf avenged his humiliation at the hands of his late brother by becoming prince of Damascus. Finally, as the guiding force behind this settlement, al-Kāmil for the first time achieved uncontested (though hardly unlimited) authority over all the princes of the Ayyubid confederation.

However turbulent al-Mu'azzam's relations with his fellow princes, his administration of his own territories seems to have been remarkably stable. In contrast to his father al-Adil, his reign was untroubled by turbulence among his senior amirs—in large part, no doubt, because he had been able to replace the old guard with his own men during the years he had ruled Damascus under al-Adil's firm guidance. Some of al-Mu'azzam's territories had been assigned in hereditary ikṭā with various younger brothers—e.g. Bānyās to al-'Aziz 'Uthmān and Buṣrā to al-Ṣāliḥ Ismā'il—but these men were firmly under his thumb. Likewise, the important town and fortress of Salkhad was held in ikṭā by his mālāk 'Īzz-al-Dīn Aybak al-Mu'azzamī. For the most part, however, al-Mu'azzam governed his principality through almost-ancillary ikṭāholders (nuzūqī), but these men could rotate or replace at will. During the summer of 622/1225, he did face an uprising in the Ghuta led by Izz-al-Dīn Aybak al-Mu'azzamī, regarded himself as a fakih, and his entourage perforce agreed with him.

Al-Mu'azzam's architectural patronage in Damascus was limited to a modest contribution to the Citadel, work on two of the city's gates (Bāb al-Shākī and Bāb Shāghūr) in the crisis year of 623/1226, the completion of the Madrasa 'Adiliyya in 619/1222, and a great minaret (madrasa) (no longer extant) in the Hanafi suburb of al-Sālihiyya. Outside Damascus, however, there was a great deal. He undertook (though he could not complete) a massive project to equip the pilgrimage route between Damascus and Mecca with baths, wells, and caravanserais at each stopping point. His father put him in charge of completing the vast fortress at Mt. Tabor, and towards the end of his reign al-Mu'azzam ordered the construction of the impressive citadel at al-Subayba overlooking Baḥyās. But Jerusalem was the real focus of his attentions; during the long years of tutelage under his father, he sponsored numerous restorations in the Haram and major additions to the city's fortifications. Predictably, he also endowed a Hanafi madrasa there.

Al-Mu'azzam was remarkable in one further respect; with the exception of Salāb al-Dīn himself, no other Ayyubid prince (and few Muslim rulers of any period) won such popular support and even affection among his own subjects. With members of the political élite he could be harsh and vindictive, but he knew how to mingle with his subjects without losing the fear and respect essential to government in those times.

Bibliography: The principal sources are the chronicles of Ibn Wāsil, Mufarrid al-kurūb fi aṣkhār Bani Ayyūb, iii-iv, Cairo 1960, 1972, and Sībīl b. al-Jawzī, Mir al-ṣamām li taʾrīkh al-aṣyān, vii (no critical edition; facsimile ed. by J. R. Jewett, Chicago 1907; Hyderabad 1952—a printed version of Jeweit); both chroniclers are sympathetic to al-Mu'azzam and his regime but hostile to al-Mu'azzam's exiled brother, the crusader al-Ashraf. Other Ayyubid princes (and few Muslim rulers of any period) won such popular support and even affection among their own subjects. With members of the political élite he could be harsh and vindictive, but he knew how to mingle with his subjects without losing the fear and respect essential to government in those times.
MÜBĀDELE (A. mubahada, "exchange"), a term used in Ottoman Turkish with various meanings:

(i) exchange of commodities and exchange of values. This usage can be seen in the rendering during the 19th century of Turkish Ottoman languages of concepts used in economics (see Ortaylı, Osmanlılarda lık bilinen telif iktisatı yazması, in Yapı [Oct. 1983], 41-2).

(ii) exchange of prisoners of war. These exchanges took place under more regular and formal bases specially after the treaties of Carlowitz [see KARLOFCA] and Passarowitz signed between the Ottoman Empire and the European powers. (iii) exchange of ambassadors between the Ottoman empire and foreign powers. (iv) exchange of populations as the result of the break-up of the Ottoman Empire at the end of World War I, which took place between Turkey and its Balkan neighbours (ahlâl mubahadeleri). Since it was regulated by international conventions, it falls in this sense without the scope of Islamic history and legal institutions; see further, MUSLÂM 1. In Turkey and the Ottoman lands. The second and third of these denotations will be treated here.

Exchange of prisoners of war. Such exchanges occurred on a large scale between the Ottoman empire and the Habsburgs after the treaties of Carlowitz and Passarowitz. For more than twenty years, the Sublime Porte continuously sent firmâns to all corners of Rumelia and Anatolia ordering local authorities to release captives in exchange for moderate ransoms (BA Nâmê abkâm, no. 58, 1154-8/1741-5, and no. 60, 1176-7/1762-4; and Ortaylı, Osmanlı-Habsburg relations (1740-1770) and structural changes in the international affairs of the Ottoman state, in Festschrift Robert Anhegger-Türkische Missellen, Varia Turcica ix (1987), 297-98). In the 18th century, treaties and conventions between the Ottoman Empire and Austria provided that prisoners could be granted enfranchisement certificates (strâk-nâmê) and be released more easily than in the past (K. Jahn, Türkische Freilassungserkärungen des 18. Jahrhunderts (1702-1711), Naples 1963, 10-11). Exchange of ambassadors. Ottoman envoys to foreign courts and their counterparts from foreign states met at the border, and after a ceremony on the spot, the latter proceeded to the Ottoman capital while the former went their way to the place where their embassy took them. Embassies sent to announce the accession to the throne of a new monarch did not fall into this category. Embassies were more usually exchanged on the occasion of renewal of treaties and negotiations pursuant to it. Great care was taken that the strictest reciprocity was applied in the matter of gifts to the sovereigns and leading dignitaries, the size and composition of the retinue of the ambassadors and the way they were received at court. The truce of al-Hudâybiya [q.v.] arranged by the Prophet with the Meccans does not include any provision concerning the exchange of legates. The first information of an exchange of envoys between an Islamic state and a people from the dâr al-harb goes back to the 3rd/9th century when the Vikings [see AL-MADJUS] sent an embassy to the amir of Cordova A'bâd al-Râhmi n II and Muslim emissaries were dispatched in return under al-Ghâzâl [q.v.]. The ambassador of the amîr was one Yâhây b. al-Hakam al-Bâkri of Jaên, known as al-Ghâzâl. He was sent in 845 either to Ireland or Denmark (B. Lewis, The Muslim discovery of Europe, London and New York, 1993, 305; cf. also E. Lévi-Provençal, Un échange d’ambassades entre Cordoue et Byzance au IVe siècle, in Byzantion, xii [1937], 1-24).

The Ottoman Empire had no permanent resident envoys in foreign countries till the reign of Selim III (1203-22/1789-1807). Embassies were sent abroad on a temporary basis, and in response to similar foreign missions. For the organisation of these temporary embassies and the reception of foreign envoys, see MÜBÂDELE 275. Ottoman missions sent to the courts of West European countries, in Ercumend Kuran’a fevkalade elcilerin âliyetleri, in Ercumend Kuran’a armagan, Ankara 1989, 201-31. Expenses of these missions were covered partly by the Treasury in Istanbul and partly by the inhabitants of the cities the embassy travelled through.

Great pomp and pageantry were displayed on the arrival of Austrian and Persian embassies, and Ottoman missions in the foreign courts were expected to be treated with the same ceremonial. The accounts of Busbeq and Dernschwam give an accurate image of the reception of Imperial embassies in 16th century Istanbul. For Russian embassies of the 18th century, the most important sources are the diaries of Repin (N. Izkowitz and M. Note, MÜBÂDELE, an Ottoman-Russian exchange of ambassadors, Chicago 1970, 125 ff.), and those of P.A. Tolstoy. Ewliya Celebi describes the entrance to Vienna of the embassy of Kara Mehemd Paşa in April 1665 (see R.F. Kreutel, Im Reiche des goldenes Apfels, Vienna 1957, 31-9).

At an appointed place on the border, the two embassies were exchanged according to an established ritual, and the number of their suites, their expenditures and livelihood on their way to and from the capital cities were determined for money brought by the two ambassadors and the letters which they carried were punctually presented. The abd-âhâm dated 15 Ragâb 972/16 February 1565 to the Emperor of Austria indicates that the Imperial ambassadors could be accompanied by as many interpreters as they wished and specifies the immunities from which these may benefit during their residence in Istanbul (A.C. Schaendlinger, Die Schreiben Suleymans des Prachtigen an Karl V, Ferdinand I und Maximilian II, Vienna 1983, Urkunde 32, p. 89).

If they were not carrying any letters from their own sovereign to the Sultan, foreign envoys were received in Istanbul only by the Grand Vizier. The Ottoman envoy sent in 1070/1660 on the occasion of the renewal of a peace treaty was not allowed to meet with his Austrian counterpart at the exchange place on the border nor to proceed to Vienna, on the grounds that the letter from the Sultan to the Emperor had not been couched in terms respectful enough. The Emperor had been addressed in the singular form (sen) and had not been given his proper title (kral instead of imperator). The letter had to be rewritten following the intervention of Siyawâsh Paşa in Budin and Murâd Paşa in Edirne (Na‘îmâ, Ta‘âbî, v. 21). The Ottoman sultans felt responsible for the immunity and personal safety of the foreign envoys who, heading towards Istanbul, had to travel through third countries. In a letter to the Austrian Emperor Ferdinand dated 21 September 1541, the latter is requested to secure the release of a French envoy who had been detained in Italy on his way to Istanbul by officials of Ferdinand’s brother Charles V (Schaendlinger, op. cit., Urkunde 3, p. 7).

The most detailed study of mubahadle in this sense is by Izkowitz and Note. A’bâd al-Kerîm Paşa and Repin were sent in 1775-6 respectively to Moscow and Istanbul on the occasion of the ratification of the treaty of Küçük Kaynardja [q.v.]. The exchange took place at Kitôtin [q.v.] after the crossing of the Dnieper. The ceremony and the negotiations are described in detail, based on a comparative study of the diaries and official dispatches. The exchange, a gun salute from each side greeted the two envoys. From that point onwards, an escort concomitant with the
envoy’s rank accompanied him along the itinerary. Requirements in food and carriage were taken care of locally. The embassies were received in state in the cities and settlements on the way to the two capitals. The financial strain caused by the need to supply means of transportation and food proved too much for some of these localities, and the itinerary was occasionally changed and some exemptions were granted. The practice of paying for the expenses of foreign missions was, however, discontinued after 1792 when Yusuf Ağāh Efendi was sent to London as the first Ottoman resident envoy abroad, where two capitals. The envoy’s rank accompanied him along the itinerary.
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MUBALAGHA — MUBALAGHA


(a) In grammar. Already in Sibawayh, the term mubalagha is used to denote the intensive participles of a number of morphemes and syntagmas (see G. Troupeau, Lexique-indice du Kitâb de Sibawayh, Paris 1976, 41). Most consistently it is henceforth applied to the intensive participles of the forms x al, x ol, etc., Al-Sjâ\d, (wrote ca. 704/1304) enumerates no less than 21 patterns for them under the general heading \\l", the term referring to nouns that are "diverged" (ma\dl) from the active participle (Manzar, 272-3). When used for God's attributes, these forms are, according to some, not intensive per se, but refer to the multiplicity of their objects, while others consider their form to be non-literal (al-wudjuh al-bayd), especially, "hyperbole".

When used for God's attributes, these forms are, according to some, not intensive per se, but refer to the multiplicity of their objects, while others consider their form to be non-literal (al-wudjuh al-bayd), especially, "hyperbole". When used for God's attributes, these forms are, according to some, not intensive per se, but refer to the multiplicity of their objects, while others consider their form to be non-literal (al-wudjuh al-bayd), especially, "hyperbole".

(b) In literary theory. Although in the classical system of 4bn al-kal\nh the term mubalagha did come to mean "hyperbole", earlier there were often protest against this narrow use and maintain that it means "emphasis, strengthening, heightening" in general, thus comprising "hyperbole" as one of its subcategories. At the outset the situation is, however, rather confusing: the earliest writers do not use the term mubalagha at all, though they are quite aware of the existence of "hyperbole", which they call by various names (Tha\flab, [d. 291/904]: al-\rdr fr l'i\drk [Kawo\d, 49]; Ibn al-Mu\tazz [d. 296/908]: al-\rdr fr l's\f [Bad\, 65]; Ibn Tabataba [d. 322/934]: al-ab\yt al\yt a\rdrka k\ldh\ldh fr ma\d\nd\ndh [S\yd, 76]).

Kudâma, though not in the sense of "hyperbole", for which they use jlu\l, but to denote a very specialised type of emphasising (jlu\l with later authors) in which a poetic idea is round ed out by a pertinent little exaggeration at the end of the line (Nakd, 77). He does, however, use mubalagha also in an untechnical way to describe the mechanism of jlu\l: the intention of hyperbole is "emphasis and image-forming (tam\ld), not the [literal] truth of a thing" (Nakd, 31, cf. also 27). Starting here, the "hyperbole" idea gradually spills over into mubalagha, although a man like Ibn Ras\kh (d. 456/1063 or later) still defends the old meaning, saying that the word mubalagha, "hyperbole", can, on the one hand, both refer to the untruth it entails mean that mubalagha, because, he says, "if all mubalagha were worthless and blameworthy, even similar would be worthless and metaphor would be blameworthy as well, as the other bearers" ("Umda, ii, 11); obviously, all these figures serve to emphasise the poetic ideas to which they are applied. In Ibn Ra\kh we also find the first systematic ordering of terms: mubalagha, now more narrowly understood as "intensification," comprises subcategories, such as takas\i ("going to the limit"), tar\l\f al-s\f ("piling of descriptions one over the other"), and jlu\lu. The enumeration is somewhat hazarded and probably not meant to be exhaustive. With the classical system of al-Kâ\b b al-Kaz\wini (d. 739/1338), logical stringency is achieved: mubalagha is defined as "claiming that a certain quality, in intensity or weakness, attains an unthinkable or improbable degree" and it is subdivided, in accordance with the philosophical distinctions munkin-muntant\-mastuth, "possible-possible-unthinkable", into to\ol\d, \rdr, and jlu\l, of which the second is possible in the mind, but not according to everyday experience, while the first and third are possible in both or neither, respectively (Id\d, 514-16, Tahl\g, 370-1). This is the system represented in the nineteenth-century Western handbooks still in use (see Rücker, Meiren and Garcin de Tassy), which are based on al-Kaz\wini and later Arabic and Persian works.

Due to the inherent absurdity (ib\a) of many hyperboles, jlu\l became a matter of dispute within the larger framework of untruth (ka\b\d) in poetry. Kudâma testifies to the existence of this literary feud in his time and opts for the permissibility of hyperbole by applying to it the adage ah\ndu l\ldr\f\m al-\al\h (Nakd, 34-8). Others differ, and a sort of compromise emerges by postulating that a given hyperbole must survive the k\d\d test to be acceptable (thus already Kudâma, Nakd, 133, cf. Abu Hilâl al-\s\r\d, S\\n\ntayn, 375, Ibn Ra\kh, "Umda, ii, 65), i.e., the hyperbole in question must admit of being rewritten with an explicit form of the verb k\d\d "to be close to [doing s.th.]" or some word to the same effect. There is no question that hyperboles were of great importance in mubalagha poetry and in its Persian and Persianate successors, and the critics, even when averse to "lies" in poetry, had to come to terms with them. A conservative authority anonymously quoted by Ibn Ra\kh says: "If poetry were [identical with] hyperbole (mubalagha) [apparently some went so far as to allege this], the sedentary people and the Moderns would be better poets than the Ancients" ("Umda, ii, 84). Others used the typical legitimising procedure of saying that the (or some) Moderns followed the Ancients in this respect (Ibn Tab\\b\t\b, "\\yf, 81, al-Kâ\d al-Dj\rdj\d, W\s\nt, 420-3). In any case, the idea that hyperbole was of the essence in traditional Islamic poetry became so engrained that in our time the Turkish poet Orhan Veli, in a poem critical of the old Di\\w\n poetry, referred to the latter as mubalagha sanat, "the art of hyperbole" (B"\drin \\rdrleri, Istanbul 1966, 80).
of the forest had to be fixed. Mubarak Ghazi who, in the eastern parts of the Ganges Delta, goes by the name of Zinda Ghazi, the living warrior, Mubarak Ghazi is said to have been a fakir (mendicant) who reclaimed the jungle tracts along the left bank of the river Hoogly. Every village has an altar dedicated to him, and no-one enters the forest nor do any of the boat’s crew, who might sail through the districts, pass without first making offerings at one of these shrines. The fakirs in these dangerous forests, who claim to be lineally descended from the Rashids, indicate with pieces of wood called sang the precise limits within which the forest has to be felled. Mubarak Ghazi, so the legend goes, came to Bengal when Raja Matoor ruled over the Sundarban. The saint happened to have a dispute with the chief, who thought himself to be in the right, upon which the latter agreed to give his only daughter Shushila in marriage to the former, should his own opinion be proved wrong. This the Ghazi succeeded in doing and won his bride in consequence. Since no man saw him die, he is believed to reside in the depths of the forest, to ride about on tigers, and to keep them so obedient to his will that they dare not touch a human being without his express desire. Before entering a jungle or sailing through the narrow channels whose shady banks are infested by tigers, boatmen and woodcutters, both Hindus and Muslims, raise little mounds of earth and on them make offerings of rice, plantains, and sweetmeats to Mubarak Ghazi, after which they fearlessly cut the brushwood and linger in the most dangerous spots.

This strange myth, there cannot be any doubt, is borrowed from Hindus to suit the taste of the superstitious boatmen and woodcutters.

Mubarak Shah, Mu'tizz al-Din, the second king of the Sayyid dynasty of Dihl, was the son of Khurshid Khan [q.v.], the first king, and succeeded his father on 19 Dhu al-Muhađra 1601/24 May 1642.

The limits of his kingdom were then restricted to a few districts of Hindustan proper and Multán, and he was obliged to desist from an attempt to establish his authority in the Pandžab by the necessity of relieving Gwalior, menaced by Hūshān of Málwa [q.v.], who raised the siege and met him, but after an indecisive action came to terms and retired to Málwa. From 828/1625 to 830/1627 he was engaged in attempting to restore order in Mewát [q.v.], and received the formal submission of the rāgas of Gwalior and Čandwār (Firuzābād); but Mūhammad Khān Awdhād of Bāyānā, who had taken prisoner, escaped and took refuge in Mevāt, and the work there had to be done again. Mūhammad Awdhād, on being hard pressed in Bāyānā, fled to the Sharkī sultan Ibrāhīm Shāh of Dāwpūr [q.v.], and as the latter marched against Kálpi [q.v.], Mūbaraḵ marched to meet him. Ibrāhīm, who had been plundering Mūbaraḵ’s dominions, surrendered and obtained a method of conciliation, and Mūbaraḵ is said to have been at Šāhād Mūbaraḵ Shāh I 831/2 April 1428, the armies met near Čandwār, and Ibrāhīm, though not decisively
defeated, retired the next day to Djawnpur. Mubarak then collected revenue in the neighbourhood of Gwalior and retired by way of Bayana, which was evacuated by Muhammad Awhadi, who had returned thither. For the rest of the year, his officers were engaged in restoring order in the Pandjab, ravaged by Qasrah the Khoqar, and he in a similar task in Mewat, and in collecting revenue by force. In 833/1430 Fülud Turbača successfully defied the royal authority in Bhatinda, and in 834/1431 a rebellion broke out in Multān and had no sooner been suppressed than Qasrah renewed his activity in the Pandjab. The chronicle of the rest of the reign is a record of rebellions in the Pandjab, Multān, Sāmāna, Mewat, Bayāna, Gwalior, Tidjāna and Itāwa; also, a rebel captured Lāhawr and attacked Dīpalpūr. Lāhawr was eventually recovered, but the whole country remained in a disturbed condition.

We broke out into Ibrāhīm of Dījawnpūr and Ḥūghān of Māwā in connection with Kālpī, the suzerainty over which belonged to neither and was claimed by both, and Mubarak, marching thither, turned aside to inspect Mubarakābād which he was building; but then, on 9 Rājab 837/19 February 1434, he was assassinated at the instance of Sarwar al-Mulk, whom he had dismissed from the post of minister in the preceding year.

By appointment of a kubī, Kāsim Frīghāt, Gulḏān-i Ībrāhīmī, Bombay 1832; Mustakkbū l-tasawīrī, ed. and tr. by Lt.-Col. G.S.A. Ranking; Tabākāt-i ʿAbbārī, ed. and tr. by B. Dé, both in the Bibli. Ind. Series of the Asiatic Society of Bengal; Yāḥyā b. Ṣaḥmī Ṣinīdī, Taʾrīkh-i Mubarak Shāhī, rare in manuscript, but reproduced by the authorities cited above, see on it, Storey, I, 512. (T.W. Haig)

MUBĀRIZ AL-DĪN [see muẓaffarids].

AL-MUBARAKA (''the veiled one''), the lākab [q. v.] of Abū Ḥarb al-Yāmāni (according to al-Yaʿqūbī: Ṭanūn al-Lakhmī, known as Abū Ḥarb), a rebel in Palestine 227/841-2 against the caliph al-Muʿtaṣim. The most detailed source referring to the events of his uprising is the Taʾrīkh of al-Ṭabarī (iii, 1319-22; cf. E. von Oppenheim, Al-Muṣṭaṣim: the Muṣṭaṣim regime, New Haven 1951, 124-6), followed by the works of Ibn al-ʿAlī (vi, 522-3) and Ibn Khaldūn (al-Ṭabarī, Beirut 1956-9, iii, 572-3). The Taʾrīkh of al-Yaʿqūbī, however, presents the most independent description of the events (ii, 586).

The revolt involved (according to al-Yaʿqūbī) the Lakhmī, Dḫuḏhum, ʿAmila and Bākayn [q. v.] (M. von Oppenheim, Die Beduinen, ii, Leipzig 1943, 7, 78, points out that the events concerning this revolt were still preserved in the memory of the Ḥabīb al-Ḥebr), a conflict concerning a soldier, whom Abū Ḥarb had put to death for personal reasons, caused his revolt and made him take refuge in the mountains of Palestine, indeed one existed). According to his own testimony, he was called, in 246/860, to Samarra (d. 255/869), who was a pupil of al-ʿAsma ibn Dībān; moreover, he took part in the scholarly discussions concerning Kurāʾan and Poetry and Works concerning al-Sulī, and when he claimed Umayyad descent, his supporters considered him to be the Sufyanī (for whose genealogy reaches back to the Djahiliyya; cf. W. von Lüerssen and W. von Steyern, in Orientalia, xiv, 1935, 222-3). The participants in these discussions were impressed by his demeanour and appearance and by his persuasive language and convincing argumentation. It is probably in these surroundings that he received his rather uncommon lākab. Among several widely differing attempts to explain the etymology of this lākab by way of anecdotes, the most realistic one tells us that Abū ʿAlī ʿAbd al-Muṣṭaṣim was called al-muṣṭaṣim, i.e. al-muṣṭaṣim bi l-ḥakk, 'he who affirms truth', because of his ingenious way of giving pertinent answers, and that others changed this name into al-mubarrad, 'the cooled one'. This distorted name finally stuck to him, as may be observed in other cases. In al-ṣabārī he also met al-Taʾwāzi (d. 233/847) and al-Ṭabarī [q. v.], and he repeatedly refers to both of them. According to his own testimony, he was called, in 246/860, to Samarra and the court of the caliph al-Mutawakkil (reigned 322-47/837-61). Subsequently, he settled down in Baghda, where his reputation as a great authority in matters of ʿaribiyā had already been established. There he committed himself to widespread teaching activities until his death on 28 Dhuʾl-Hijja 286/4 January 900 (or a year earlier). He was buried in the cemetery near Bāb al-Kūfa in a 'house'. Among his pupils were al-Dījawnpūrī, Ibn Kawsān, Mubarak al-Muṣṭaṣim and Ibn Durfustawāy, as well as al-Zadīdījānī, al-ʿAṣkārī, Ibn al-Sarrājī and al-Sūfī; for two warrāqs see Führich, 60, 11, and for an alleged mustamlii, see al-
In Baghdad, the madjlis of philologists received its classical form through the disputes (musa'idat), and its chapters on the KharidjTs (chs. 49, 51 and 34 [pp. 327-703 in Wright's edition]), consisting of loosely arranged reports, without any visible structural intention (cf. pp. 581, 12 ff. and 703, 1 ff.), again and again interrupted by excursions on grammatical and lexicographical questions; now and then, these sections form short independent chapters (cf. chs. 50 and 52-3). Mention should also be made of al-Mubarrad's predilection for verses containing a comparision/simile (sayyāh), to which he repeatedly dedicates whole passages (pp. 747-54 and 432-4). Later scholars have made of al-Ruṣāfī's, from whom al-Kisā'i transmitted, the founder of the Kufan madhab (q.v.), of his teacher al-Kisā'i (q.v.), and of his pupil al-Ḥasan al-Akhfash al-Asghar (d. 315/927) [q.v.].

Weil's introd. to his edition of Ibn al-Anbarī's Tahdhib al-Kāmil (p. 760, K. al-Ikhtiyār, ibidem), was inevitably pushed into the role of a representative of Kufan traditions—which, as it seems to me, have never been transmitted in a perfect way—always from the point of view of modern commentaries: one by al-Siibā'i, from whom al-Ruṣāfī transmitted, the founder of the Kufan madhab (q.v.), and of his pupil al-Ḥasan al-Akhfash al-Asghar (d. 315/927) [q.v.], and of his pupil al-Kisā'i (q.v.), and of his pupil al-Ḥasan al-Akhfash al-Asghar (d. 315/927) [q.v.].

Weil's introd. to his edition of Ibn al-Anbarī's Tahdhib al-Kāmil (p. 760, K. al-Ikhtiyār, ibidem), was inevitably pushed into the role of a representative of Kufan traditions—which, as it seems to me, have never been transmitted in a perfect way—always from the point of view of modern commentaries: one by al-Siibā'i, from whom al-Ruṣāfī transmitted, the founder of the Kufan madhab (q.v.), and of his pupil al-Ḥasan al-Akhfash al-Asghar (d. 315/927) [q.v.], and of his pupil al-Kisā'i (q.v.), and of his pupil al-Ḥasan al-Akhfash al-Asghar (d. 315/927) [q.v.].

Weil's introd. to his edition of Ibn al-Anbarī's Tahdhib al-Kāmil (p. 760, K. al-Ikhtiyār, ibidem), was inevitably pushed into the role of a representative of Kufan traditions—which, as it seems to me, have never been transmitted in a perfect way—always from the point of view of modern commentaries: one by al-Siibā'i, from whom al-Ruṣāfī transmitted, the founder of the Kufan madhab (q.v.), and of his pupil al-Ḥasan al-Akhfash al-Asghar (d. 315/927) [q.v.], and of his pupil al-Kisā'i (q.v.), and of his pupil al-Ḥasan al-Akhfash al-Asghar (d. 315/927) [q.v.].

The elegy on the caliph al-Mutawakkil (d. 2477/861) may serve as a termius post quern for the genesis of the work (pp. 775-6), in which occasionally his K. al-Muktadab (p. 535, 2) and his K. al-Ikhtiyār (p. 760, 4) are referred to for further commentaries (see below, nos. 4 and 12).—O. Rescher has published a partial German translation, Die Kharidchitenkapitel aus dem Kāmil (nach der Ausgabe William Wright's), in Specimen Adael 38 (1954) and 39 (1955). For the older Oriental prints, see Brockelmann, I, 109, S I, 168. On the basis of Wright's edition, a new edition with enlarged indices (by Muhammad Sayyid Kaylānī) has been initiated by Muhammad Zā'ī Abīd al-Salām Mūbrāk, continued from p. 433 onwards by Ahmad Muhammad Shākir, 3 vols., Cairo 1356-76/1937-56; the new edition by Muhammad Abīd al-Fadl Ibrāhīm and al-Sayyid Shāhāk, in 4 vols., Cairo 1376/1956 ff., is no improvement. The most recent edition has been published by Muhammad Ahmad al-Dālī, in 4 vols., Beirut 1406/1986, followed by an exact, Damascus 1407/1987. There are two useful modern commentaries: one by al-Sibā'i al-Bayyyūmī, Tahdhib al-Kāmil, 2 vols., Cairo 1341/1923, and above all Raghaṭ al-āmil min kitāb al-Kāmil, by Sayyid b. Abī al-Mardūq, 8 vols., Cairo 1346-8/1932-30; for the glosses and critical remarks by an anonymous author, following Ibn al-Sid al-Batalyawi (d. 494/1101) and Abī 'l-Wālī al-Wakhsāshī al-Wakhsī (d. 489/1096), see H. Ritter, in Oriens, ii [1949], 275-6, and Muhammad Zā'ī Abīd al-Khālíq 'Udaymā in the introduction, pp. 54-5, to his edition of al-Mubarrad's al-Muktadab (see below, no. 4).

2.) K. al-Taṣā'ī (wa 'l-mujādila), another adab-work, though of much smaller size (ca. 1/10). It is better structured, but this is not consistently maintained; it is divided into 15 chapters (bāb) and a final one, consisting of 7 sections (fāṣil). The preface is, considering...
the early date of the work, remarkably abundant; it contains e.g. akhbār about the rise of Arabic grammar, a number of sayings and a play on words with the root َفَلَج١ and its derivations, followed by an elegant transi-
tion to the main subject, sc. َعَدَاد٢. Besides the
excellence of poetry, mostly embedded in pointed
stories from the time of the Umayyads, further sub-
jects are: generosity, grief, youth and old age, 
gratitude, envy, eloquence, and beauty; and, as in َكَمِل٣ (see above, no. 1), we find several casual
remarks concerning the character and aim of the small
trunk (pp. 68, 86 and 99). His principal authorities
are al-ʿAlīṣī, al-Riḍāj, and al-Tawwāzī, three scholars
to whom he also refers in َكَمِل٢. No sources
are mentioned, nor does he refer to his own
works or to the works of other authors. Part of
the material is familiar to us from َكَمِل٣, and in both
works he scarcely uses ṣīnād. In contrast to َكَمِل٢, lexicographical or grammatical explanations are
rarely given here. In َفِدِل٤, the hand of the author,
deliberately shaping the book, is clearly perceptible.
ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Maymānī has edited the text from a
uncīm, Cairo 1375/1956 (see also H. Ritter, in َوَى٥ [1953], 67).
(3) K. al-ʿTaḍāzī َعَلِى٦ ِمَارَاذِغ٧, a voluminous collec-
tion of poems on condolence and mourning, with
appropriate stories added to them. The text can be
precisely dated to the period between the end of
282/beginning of 896 and 284/897. The core of
the book consists of verses and poems, together with
“historical” explanations which had already been
quoted by the author in َكَمِل٢ and in َفِدِل٤. He
draws also on traditions following al-Māḍānī (d.
228/842, cf. K. al-ʿTaḍāzī, Nadjīf 1391/1971; see also
Borni el-Oumm’s edition [from the same uncīm],
and his German translation, PhD thesis, University
of Göttingen 1984, passim), and, without mentioning
a name, following authorities such as Abū Hātim َسِدْجِستَن٨ (d. 255/869; cf. his K. al-Wasjāyā, 
Cairo 1961, 148 ff. ad 116 ff.). Muhammad al-Dīhājī
has edited the text in Damascus in 1396/1976 (cf. ʿAlībāḥ al-Ṭurārī al-ʿArabī [Kuwait], i [1402/1982], 28, and
Māzdār [Baghdād], iii, 4 [1399/1974], 31 ff.). A
collection of particular questions concerning mor-
phology (sarj) and syntax (nahw), and a prefac-
ed. (4) K. al-Mudhakkar, a voluminous collec-
tion of ṣīnūd and its derivations, followed by an elegant transi-
tion to the main subject, sc. َعَدَاد٢. Besides the
excellence of poetry, mostly embedded in pointed
stories from the time of the Umayyads, further sub-
jects are: generosity, grief, youth and old age, 
gratitude, envy, eloquence, and beauty; and, as in َكَمِل٢ (see above, no. 5), who also gives the most
detailed investigation is necessary before we can say
more on these topics. Of the four commentaries on
.resume adad known to have existed, only that by Abu ʿI-
Kāsim al-Fārīḍī (d. 391/1001) has survived (see iv,
index, 219; Sezgin, iv, 79 and 201).
The short treatises by, or, more precisely, transmit-
ted from al-Mubarrad and dealing with isolated ques-
tions relating to the fields of grammar, lexicography,
and َعَدَاد٢, such as nasāb (genealogy), are mere lecture-
otes; this can be concluded, among other things,
from the fact that they have no prefaces. They
originated in the magāfīs, either at the time of
al-Muktdad and َكَمِل٢, or a little later, but in any case
more or less in the background of these two works,
and therefore have been called, more or less correctly,
booklets by al-Mubarrad. Their titles are as follows:
(5) K. al-Mudhakkar َعَلِي٦ ِمُوَاَنَنْع٧, ed. Raḍāmān
ʿAbd al-Tawwāb and Šāhād al-Dīn al-Ḥādi, Cairo
1970 (cf. al-Muktdad, iv, index, 107 ff.); (6) K. al-
Kawāfī َعَلِي٦ ِمُعَتَّق٧ ِكَبَحَّنا٨ min al-Kubīl al-magāfī, ed.
ʿAbd al-Tawwāb, Cairo 1972; (7) K. ʿAbd al-Ṭaṣāfā laf-
ṣūa َعَلِي٦ ِكَبَحَّنا٨ min al-Kubīl al-magāfī, ed.
ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Maymānī, Cairo 1350/1931 (cf.
ʿAbd al-Ṣaḥīf [Kuwayt], nos. 40-1 [1409/1989], 8); (8) Ṣaḥīf
fī ṣīnād bayātī tughfī fī َتَمِيمْل٨ ِسُدْرَحْبَه٩, ed.
ʿAbd al-Salām Hārūn, in َتَحْلِيِل١٠ al-mākhṭūtāt, i, Cairo
1370/1951, 161-73; (9) K. Nasāb ʿIbn al-Khadājān, 
ed. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Maymānī, Cairo 1354/1936.—
From the point of view of language and style, also his
brief ṣīnād, entitled (10) al-Ṭalābājā, which was
written for Ahmad, the son of the caliph al-Wathik (reigned
227-32/842-7), forms part of this group (cf. e.g. al-
Muktdad, iv, index, 218). There are three editions of
it, each one based on the only complete manuscript
(Munich [Amer], no. 791) written by the famous
calligrapher Ibn al-Bawwāb (d. 413/1022 [q.v.]); one
by G. von Grünbaum, in Orientalia, x [1941], 372-82,
and one by Ramāḍān ʿAbd al-Tawwāb, Cairo 1965,
1985, and one by Maḥdīr al-Dīn Ahmad, Aligarh
1968.—Other works transmitted from al-Mubarrad and
known from numerous quotations, such as his
(11) ʿArbaʿ with critical remarks on the Kitāb
al-Sīrāwat, are of a similar quality, cf. al-Muktdad, iv,
index, 220-6, and i, introduction, 87 ff.; ʿAbd al-
ʿAzīz Maymānī (al-Maymānī), Kitāb al-Sīrāwat, Lahore
1927, 89; also called (?) K. al-Ziyīda al-muntaza min
Kitāb Sīrāwat, ms. Konya, Yusuf Aga, no. 4914,2
(cf. A. Ates, in َبِلِيِتِن١١, xvi [1959], 59; f.)
also called (?), K. al-Ziyīda al-muntaza min
Kitāb Sīrāwat, ms. Konya, Yusuf Aga, no. 4914,2
(cf. A. Ates, in َبِلِيِتِن١١, xvi [1959], 59; f.)
oc, and 219; Sezgin, iv, 79 and 201).
For further works whose titles are mentioned in the
sources, such as (12) al-Ḵiṭīrāj, (13) Ṣaḥīf al-ḥādiḥ, 
(14) al-Pīʿānī, (15) Ṣafīt Allāh (cf. F. Shath, Chois de
livres... d’Alap, Cairo 1946, index), (16) Ṣaḥīf al-
ṭābur (op. cit.), and (17) Tabābkī al-al-khīyānīn al-Bayyinīn
ṣiʿa al-ḥādarah (op. cit.), see especially Ramāḍān ʿAbd
al-Tawwāb, in his introduction to al-Mubarrad’s al-
Mudhakkar (see above, no. 5), who also gives the most
complete list of works, containing all together 54 titles, each one provided with a commentary.—Al-Mubarrad's (18) K. al-Rau'da, a collection of poems by contemporary poets beginning with Abu Nuwas, by contemporary poets beginning with Abu Nuwas, who was himself a pupil of Ben Mubarrad. It is probable that the work of one of his younger contemporaries, namely his pupil al-Akhfash al-Asghar (see above); in his small treatise, consisting exclusively of glosses—a feature typical of this author—he refers not only to Abu 'l-Abbas [al-Mubarrad], but also to Ahmad b. Yahyā [Thālab], Fadl al-Yazīd and al-Ahwal, all authorities known to have been his teachers (cf. Yākūt, Irshād, v, 224 f. [Marzubān, Mubārad, 93, 11 f. and vi, 482.19.—Broedelmann, S I, 53 f.; Sezgin, ii, 135; F. Krenkow, f.]; and vii, 482.19.—Brockelmann, S I, 53 f.; Sezgin, ii, 135; F. Krenkow, f.]); and vi, 482.19.—Brockelmann, S I, 53 f.; Sezgin, ii, 135; F. Krenkow, f.]

—The contents of a (19) Khutbat takrū' li manhadi al-Mubarrad in ix/3 (1400/1980), are unknown to us. His surviving work, composed in 440/1048-9, is probably not identical with his three-volume Mukhtār al-hikam wa-mahdsin al-kalim, which, if preserved, would be a source of inestimable value. This work had the following combination of biographical sketches and collections of saying. It starts with chapters on legendary "sages" from the Egyptian Hermetic tradition, namely, Seth, Fadl al-Yazīd and al-Ahwal, all authorities known to have been his teachers (cf. Yākūt, Irshād, v, 224 f. [Marzubān, Mubārad, 93, 11 f. and vi, 482.19.—Broedelmann, S I, 53 f.; Sezgin, ii, 135; F. Krenkow, f.]; and vii, 482.19.—Brockelmann, S I, 53 f.; Sezgin, ii, 135; F. Krenkow, f.])


—The German literature on al-Mubarrad is abundant and varied. The main sources are: Zadjdjadjl, Khatīb al-Baghdadī, iii, 380-7; [q. v.], Saragossa 1383/1963, iii, 146; Ibn Khayr, in MO, i, 157 f. (R. SELLHEIM).


—The main sources are: Zadjdjadjl, Khatīb al-Baghdadī, iii, 380-7; [q. v.], Saragossa 1383/1963, iii, 146; Ibn Khayr, in MO, i, 157 f. (R. SELLHEIM).
Hermes and Tat (or Säh, apparently, the Hermetic Tat somehow equated with the fictitious eponym of the Sàbians). They are followed by Asclepius, who signals the transition to the general Greek tradition. Entries are devoted to Homer, Solon, Zeno of Elea, Hippocrates, Pythagoras, Diogenes, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, King Alexander, Poltemy, Syros (?), Lukmán [q.v.]. Ainosios (i.e. Aescop?) Maḥālārdī (not yet definitely identified), the Church Fathers Basilius and Gregorios, and finally Galen. The work ends with a chapter on sayings of various sages and one containing anonymous sayings. The biographical information is often more detailed than anything that was ordinarily available in mediaeval times; some of it reflects otherwise lost sources. As an entertaining mirror of the best that Classical Antiquity had to offer in ethical thought and moral behaviour, the Muṣāḥar enjoyed great popularity in the Muslim world, as evidenced by the number of preserved manuscripts and its frequent use by later writers. A special reception of the text circulated in the Muslim West. It was translated into Spanish about 1250. The translation dropped al-Mubashshir's name, which was thus lost to the old European tradition. The Spanish translation was followed by translations into Latin and then into some European vernaculars—French, Provençal and English. Its title of Bocados d'oro was not adopted by subsequent translations; they preferred titles on the order of Liber philosophorum musulnorum or Dîcunt and sayings of the philosophers. After the invention of printing, editions of the Spanish, French and English versions appeared in large numbers. The English text printed by Caxton in 1477 is believed to have been the first English book printed in England. The last time one of the translations was printed in Renaissance Europe was in 1553, the date of a French edition. The growing acquaintance with Greek literature then made the work obsolete until Orientalist scholarship began to pay attention to it in the early 17th century.

**Bibliography:** Brockelmann, I, 600, S I, 829: F. Rosenthal, in Orients, xii-xiii (1961), 132-58, giving most of the earlier literature; on further ms., idem, in JAO S, lxxiii (1963), 456 I., xv (1975), 211-13, xcix (1979), 91-3; idem, tr. of the chapter on the sayings of various sages, in The classical heritage in Islam, 118-44, London 1975; Mechtild Crombach, Bocados d'oro, Ausgabe des alspanischen Textes, Bonn 1971. (F. Rosenthal)

**AL-MUBAYYIDA [SC AL-MUKANNA]**

**MUBTADA** (a.) I. As a technical term of Arabic grammar. Here it is generally translated as 'introductive'. It designates the first component part of which one begins (yubtada' bihi) the nominal phrase, whose second component is the predicate (khabar) [q.v.]. Sibawayh defines it as being 'every noun with which one begins in order to construct a statement (kalâm) upon it; the introductory noun is the first and the construction built upon it comes after; the first is 'that which is connected' (masnad) and the other 'that to which it is connected' (mumad tayhth). It is closely connected with the known, such as an unknown thing which is qualified for the predicate it was also the subject of a difference of opinion among the early grammarians; those of Basra allowed it, whereas those of Kufa rejected it and, in agreement in stating that the introductory noun may be an unknown thing, on condition that it is closely connected with the known, such as an unknown thing which is qualified (mawṣūf), for the quality particularises it.

As for the possibility of moving back (wābdh) the introductory noun and bringing forward (tābā'ī) the predicate, it was also the subject of a difference of opinion among the early grammarians; those of Basra allowed it, whereas those of Kufa rejected it and, in the case where the predicate that has been brought forward is an adverb (zaf), they consider that the noun that has been moved back is again "introductory".


(G. TROUPEAU)

2. In history. The term is employed in historical works, in particular with regard to the beginning of the creation and also to biblical history in general. In his Fihnrist, 94 ll. 8-9, Ibn al-Nadīm mentions a K. al-Mubtadā that he attributed to ʿAbd al-Munīm b. Idrīs (d. 228/842) and which allegedly went back to that author's maternal grandfather Wahb b. Munabbih (d. 110/728 or 114/732). This work, which deals with the history of the prophets (kiṣṣā al-ʿanbiyya), is the first of its type in Islamic culture. At the same time, Ibn Kutayba, Maʿṣūf, 3 ll. 7 ff., and al-Thalabī (d. 427/1035), Kiṣṣā al-ʿanbiyya, 65 ll. 11 ff., after him, speak of an al-Mubtadā wa-kiṣṣā al-ʿanbiyya, attributing it to Wahb. The same title was used by Muhammad b. Ishaq (d. 150/767 or 151/768) in the first part of his K. al-Maghdī, where he frequently cites Ibn Munabbih, who influenced him considerably in regard to enlarging his historical perspectives (see Brockelmann, S I, 205; Sezgin, GAS, i, 289, and their references: R.G. Khoury, Les sources islamiques de la "Sîna", 24 ff.). Al-Masʿūdī, Murādī, i, 127 = § 126, uses the same word in regard to Ibn Munabbih and others, with a difference however in the second part of the title: K. al-Mubtadā wa ʿl-iṣyār. The word is also to be found in the long title of the History of Ibn Khaldūn.

Other later compilations, beginning with earlier oral or written versions, including that of Ibn Munabbih, use rather the synonym bad, such as...
MUBTADA’ — MUDÂRABA

Umara b. Wathima b. Musa b. al-Furat al-Faris! (d. 289/902) in his K. Badī' al-khalk wa-kisas al-anbiyā’, which he transmitted from his father Wadima (d. 237/858). He is followed by Ibn Kathīr (d. 699/1300), who called his own work K. al-Badī’ wa l-tā’īfīh. Abū Bakr Muhammad al-Kisā? also followed this tradition in certain versions of his book on the history of the prophets in Islam (see Brockelmann, S 1, 592). With Ibn Kathīr (d. 744/1343), there appears a third variant of Mubtaba*, sc. al-Badī’, in his History called al-Bidaya wa l-an’ahā’. For more detail on the different works mentioned above, see the articles on their respective authors.

Bibliography:

MUDÂNNA, a Turkish town located on the Gulf of Gemlik on the Asiatic shore of the Sea of Marmara, now in the ilce or district of the same name and in the il of or province of Bursa [q.v.] In early Ottoman times, it came within the il of Khudawendigar [q.v.]. In late Ottoman times it was a port of regional importance, exporting the olive oil, fruit, wines and other agricultural produce of the fertile surrounding region; it also served as the port of transit for the manufactures of Bursa, the provincial capital, to which it was linked in 1892 by a narrow-gauge railway. The inhabitants of Mudanya were a mixture of Turks and Greeks; Ottoman statistics set the population of the kada‘ of Mudanya at 17,395 in 1893 and at 24,233 in 1914. It now in the ilce of Gemlik on the Asiatic shore of the Sea of Marmara, [q.v.

On 23 September the Allied Powers offered to let them pass, and for some days war threatened. On 3 October, the Turks agreed to respect the neutral zone pending the outcome of a peace conference. They also agreed to a cessation of hostilities with Greece. The armistice came into force at midnight on 14—15 October 1922; Greece did not sign it, but announced her adherence on 14 October.

The armistice was therefore more than a ceasefire. By recognising full Ottoman sovereignty in Eastern Thrace it resolved one of the principal political issues between Turkey, Greece and the Allied Powers; the others were dealt with at the peace conference held at Lausanne (November 1922—July 1923). Allied forces remained in the neutral zone and Istanbul until the conclusion of the peace conference; all were evacuated by 1 October 1923. The Government of the Grand National Assembly had long since asserted its own political authority in Istanbul: some three weeks after the Mudanya armistice, it abolished the Sultanate and insisted that Eastern Thrace be recognised as Turkish sovereign territory and placed under Turkish control. The slow rape of Turkey by representatives of the Government of the Grand National Assembly in the name of the Sultan’s government which had hitherto survived under Allied protection, and installed its own men in charge of the capital.


MUĐÂRABA [see râbi‘a] MUDÂRABA (A.) (also, in Şâhi‘i and Mâlikî sources, kənād and muqārada), a commercial association whereby an investor (tâb al-mâl) entrusts capital to an agent (muḏârâb, ṣamîl) who trades with it and shares with the investor a pre-determined proportion of the profits. Losses incurred in the venture are the responsibility of the investor; the agent loses his time and effort, and any profit he would have gained were it successful. Most schools of law require that the capital be entirely provided by the investor and the labour entirely by the agent, otherwise the arrangement is transformed into another kind of contract (e.g., loan, investment of merchandise, or partnership with unsecured capital [sdiu"

and becomes a partnership only with the division of the profits.

The capital for the formation of the muddaraba must consist of currency. Chattels (warud) and real property are ineligible on grounds of uncertainty and risk (gharar) because their value may fluctuate before they are converted into cash, leaving the subject matter of the muddaraba undefined and undetermined. However, the Hanafi and Hanbali schools permit the formation of a muddaraba with a pre-condition, so that once specific chattels or real property have been sold, the proceeds may finance the muddaraba. Subject to conversion of the capital, the profits are eligible on grounds of uncertainty and risk (ghasb).

The right of the agent includes a previously agreed proportion of the profit (neither party can stipulate a specific sum). He may deduct all legitimate business expenses from the capital to the extent that customary practice dictates; and he may usually deduct personal living expenses, but only if he is travelling. The Hanbali school, by allowing all matters of personal expenses to be the subject of agreement between the parties, permits greater flexibility. Although the investor has the right to impose certain restrictions, the agent is given considerable freedom of action to conduct business and achieve a profit. Does the agent have the right to mix his own capital in the muddaraba? The Hanbali schools permit the association of capital of both and the labour of one of the parties; the Hanafis permit the association of capital of one and the labour of both parties to conduct trade together (Maghni, v, 136). Again, further latitude is envisioned only by the Hanbalis, who also permit an association of labour, where the capital is contributed by one party while both parties conduct trade together (Maghni, v, 137). Such a muddaraba is not permitted by the other schools, who insist that the capital be placed in the absolute possession of the agent.

The liquidation of the muddaraba, i.e. conversion of the muddaraba properties back to currency, is the duty of the agent, although there is considerable discussion as to the degree each party is entitled to decide the most profitable (or least harmful) time to do so. The recognised duty of the agent to buy and sell at the most profitable time conflicts, of course, with the notion of a fiduciary and non-binding contract which normally either party can dissolve at will. The inconsistency was noted by all schools and various rules attempt to resolve the conflict. In addition, in contrast to the Shi'is and Malikis, the Hanbali and Hanafis permit a muddaraba contract to be formed with a pre-determined time limit, after which the agent could no longer engage in trade on behalf of the muddaraba.

The muddaraba is treated at length in the classical fikh works as a contract distinct from other partnerships, reflecting the important role it played in medieval long distance trade. For this aspect, see Kirad. The contract was also a device to lend money with interest just as one can with the noun of the agent (ism al-fid'il) to the similar prefix the agent is given considerable freedom of action to conduct business and achieve a profit. Does the agent have the right to mix his own capital in the muddaraba? The Hanbali schools permit the association of capital of both and the labour of one of the parties; the Hanafis permit the association of capital of one and the labour of both parties to conduct trade together (Maghni, v, 136). Again, further latitude is envisioned only by the Hanbalis, who also permit an association of labour, where the capital is contributed by one party while both parties conduct trade together (Maghni, v, 137). Such a muddaraba is not permitted by the other schools, who insist that the capital be placed in the absolute possession of the agent.

The liquidation of the muddaraba, i.e. conversion of the muddaraba properties back to currency, is the duty of the agent, although there is considerable discussion as to the degree each party is entitled to decide the most profitable (or least harmful) time to do so. The recognised duty of the agent to buy and sell at the most profitable time conflicts, of course, with the notion of a fiduciary and non-binding contract which normally either party can dissolve at will. The inconsistency was noted by all schools and various rules attempt to resolve the conflict. In addition, in contrast to the Shi'is and Malikis, the Hanbali and Hanafis permit a muddaraba contract to be formed with a pre-determined time limit, after which the agent could no longer engage in trade on behalf of the muddaraba.
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MUDĀRING — MUDĒJAR


G. TROUPEAU

AL-MUDAWWANA, Mālik treatise [see SAḤNUN].

AL-MUDAWWARA (A.), lit. "something circular", a term used in the central and western parts of the Arab world in the later Middle Ages to denote a large tent, or pavilion, used especially when the army was on the march.

Khalīl al-Zāhirī (Zubdat kašf al-mamlāk, ed. R. Ravaise, Paris 1894, 136-7, tr. Venture de Paradis, Beirut 1950, 228) states that when the Mamlūk sultan sent out a powerful military expedition, the order of the commander's tents, when encamped, is that the highest-ranking officer's tent (waṭāk) is set up at the end of the formation, with the sultan's muḍawwara (of such a size that its components had to be carried on 120 camels) right at the end of the line. The information of al-Kalkashandi confirms that the muḍawwara was a very large tent or pavilion. When the army of the Moroccan Marinids [q.v.] was on the march, the city-like formation of the encampment (ghisqa, in Mamlūk parlance, hawāq) included a lofty tent intended as the sultan's public audience hall, the kubbat al-sikā, which al-Kalkashandi says was called a muḍawwara in Egypt (Subh al-ašā, v, 208-9).

Bibliography: Given in the article, but see also Quarat al-waṣīr, Hist. des sultans mamlouks, i, 192; ii, 212, and Dozy, Supplément, i, 475. (Ed.)

AL-MUḌATTHIRR and AL-MUZZAMMIL, the titles respectively of the 74th and 73rd sūras of the Kurʾān, derived from the first verse of each of them which may be translated "O you covered in a cloak!" The first term is the active participle of a form V, nā̄dādhar, derivative verb from nāḍār "over garment", and the second, also an active participle, from form V, tāzamāla "to wrap oneself [in a garment]", the infix t of muḍat̄thir and muzzāmml being simply assimilated to the first radical. The two sūras are Meccan, and the opening verses of the first sūra may well be the opening of the entire revelation. The exegetes offer several explanations for the two expressions, which obviously designate in both cases the Prophet in an ecstatic condition, probably with his head covered in the fashion of the diviners of former times. The variant muzungml, passive participle of form II, would imply the intervention of another person, in this case Khadīja [q.v.], whom Muhammad must have asked to cover him when he felt that a revelation was at hand.

Bibliography: In addition to the classical commentaries, see in particular, Nöldke-Schwally, Geschichte des Qorān, i, 98; M. Gaudefroy-Demombynes, Mahomet, Paris 1969, 72-75. (Ed.)

MUDĒJAR (Spanish; in Catalan mudejar), from the Arabic muḍadāq or aḥl al-dağh, a term to designate the Muslim who, in return for the payment of tribute, continued to live in territories conquered by the Christians. The word covers the double sense of "one who remains behind, a garrison", and of tributarius, which is the translation of the Vocabulista in arabico. In fact, there is a correlation between the fact of not emigrating before the Christian advance and that of becoming subject to a new jurisdiction which is no longer Islamic. The term is also used to characterise the manifestations relative to this culture; thus there is reference to Mudējar architecture, literature, etc. It should be stressed that before the 15th century, the Mudējars are generally called mawrilmomos (often, more specifically, moros de paz), saracenis-sarrahins, and that the term mudējar only appears in Spanish texts ca. 1462, "eran de intención que se diesen al rey nuestro, e biviesen por modejares en aquella ciudad e su tierra" (Crónica constatable Luis de Franza). The surrender of Purchena (1489) stipulates "...que Nos tomanos e recibimos por nuestros vasallos mudexares..." and the "alafqui Yuzaf el Mudexar" was one of the administrators of Grenada in 1491.

It is possible to identify the status of being a Mudējar: (a) of individuals, (b) of communities and (c) of political formations. These last may be "external" (i.e. not included geographically in the Christian zone). Thus it seems appropriate to speak of the Mudējar status of the Nasrid sultanate of Granada, politically subordinate to the Castilians to whom it paid tribute (the parias [q.v.]) and even to extend it to European colonialism and protectorates when exercised at the expense of Islamic states.

(a) Individual Mudējar status is produced—at least sporadically—when an expedition launched from the dar al-dahr has successfully occupied a part of the dār al-İslām whose inhabitants have not yet submitted. There is also an implicit notion of the possibility of choice of residence, and a Muslim prisoner could not be considered a Mudējar unless, when freed, he chose to stay (his status from the point of view of fitk is a subject to which we shall return). In this sense, the status of Mudējars existed on almost all the frontiers (thughur [q.v.]), the first cases occurring in Azia Minor, between the Byzantine counter-offensive of the 8th-9th centuries.

(b) The Mudējar status of communities. This appears, in the sense of a widespread phenomenon giving its name to the process, in Spain only in the 5th-6th/11th-12th centuries (the Maghribi jurist al-Wansharīsī, d. 915/1509) considered it to have begun ca. 503/1100. It also came about in Sicily with the Norman conquest of the 11th century; in Syria-Palestine with the creation of the Latin Kingdom in the 12th century; in Russia with the Muscovite expansion of the 15th-16th centuries, and in the Balkans with the decline of the Ottomans in the 18th-19th centuries. The phenomenon has received no specific designation in these regions, and no scholar has yet undertaken a global and comparative study either of this historical process or of its evolution.

In all cases, this was a process affecting organised and close-knit (usually urban) groups who—having the option of emigration—preserved, in return for a formal capitulation, their religious, judicial, administrative, fiscal, linguistic and other structures. It also constituted the application to conquered Muslims of the status of dhimmī [q.v.]. That seems to be the opinion of the eminent Abd Allah al-Turtushi (d. 1502), who in 1462, "to cover the tribe paid to Alfonso VI of Castile. Ibn al-Kardabūs also uses it when speaking of
the tribute levied by the King of Castile, the Cid and Alfonso I of Aragon. Al-WansharisI spoke of the tributes and guarantees: "Item es asentado e concordado que sus Altezas e sus descendientes para siempre jamas dejaran vivir..."

Thus the terms of surrender of Tudela stipulated: ...volendo Deo ut affirmat illo alcardi in suo honore et in sua iustitia et suo filio, salvum illum, in suo honore et in suo mandamento, et totos illos alguaciroes et alfachis et maiorales quod tenet eos in suos fueros, et totos illos alios mauros quod stent in lures casas intra in illa civitate, de isto uno ano completo de ista carta; et infer tantum quod faciant et indrecreant casas in illas arrabales de foras, et quod remaneat illa metzchida maiore in lurs manus usque ad isto ano completo, quod levent illos in lur fuero de lures hereditates que habent in Tortoxa, et in suas villas per direito et per iusticia sic es fuero in lure lege, id est, quod donent decima ad comes Raymundus Berengarii de totos lures fructos et totes lures alcatas, et qui voluerit ex eis sua alode vendere, qui non illi devettet aliquis, et vendat uti potuerit, et qui voluerit ex illis exire de Tortoxa per ad alias terras aut per terra vel per aqua, vadat solutus cum suo toto avere, et cum filios et mulieres, qua hora voluerint prope vel tarde, et vadat de salvetate, si voluerit, sine consilio de nullo homine. Et totos illos mauros quod stent in lures fueros et in lures iusticias, et non inde illos dissolvat nullus homo, et stet super illos lures iudicem cum suis castigamentos, sicut est in lure lege, et non illos forgeret, per alia iura facere.

The first known situation involving Mudejars was when the conquering power, having pushed back the Muslims, was to mark the end of their reign. The capitulation of Granada guaranteed:

Thus the terms of surrender of Tudela stipulated: ...volendo Deo ut affirmat illo alcardi in suo honore et in sua iustitia et suo filio, salvum illum, in suo honore et in suo mandamento, et totos illos alguaciroes et alfachis et maiorales quod tenet eos in suos fueros, et totos illos alios mauros quod stent in lures casas intra in illa civitate, de isto uno ano completo de ista carta; et infer tantum quod faciant et indrecreant casas in illas arrabales de foras, et quod remaneat illa metzchida maiore in lurs manos usque ad isto ano completo, quod levent illos in lur fuero de lures hereditates que habent in Tortoxa, et in suas villas per direito et per iusticia sic es fuero in lure lege, id est, quod donent decima ad comes Raymundus Berengarii de totos lures fructos et totes lures alcatas, et qui voluerit ex eis sua alode vendere, qui non illi devettet aliquis, et vendat uti potuerit, et qui voluerit ex illis exire de Tortoxa per ad alias terras aut per terra vel per aqua, vadat solutus cum suo toto avere, et cum filios et mulieres, qua hora voluerint prope vel tarde, et vadat de salvetate, si voluerit, sine consilio de nullo homine. Et totos illos mauros quod stent in lures fueros et in lures iusticias, et non inde illos dissolvat nullus homo, et stet super illos lures iudicem cum suis castigamentos, sicut est in lure lege, et non illos forgeret, per alia iura facere.
al dicho Rey Muley Baaudili e a los dichos alcaides, e alcadis, e sabios, e mofties, e alfaquies, e algua-
ciles, e caballeres e escuderos, e viejos e buenos hombres y de la comunidad, chico e mayor, e estar en
su ley, e non les mandarán quitar sus algumas y zumas, e almuedanos, e torres de los dichos almuedanos, para que llamen á sus azalaeas, e dejarán e mandarán dejar á la dichas algumas sus propios e rentas como ago lao los tienen, e que sean
juzgados por su ley xaracina con consejo de sus alcadis, segund costumbre de los moros, y les guar-
darán e mandarán guardar sus buenos usos e costumbres...serán honrados e mirados de sus alza-
tes, e sus dichos oidos, e guardados sus buenos usos e costumbres; e que sean pagados á los alca-
dis e alfaquies sus quitaciones, e derechos, e franquezas e todas las otras cosas e cada una dellas, segund e
en la manera que lo hoy tienen e gozan e deben gozar.

Item es asentado e concordado que si debate ó quistión hobiere entre los dichos moros, que sean
juzgados por su ley xaracima e por sus alcadis segund costumbre de los moros...

Item es asentado e concordado que las rentas de las dichas algumas, e cofradias, e otras cosas dadas para limosnas, e las rentas de las escuelas de abezar mochachos, queden á la gobernación de los alfa-
quies; e que las dichas iimosnas las puedan gastar nin gelas manden tomar nin embargar agora nin en
tiempo alguno para siempre jamás...

It is evident that, far from seeking their departure, these conditions were intended to retain and even to
attract the Muslims. It is thus that the stipulations of the treaties (and of the Cartas pueblas of Chivert-
Edida, Uxó, etc.) all tend to preserve a status accet-
table to the Muslims, and also to cancel the
Almoravid fiscal inducement, taxes being reduced to
exiguities. It seems that it would be in order to speak of
"ladrillo gothic"), steeples whose construc-
tion and decoration are extremely reminiscent of
the Giralda of Seville. Mudéjarism, which respected
the religion and culture of the vanquished, was
abruptly ended by the compulsory conversion decreed
by the Catholic Kings in 1502 for the Castilian
vassal of a Christian kingdom. This type of Mudé-
jarism was always episodic and temporary. Within a
fairly short period of time, it became internalised and
finally blended into Mudéjarism of a community.
Disregarding the disputable cases of Toledo,
Saragossa and Tudela under Lubb b. Musa b. Kasf
(ca. 863), and Toledo (1080-5) and Valencia (1086-92)
under al-Kadir b. Phi'1-Nun, there exist others,
finally blended into Mudéjarism of a community.
It followed from this that there appeared the famous steeples of the Aragonese
churches of the 14th-15th centuries (art historians
speak of "ladrillo gothic"), steeples whose construc-
tion and decoration are extremely reminiscent of
the Giralda of Seville. Mudéjarism, which respected
the religion and culture of the vanquished, was
abruptly ended by the compulsory conversion decreed
by the Catholic Kings in 1502 for the Castilian
vassal of a Christian kingdom. This type of Mudé-
jarism was always episodic and temporary. Within a
fairly short period of time, it became internalised and
finally blended into Mudéjarism of a community.
Disregarding the disputable cases of Toledo,
Saragossa and Tudela under Lubb b. Musa b. Kasf
(ca. 863), and Toledo (1080-5) and Valencia (1086-92)
under al-Kadir b. Dhi 'l-Nun, there exist others,
indubitable and well-known: those of the kingdoms of
Minorca (1231-87), Murcia (1243-66), Granada
(1245 and at intervals until 1490), Niebla (1257-63)
and Crévillente (1296-1316).

Bibliography: The basic authority (which
gathers together and publishes numerous
documents) continues to be P. Fernández de
calzada, Estado social y político de los mudéjares de Castilla,
Madrid 1866; Isidoro de las Cagigas, Los mudéjares,
594/1198 [q.e.] and al-Wanghari (d. 912/1509),
and there were many fatwaes declaring it the duty of the
Andalusians to abandon the land of the infidels
(Mudéjar, it. 1199-1258)...

The Christian occupation was accompanied by the
disappearance of Arabo-Muslim political and cultural
élites. Even such an educated and intellectually "pro-
Arab" monarch as Alfonso X of Castile did not suc-
ceed in retaining the services of the celebrated
Muhammad al-Tikutl. It followed from this that there
could be no elaborate training nor future for the
Mudéjares (salvaq and sadak) which explains the lack of
creativity and the erosion of linguistic knowledge.
Grammatical errors and an increasing impoverish-
ment of vocabulary led eventually to a total and wide-
spread ignorance of the Arabic language. This
explains the emergence of the afjamado [q.e.] which is
nothing other than Castilian written in Arabic charac-
ters. In the 14th century, the Leyes de moros were
composed purely in Castilian and, in 1462, Icle de Gebir
published the Suma de los principales mandamientos de la
Leyy funna, evidently intended for a population which
considered itself Muslim but which was no longer
Arabic-speaking. On the other hand, the Mudéjars of
Aragon and especially those of Valencia maintained
the use of Arabic (spoken and written) until the time of
their expulsion—as the Moriscos [q.e.].

The skill, high degree of specialisation and
cheapness of Mudéjar handicrafts led to the continua-
tion of such activity, thus perpetuating Arabo-Muslim
techniques and decorative designs. This was particu-
larly true in the context of ceramics (loza dorada),
sculpted and painted ceilings (artesonados), decoration
in stucco and, most of all, the use of brick for con-
struction. It was in this period and in this context that
there appeared the famous steeples of the Aragonese
churches, the famous steeples of the Aragonese
churches of the 14th-15th centuries (art historians
speak of "ladrillo gothic"), steeples whose construc-
tion and decoration are extremely reminiscent of
the Giralda of Seville. Mudéjarism, which respected
the religion and culture of the vanquished, was
abruptly ended by the compulsory conversion decreed
by the Catholic Kings in 1502 for the Castilian
vassal of a Christian kingdom. This type of Mudé-
jarism was always episodic and temporary. Within a
fairly short period of time, it became internalised and
finally blended into Mudéjarism of a community.
Disregarding the disputable cases of Toledo,
Saragossa and Tudela under Lubb b. Musa b. Kasf
(ca. 863), and Toledo (1080-5) and Valencia (1086-92)
under al-Kadir b. Dhi 'l-Nun, there exist others,
indubitable and well-known: those of the kingdoms of
Minorca (1231-87), Murcia (1243-66), Granada
(1245 and at intervals until 1490), Niebla (1257-63)
and Crévillente (1296-1316).

Bibliography: The basic authority (which
gathers together and publishes numerous
documents) continues to be P. Fernández de
calzada, Estado social y político de los mudéjares de Castilla,
Madrid 1866; Isidoro de las Cagigas, Los mudéjares,

(P. CHALMETA) MUDGAL, ancient fort in India situated in 13°5' N., 75° E., in the modern state of Karnāfaka, together with Rāykur [q.v.], it formed a principal defence of the Raykur dīrāb, i.e. that between the rivers Krīṅgana and Tungabhāgā, that shared a bone of contention between the Hindu kingdom of Vidjayanagara [q.v.] and the Deccan sultanas. The date of its foundation is unknown, but it seems to have passed from the possession of the Yādava rulers of Dēṣgīr [see DAWLATABAD] to the Kākātiya kings of Warangal, and from the appearance of the cyclopean masonry of parts of the outer wall, it could well have been established under the former. It came first to the attention of a Muslim sultanate after the conquest of Dēṣgīr (694/1295), when Malik Kāfir [q.v.] captured and garrisoned both Mudgal and Rāykur when on his way to attack the Kākātiya capital of Warangal; but there are no records of how long Muslim sway was then maintained. After the establishment of the Bahmāni [q.v.] sultanate in Guḷbarga, Mudgal frequently changed hands between that sultanate and Vidjayanagara; thus under the Bahmāni Sultan Muḥammad Ṣah, the founder of the sultanate, it formed, with Rāykur, part of the Ahsanābād-Guḷbarga tārāf under the able ważīr Sayf al-Dīn Ghūrī; it was lost for a time to the Vidjayanagara ruler Bukka I, but recaptured in the wars of 767/1366 when the Bahmāni used cannon for the first time, and it was presumably about this time that the defences of the fort were adapted for artillery.

The reign of Dēvārāya I in Vidjayanagara, 808/1406, saw a renewal of hostilities brought about by the notorious “war of the goldsmith’s daughter”; an accomplished young lady whom the Rāḍā coveted, the Bahmāni Sultan Muḥammad Ṣah, the founder of the sultanate, it formed, with Rāykur, part of the Ahsanābād-Guḷbarga tārāf under the able ważīr Sayf al-Dīn Ghūrī; it was lost for a time to the Vidjayanagara ruler Bukka I, but recaptured in the wars of 767/1366 when the Bahmāni used cannon for the first time, and it was presumably about this time that the defences of the fort were adapted for artillery.

The reign of Dēvārāya I in Vidjayanagara, 808/1406, saw a renewal of hostilities brought about by the notorious “war of the goldsmith’s daughter”; an accomplished young lady whom the Rāḍā coveted, the Bahmāni Sultan Muḥammad Ṣah, the founder of the sultanate, it formed, with Rāykur, part of the Ahsanābād-Guḷbarga tārāf under the able ważīr Sayf al-Dīn Ghūrī; it was lost for a time to the Vidjayanagara ruler Bukka I, but recaptured in the wars of 767/1366 when the Bahmāni used cannon for the first time, and it was presumably about this time that the defences of the fort were adapted for artillery.

The reign of Dēvārāya I in Vidjayanagara, 808/1406, saw a renewal of hostilities brought about by the notorious “war of the goldsmith’s daughter”; an accomplished young lady whom the Rāḍā coveted, the Bahmāni Sultan Muḥammad Ṣah, the founder of the sultanate, it formed, with Rāykur, part of the Ahsanābād-Guḷbarga tārāf under the able ważīr Sayf al-Dīn Ghūrī; it was lost for a time to the Vidjayanagara ruler Bukka I, but recaptured in the wars of 767/1366 when the Bahmāni used cannon for the first time, and it was presumably about this time that the defences of the fort were adapted for artillery.

The reign of Dēvārāya I in Vidjayanagara, 808/1406, saw a renewal of hostilities brought about by the notorious “war of the goldsmith’s daughter”; an accomplished young lady whom the Rāḍā coveted, the Bahmāni Sultan Muḥammad Ṣah, the founder of the sultanate, it formed, with Rāykur, part of the Ahsanābād-Guḷbarga tārāf under the able ważīr Sayf al-Dīn Ghūrī; it was lost for a time to the Vidjayanagara ruler Bukka I, but recaptured in the wars of 767/1366 when the Bahmāni used cannon for the first time, and it was presumably about this time that the defences of the fort were adapted for artillery.
(ta'allakd) on convention (istilah) and on specific usage (wadc), such as busrd "good news", and shams "sun"; in these nouns, the mark of the feminine is suppressed (hudhifa) in pronunciation and the practice is to dispense with (istaghn) the fact of their particular classification (ihtisay) as feminine.

There are also adjectives which qualify as feminine nouns, although devoid of the mark of the feminine: they are those which express a durable (hadyd) and not accidental (hadid) quality, such as zkar "sterile". Conversely, there are adjectives possessing the mark of the feminine, which qualify as masculine nouns: they are those which express an excess (mubalaghah) in the quality, such as ulāmā "greatly learned". Finally, there are nouns which are considered sometimes as masculine, sometimes as feminine, such as islmān "tongue".


(M. G. Troupeau)

MUDIR (A.), the title of governors of the provinces of Egypt, called mudiriyas. The use of the word mudir in this meaning is no doubt of Turkish origin. The office was created by Muhammad 'All, when, shortly after 1813, he reorganised the administrative structure of Egypt, instituting seven mudiriyas; this number has been changed several times. The chief task of the mudir is the controlling of the industrial and agricultural administration and of the irrigation, as executed by his subordinates, viz. the ma'ānīr, who administers a markaz, and the nāṣīr who controls the kīrīm, which is again a subdivision of the markaz. Under Sa'id Pāgha (1854-63) the office of mudir was temporarily abolished with a view to preventing oppression. Until that time they had been without exception Turks, but under the Khedive Ismā'īl (1863-79) when the institution was again, this high administrative position was opened also to native Egyptians.

At the present time, Egypt comprises 25 mudiriyas or governorates; some are comparatively small in area, being essentially urban (e.g. Port Said, Damietta, Cairo and Aswan), whilst at the other end of the spectrum, those covering the deserts of which the land mass of Egypt is largely composed (e.g. al-Bār al- Ahmar, al-Wādī al-Djāhid and Mersa Matruh) are enormous in extent.


MUDJADDID (A.) ("renewer of the century"). In his Mughnī (Brockelmann, II, 65; S I, 749, 19) Zayd al-Dīn al-Ṭrāṭī (d. 806/1404) quotes a tradition according to which the Prophet said that, at the beginning of each century, God will send a man, a descendant of his family, who will explain the matters of religion. Because of the lethargy in which Islamic science found itself since the 8th/14th century, no such renewal was expected for the 9th. This view was contested by Djalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūtī (d. 911/1505 [q.v.]). In his Kitāb an muddakhasa hadīthī l-turūm al-ẓafra (Brockelmann, II, 151, 35; S II, 187; Cat. Cod. Bibl. Acad. Ligea, iv, 275), written in 902/1500, al-Suyūtī hopes that it is to him that his contemporaries will grant the title of mudjadid al-dīn, or also of muhīr al-islm "renovator of Islam", for the coming 10th century.

In the title of the work mentioned above, al-Suyūtī refers to the belief, current in certain circles, that Islam would not outlive a thousand years. This belief apparently was also spread in the Yemen, for Shāhīb al-Dīn Abū al-Kādir, in his Fatīh al-Habahī, written shortly after 967/1559-60, speaks of ignorantomuses and stupid people who, relying on apocryphal traditions, pretend that the last days have arrived, since the 10th century is already at hand. According to al-Suyūtī, quoted by Shāhīb al-Dīn, the reliable traditions of the Prophet mean that the Islamic milla will outlast one thousand years, but not five hundred more years, "What comes afterwards, only God knows."

The labak [q.v.] mudjadid was, among others, given to the Umayyad caliph Umar II (Ibn Sa'd, v, 245), since he was particularly guided by God. The best known mudjadid of later times was the great theologian al-Ghazālī [q.v.], who was also given the ho. This view was contested for the coming 10th century. The latter labak was given much more frequently, both to scholars and rulers. Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī [q.v.] was generally known as mudjadid-i alf thānī "renovator of the second millennium".


MUDJADDIT (see RASÜL, BANU).

MUDJADDID (A.), the active participle of the form III verb dāhada "to strive" (of which the verbal noun is dihād [q.v.]), hence acquiring the technical religious meaning of "fighter for the faith", one who wages war against the unbelievers.

1. In classical legal theory and in early Islam. See for this qidiad.

2. In Muslim Indian usage.

In the subcontinent, the term mudjaddid has been associated with Islamic revivalist movements there, and especially with the more militant ones which arose from the late 18th century onwards in response to threats to the waning power of the Mughals in Dīhil and other Muslim sultanates from the increased pressures of the Marātḥās, the Sikhs and the British.

The revivalist and reformer Shāh Wāli Allāh Dīlawī (1703-63 [q.v.]) stressed the duty of dihād and played a role in the invecting of the Afghān amīr Ahmad Shāh Durrānī [q.v.] into India in order to curb the Marātḥās and Dāirs [q.v.]. Shāh Wāli Allāh's ideas much influenced Sayyid Ahmad Bārīwī (see AHBED, Bārīwī) of Bareilly (1786-1831) who in the early years of the 19th century formed the Tarākt-i Mubāmr ma'nīya movement, basically Sūf-inspired but with some parallel motivation from the contemporary
Wahhabi movement [q.v.] in Arabia. In Sayyid Ahmad's movement, djihadd was viewed as the means to establish an independent Muslim state in the subcontinent, and his mudjahidin first turned their attention to the Sikhs' power in the Punjab (in the struggle against whom Sayyid Ahmad was himself killed at Balaot). His surviving mudjahadin, and more particularly the activist wing under Sayyid Ahmad's main successor Mawlawi Wilayat 'Ali (d. 1853) and the latter's brother Inayat 'Ali (d. 1858), centred on Patna, fought on in the 1830s and 1840s, but now against the British after they had succeeded to the Sikh empire in the Punjab and had tried to extend north-westwards into Afghanistan. In the Indian Mutiny of 1857-8, they allied themselves with the rebels, but their headquarters at Sithana were sacked by British forces in 1858, and they further suffered during the Ambala campaign of 1858 and in the so-called "Wahhabi trials" of the 1860s. Parallel mudijhid-type movements also occurred in the rural Muslim regions of Bengal in the early decades of the 19th century, such as that of the Farangiyya [q.v.], of Haidji Sharif 'Ali (d. 1820) and his more militant brother Djudhul Miyan (d. 1860) and that of Sayyid Ahmad Brâwi's disciple Titu [q.v.] or Mir Mithar 'Ali (d. 1831), and in the extreme south-western tip of India among the Muslim Mâpîllas [q.v.] or Moplah peasantry.

Enthusiasm for djihadd remained strongest in the North-West frontier region of India. Mudijhindin participated in the frontier rising of 1897-8, and in the early 20th century they allied themselves with the Khilafat movement [q.v.]. In the Third Afghan War of 1919 was launched by King Amâr 'Ali [q.v. in Suppl.] of Afghanistan as a djihadd against the British. During the events of 1947, when Indian forces moved into the predominantly Muslim-populated princely state of Jhànnd and Kashmir [q.v.] in order to prevent the population from acceding to Pakistan, mudijhidin from the Pathan areas of the North-West Frontier Province and also from Afghanistan flocked thither in autumn of that year, attempting to establish Muslim rule there.

In recent years, since the setting-up in Kabul of the Soviet-supported regime of Babâri Karmal in December 1979, the anti-Communist resistance within Afghanistan has termed itself that of the mudjihidin.


3. In modern Arab usage

Many Muslims in the contemporary Arab world (and also outside this area) have come increasingly to regard all rulers who do not rule according to Islamic law as unbelievers (káfîrůn) [see KÁRIR] and thus, when born as Muslims, as apostates from Islam (mu'tadîdun) which according to Islamic law merit the death penalty [see MURTAD, RIDDA].

A scriptural basis for this theory is found in, e.g., Qur'ân V, 44: "Whosoever does not rule (yakhum) according to what God has sent down, they are the unbelievers." Hence war against unbelievers has become more and more directed against rulers who are not in favour of immediate and complete application of Islamic law in all its details both in private and in public life.

This militant view is usually designated as the takfîr al-hâkim ("regarding the ruler as an unbeliever") theory. Even Muslims who are not ready to join the different activist groups are rarely willing to deny publicly that Muslim law has to be applied, and hence contribute to the creation of a general atmosphere in which anything that helps to introduce its application meets with approval or passive support.

Muslims, so the activists and extremists argue, have the duty to execute the prescriptions of Islamic law in all its details, since according to Muslims those prescriptions are the command of God. Total and general application of these precepts (or any other system of law) is, however, not possible without the active support of the power of the state. Hence, the establishment of an Islamic state which applies Islamic law is—according to many militant Muslims—an Islamic religious obligation as well.

Since no state can be established without the use of force, to participate in the violence, the use of force and possibly even the civil wars which are necessary to bring about the establishment of such a Muslim state, are equally a Muslim religious obligation. Hence a Muslim who participates in acts of terrorism which aim at the introduction of Islamic law in public life or the establishment of an Islamic state, may have good reason to regard himself as a true mudijhid.

According to e.g. Dr. Yusuf al-Kardawi (see BIBL.), this way of thought came into being in the harsh atmosphere of the prison camps in which many members of the Muslim Brothers [see AL-IKHWAN AL-MUSLIMUN] were held during the power struggle between the Brothers and the Nasser régime in the sixties [see 'ABD AL-ÎASSÎR, ÎIMÂN, in Suppl.]; certainly, the growing general support for the idea that Islamic law has to be applied both privately and publicly seems to be largely due to the efforts of the organisation of the Muslim Brothers.

Self-testimonies from Muslim extremist mudijhidin circles are rare, and seems that Shukri Mustafa (executed in 1978 for his role in the abduction and murder of Shaykh al-Dhahabi in Cairo in 1977) wrote a book entitled Kitâb al-Khîlafa, but up to now this book has not been made accessible.

A member of the group that assassinated President Anwar al-Sadat in October 1981, a certain Muhamnad 'Abd al-Salâm Faraqî (executed in 1982), wrote an internal memorandum, entitled al-Farida al-'alîgha [Arabic: "The neglected duty"], which was published for the first time in the Cairo weekly al-Ahrâr on 14 December 1981, while its author was on trial for his role in al-Sadat's assassination. This document has been reprinted, and translated into English (see BIBL.); up to now (1986), it is by far the best primary source for modern Islamic activism and extremism.

The title of this brochure, "The neglected duty", refers to the neglect into which the Islamic religious duty of waging djihadd against unbelievers has fallen. Islam, so its author argues, not only involves praying and fasting, but equally prescribes fighting for the cause of God.

The Farida document quotes a large number of Muslim authorities to prove the existence of a general Muslim consensus (îjmâ' [q.v.]) which prescribes "taking Islam as a whole", al-islâm ka-kull, including the duty of waging war against unbelievers (cf. Qur'ân II, 85: "Do ye believe in part of the Book and disbelieve [takfurûnà in [another] part?").

The most often and most extensively quoted authority, however, is the Hanbali fâlîk Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328 [q.v.]), especially his anti-Mongol fatûda which emphasize that the Mongol rulers, by not applying Islamic law after their conversion to Islam, had become apostates from Islam who had to be fought by the Sunni Mamlûk Muslims and
and left his son (and eventual successor), 'Ali, later known as Ikbal al-Dawla, as a prisoner in Christian hands, where he remained for many years. During Mudjahid’s absence, al-Mu’ayyad seems to have tried to take power in Denia for himself (possibly encouraged by reports of Mudjahid’s difficulties during his campaign); he was sent to an obscure exile in north Africa by Mudjahid as soon as he returned.

For the next thirty years, Mudjahid ruled with apparent success, keeping Denia (relatively isolated geographically) out of the mainstream of Iberian politics; he seems to have occupied Murcia temporarily at the very end of his life, but otherwise seems not to have entertained any ambitions for territorial aggrandisement within the peninsula after the consolidation of his rule. The numismatic material suggests some possible political difficulties with a son, Hasan, towards the end of his life (well discussed by Prieto; see Bibl.), but the evidence remains inconclusive. It is striking that we have no surviving dated coins at all for most of his long reign (from 407/1016-7 to 434/1042-3); a couple of coins at the very beginning of his reign (discussed by Miles; see Bibl.) followed by a long silence until the penultimate year of his reign. In the last decade of his reign, Mudjahid gave nominal recognition to the puppet caliph, said to be Hisham II al-Mu’ayyad, set up by the ‘Abbadids of Seville (q.v.). Mudjahid seems also to have established ties of marriage with this dynasty, strengthening the links between Slav and Andalusian in the peninsula, as against the Berbers), but this recognition amounted to nothing in practical terms (it is discussed in Wasserstein, Rise and fall, 120-1).

For the long middle period of his reign, we know almost nothing in political terms, but we are relatively well informed about the cultural life of his court. Like many others of the Taifa rulers, Mudjahid was anxious to present himself as a Maccenean, and, unusually, was well placed, as an educated Slav, to encourage genuinely scholarly, as well as literary, activities: Denia became well-known as a centre for theological studies (Urvoy suggests that the entire religious form of culture in al-Andalus at this time is said to have been bought, saklabt (q.v.), is seen as one of the few possibilities of making the world more Islamic and more liveable at the same time.

The discussions and aspirations of the modern mudjahidun are extremely attractive to large groups of middle-class university graduates, who have little hope of material bliss in this world and who have great expectations of the wholesome effects on economic and social justice of the introduction of Islamic law.

Many modern mudjahidun believe that Ibn Taymiyya’s anti-Mongol theologie de guerre from the 7th/13th century is, however, valid for all times and all places.

Many observers, both inside the Arab world and outside, think that even if the answers which the author of the Farida document supplies to his readers are not correct, the questions he asks are the very questions which modern Muslims will have to find an answer to.
Hazen and Ibn 'Abd al-Barr [q.v.] also spent time at his court (see the works by Sarnelli Cerqua and Urvoy listed in the Bibli.). The character of Mudjahid's court lasted beyond his death, as is shown by the fact that Ibn Hazn and al-Bajjî carried on their dispute at the court of his son 'Ali Ibâl al-Dawla, in Majorca (Mayrêa [q.v.]), around 439/1047-8.

**Bibliography:** Roque Chabas, Mochêhid hijo de Yâsîf y Ali hijo de Mochêhid, in Homenaje a D. F. Codera, Saragossa 1904, 411-34; F. Codera, Mochëhid, conquistador de Cerdanya, in Contributio della nascita di Michele Amari, i, Palermo 1910, 115-33; C. Sarnelli Cerqua, Mudjähid al-‘Amâri, Cairo 1961 (in Arabic); idem, La vita intellettuale a Denia alla corte di Mughêlid al-‘Amâri, in AJOUN, N.S., xiv (‘Scritti in onore di Laura Vecca Vaglieri’, ii) (1964), 597-622 (provides useful lists of scholars and littérateurs at Denian court, but should be used with caution); D. Urvoy, La vie intellectuelle et spirituelle dans les Balares musulmanes, in And. (1972), 87-132, idem, Une étude sociologique des mouvements religieux dans l’Espagne musulmane de la chute du califat au milieu du XIVe siècle, in Mélanges de la Casa de Velázquez, viii (1972), 223-93; M.J. Rubiera Mata, La Taifa de Denia, Alicante 1985; D. Wasserstein, The rise and fall of the Party-Kings, politics and society in Islamic Spain, 1002-1006, Princeton 1985, index; M. de Epalza, El margen político del discurso de Denia en el siglo XI: el Califato Al-Muâdhir y el Rey Mughêlid, in Actas del 5º Congres d’Estudis de la Marina Alta, 1986, Universidad de Alicante 1986, 157-63; D.J. Wasserstein, The Spanish caliphate (forthcoming), ch. 5; for the coins, see A. Vives y Escudero, Monedas de las dinastías arábigo-españolas, Madrid 1893, p. lvii; 119, nos. 819-20; 212-13, nos. 1296-1301; 217, nos. 1292-25; A. Prieto y Vives, Los Reyes de Ta ifas, Estudio histórico-numismático de los musulmanes españoles en el siglo V de la hégira (XI de J.C.), Madrid 1926, 36, 122-23; 181, nos. 135, 137; 191-2, nos. 198-208; G.C. Miles, Coins of the Spanish Mutûlîk al-Tawâqûf, New York 1954, 43-44, no. 159-60; 61, no. 60.

**MUDJÂHID**

**Djabr al-Makki**, Abu 1-Hâjâqâbî, a Successor, born 214/827-29 between 100/178 and 104/172 in Mecca, member of the Sâbîb (or 'Abîd Allah or Kays) b. Abu l-Sâbîb al-Makki. Famed as a mukrî and as a source of tafsîr, he is connected to the school of 'Abîd Allah b. 'Abîbâbîh. He was three times, stopping each time after each verse and asking about its interpretation, specifically concerning what it was revealed about and how it came to be so. He was proclaimed the most knowledgeable in tafsîr in his time. Some of his information was said to have come from Jews and Christians, thus making some wary of his work (Ibn Sa dâb, Tabâbâ, v, 467); he is also said to have searched the world for wonders spoken of in the Kur ân, for example, meeting Harût and Marût at Babel (al-Dhahabi, 396). A report is found that he read the Kur ân with Ibn 'Abîbâbîh three times, stopping each time after each verse and asking about its interpretation, specifically concerning what it was revealed about and how it came to be so.

Mudjahid, but it has been shown that persons who come from outside and live in the neighbourhood [see also gâwîr]. In the restricted sense, the term indicates, as does the synonym gîr allâh, a person who, for a shorter or longer period of time, settled in a holy place in order to lead a life of ascetism and religious contemplation and to receive the baraka of that place. Such places are the Ka'bah in Mecca, the harem in Jerusalem and the Prophet's tomb in Medina, but also the tombs of earlier prophets (see al-Khalîl), of the companions of Muhammad, of the Imâms and their descendants (especially with the Shî'is [see îmâmzâda]), and in general the tombs of highly venerated Muslims, theologians as well as Sûfis.

Already in early times, zāvîyats and madrasas [q.v.] arose in the neighbourhood of such places, in or near which mudjâwîr settled in order to receive religious instruction from saints and scholars who were living there, or to be teachers themselves, to show the holy places to visitors (zawwâr) and to give them religious instruction. A subsidiary meaning of the term, used in Egypt until today, arose in connection with the madrasas: mudjâwîr may indicate there any student of the Qur' an, who comes from outside and lives in the premises of al-Azhâr (Lane, i/2, 485, s.v. dîwâ-r (3); idem, The manners and customs of the modern Egyptians, London 1895, 213; H. Wehr, Dictionary of modern written Arabic, s.v.).

The Prophet himself is the example of the muqâwîr. In a certain moment in his life onwards, he used to withdraw every day in the solitude of Mount Hira in order to lead a life of religious contemplation there (kûnûn muqâwîr; Ibn Hîghâm, Sîra, i, 152, and see Hira'). This practice, together with the specific significance of the Harâmân in the Hijâz, has caused the term muqâwîr to be associated in the first place with those who have taken up their "pious residence" (mudjâwîr, also gîwâr) in Mecca or Medina (Lane, loc. cit., and Redhouse, Yemen Turkçe İngilizce sözlük, s.v. müsavvet, müsavir). The term is used in the same way by the Shî'is, except that for them mudjâwîr at the tombs of the Imâms in 1îrak [see sâ'î] the term is hardly used.

Many pious Muslims considered mudjâwîr in Medina, at the tomb of the Prophet and the resting-
places of many of his Companions, as even more meritorious than that in Mecca. This opinion was, among other things, influenced by the fact that apparently none of the Companions of the Prophet had specially Mecca for people who had been firmly established in their religion. Becoming too familiar with the holy places could easily lead to carelessness and even to distaste and arrogance, and finally to desecration of the sanctity of these places. Only a very few persons would be immune from this weakness or from the sins emanating from it. To this small number of believers alone, mudjawara at the Haramayn might be recommended without limits, and for them it might really bring great profit. All others, for the sake of their spiritual welfare, should avoid mudjawara (Rahmat Allah b. 'Abd Allah al-Sindi (d. 1585), *Djm al-manasiik wa-nafa* al-nasir, in the margins of Ahmad b. Mustafa Diva, *al-Din al-Khalil*, pp. 1289/1872, 387-9).

The position and pattern of behaviour of the mudjawir stand in the same relation to the activities of the hajj or the visitor of another holy place (zavir) as that which exists between the musabih and the mudjahid, with the mudjawir and the murabih, the element of quiet and contemplation, of waiting and watching is predominant, while with the hajj and the mudjahid, involvement in activities prevails (see F. Meier, *Le guide du pèlerin à Jérusalem*, p. 1289/1872, 387-9).

Not seldom a pilgrimage to Mecca, followed by mudjawara there or in Medina, was made use of as a means of exile or banishment. One out of many examples is the vizier Abu Shudja al-Rudhrawari, who, after his fall, lived in Medina as a mudjawir and died there in 488/1095 (H. Laoust, *La politique de l'histoire religieuse, Arab historian, born in Jerusalem in 810/1456. After his studies in Cairo, he was first appointed judge in Ramla, then became kadi 'l-kudat in Jerusalem, which office he held until 992/1586. He died in the town of his birth in 986/1584. He is the author of a commentary on the Prophet's tomb in Medina (*Ihia al-zavir wa-nafa al-musafir*) and of a general history until 896/1491 and dealing with Jerusalem in particular (K. Ruiz al-mu'tabar fi anba' man *ala farrush*). This latter work may be identical with the ms. B.N. Suppl. no. 488, which has no title.

Mudjar al-Din's principal work is a history in two volumes of Jerusalem and Hebron, entitled *al-Uns al-dalit fi tarikh al-Kuds wa l-Khalil*, the only extant history concerned with Jerusalem and some of the holy places of Palestine. As he states in his preface, the author had no predecessor; however, in 1926 (in this article, references are to the 1973 *Ammân edition*), he mentions the Shari fakhr Abu 'l-Kasim al-Makk (born in 432/1040-1, taken prisoner by the Crusaders and stoned for being unable to pay the ransom), who had begun a history of Jerusalem and had gathered a large amount of material, which suggests that this work was not finished (al-Makk is cited by Yâkût, *Mudjam*, s.v. *Bayt Lahm*). Apparently, Mudjar al-Din had no further successor, for the rich historiography of the Ayyubid period, especially in local history, ended abruptly, here as elsewhere, after the arrival of the Ottomans.

Mudjar al-Din puts Palestine, with Jerusalem and Hebron, on the same level as the Hijâz with its Holy Cities of Mecca and Medina. It is significant that he begins, citing sûra XVII, 1, with a reference to the *isa* (and *muhsâb* [q. v.]). In a sometimes rather mixed order, he discourses, after some introductory remarks, the following subjects: 1. The most important...
moments in sacred history, where he also discusses the history of Jerusalem and Hebron, until "the third foundation of Jerusalem by the Ayyubids (642/1244) (i, 303-ii, 10); (4) The construction of al-Aksa Mosque in Jerusalem (i, 224-44); (5) The events that took place between the destruction of the Holy Sepulchre by the Fatimids; (6) Events relating to the Ka'bah, the Prophet's tomb in Medina and officials, as well as fukahah; (7) The work was printed in Cairo (1283/1866-7), Nadjaf documents, al-Mamlukiyah. A History of Mamluk Jerusalem based on the Haram documents, Berlin 1985, 72 ff.

MUDJTAHID (A.), active participle of Form IV of the root -zd-, lit. "that by means of which [the Prophet] confounds, overwhelms, his opponents", has become the technical term for miracle. It does not occur in the Kurgan, which denies miracles in connection with Muhammad, whereas it emphasises his "signs", ayah, later taken to mean the verses of the Kurgan [see KURGAN. 1]. Even in later literature, Muhammad's chief miracle is the Kurgan (cf. Abu Nu'mayy, Dal'il al-nubuwwa, 74). Mu'ajiza and aya have become synonyms; they denote the miracles performed by Allah in order to prove the sincerity of His apostles. The term karima [q. v.] is used in connection with the saints; it differs from mu'ajiza in so far as it denotes nothing but a personal distinction granted by God to a saint.

Miracles of Apostles and Prophets, especially those of Muhammad, occur in the sira and in hadith. Yet in this literature the term mu'ajiza is still lacking, as it is in the oldest forms of the creed. The Fikh akbar, ii, art. 16, mentions the ayyah of the prophets and the karimah of the saints. Mu'ajiza occurs in the creed of Abu Hafs 'Umar al-Nasafi (ed. Cureton, 4; ed. al-Taftazani, 165): "And He has fortified them (sc. the apostles) by miracles contradicting the usual course of things.

Al-Taftazani explains it in this way: a thing deviating from the usual course of things, appearing at the hands of him who pretends to be a prophet, as a challenge to those who deny this, of such a nature that it makes it impossible for them to produce the like of it. It is God's testimony to the sincerity of His apostles.

A very complete and systematic description occurs in al-Idji's Ma'asikfi. He gives the following definition of mu'ajiza: it is meant to prove the sincerity of him who pretends to be an apostle of God. Further, he enumerates the following conditions: (1) it must be an act of God; (2) it must be contrary to the usual course of things; (3) contradiction to it must be impossible; (4) it must happen at the hands of him who claims to be an apostle, so that it appears as a confirmation of his sincerity; (5) it must be in conformity with his announcement of it, and the miracle itself must not be a disavowal of his claim (da'wah); (6) it must follow on his da'wah.

Further, according to al-Idji, the miracle happens in this way that God produces it at the hands of him whose sincerity he wishes to show, in order to realise His will, viz. the salvation of men through the preaching of His apostle. Finally, as to its effect, it produces, in accordance with God's custom, in those who witness it, the conviction of the apostle's being sincere.

his own judgement on questions concerning the *ghar* ‘a*, using personal effort (*idjtihdd* [q. v.]) in the interpretation of the fundamental principles (*usul* [v.]). The term *idjtihdd* is thus essentially linked to the diverse connotations of the term *idjtihdd* which have varied in the course of time and according to schools. Its application to the field of jurisprudence is in fact a narrowing of the concept, the term *idjtihdd* rather signifying originally*, in various contexts: to exert oneself, using one’s intellectual faculties, for (the good of) the Muslim community or of Islam (see Braumann, 188 ff., who criticises Schacht’s interpretation). Employed in a broader sense, this concept embraced that of piety or of mysticism. The cognomen *mudjnahid fi l-* 'ibdada is in fact frequently encountered in the biographies of the early ascetics (Laoust (1958), index). But it is especially in its technical jurisprudential sense that the term *mudjähid* is currently utilised, with variants or extrapolations, in contexts specific to Sunnism, to *Shī‘ism* and to movements evolved from *Shī‘ism*.

1. In Sunnī Circles.

Until quite recently, numerous authors have reckoned that, towards the end of the 3rd/nth century or the beginning of the 4th/nth, when the *ghar* ‘a* had* had been elaborated in detail, a consensus was gradually established, little by little, in the Sunnī juristic tradition as well as in the *Sahāri* schools, considering that *idjtihdd* could no longer be practised. In this context, only the founders of the four schools of law (Hanafi, Mālikī, *Shāhī*‘ī, Hanbalī) and certain of their contemporaries or immediate successors could be regarded as *mudjähids* in the strict sense (*mudjahid*). Henceforward, jurists, like other devout Muslims, were obliged to practise *taklid* [q. v.], thus becoming plain *mukallids*. The great *mudjähids* of the past were succeeded by those who could only be considered as *mufīs* (the prudentes of Roman law) or as *mudjähid* fi l-’*fawā‘* (by judicial opinion), sometimes called *mudjähid fi l-* ’mamahab (according to the jurisprudence of each school). This notion of the closure of the door of *idjtihdd* (intidad bāb al-*idjtihdd*) and its logical consequence, i.e. the disappearance of *mudjähids*, has been vehemently opposed by certain scholars-jurists. A critical re-appraisal of the question, based on primary sources from the 4th/nth century, shows that jurists capable of *idjtihdd* existed almost all the time, that *idjtihdd* was used to develop the law after the formation of the judicial schools, that until ca. 500 A.H. there was no mention of closure of the door of *idjtihdd*, and that controversy over this closure and the extinction of the *mudjähids* prevented jurists from reaching a consensus on this subject (see Hallaq (1984), who calls into question the positions adopted by Schacht, Anderson, Khadduri, Rahman, Gibb, Coulson, Lewis, etc.; idem (1986), 130, nn. 4 and 5). Movements opposed to *idjtihdd* (such as the *Zahiriyaa* or *Hashwiyaa*) being excluded from Sunnism, there was “no school or branch of a school within the Sunnī Muslim community which could have opposed *idjtihdd* as a point of principle” (Hallaq (1984), 9, quoting Ibn ‘Abd al-Barra). From the time of al-Tabārī (d. 310/922) onwards, a consensus was established on the validity of the existing Sunnī schools, with the exception of the *Zahirīs*. However, in the 4th/nth century, *mudjähids*, independent or affiliated to the schools, sometimes in disharmony with them, continued to elaborate the *ghar* ‘a* (idem, 10f.).

The jurists of the 5th/nth century also practised *idjtihdd* fi ’l-*maddhab* to the simply devout (‘*āmm). With their emergence as the sole unifying element of the Muslim community, the *‘ulama*2* wielded ever more influence over the holders of political and military power who sought their advice. Henceforward, the questionable nature of *idjtihdd* and the competence or authority of *mudjähids* is an issue in the works of all authors dealing with theories of power and the sovereignty exercised by the *Imām* or the caliph, in particular al-Baghdādī (d. 429/1037), al-Mawardi (d. 450/1058), d.-Djiwaini (d. 478/1085), al-Ghazzālī (d. 505/1111) and Ibn al-*‘Ākīl* (d. 513/1120). According to al-Baghdādī, al-Mawardi and al-Djiwaini, the *Imām* must be capable of *idjtihdd* (*idem, 13 ff.; Lambton (1985), 89, 195). Nevertheless, the controversy over the existence of *mudjähids* takes on a polemical tone with *‘Arūdī* (d. 631/1233) and Ibn al-Ḥāḍib (d. 646/1249), and is revived by al-Subki (d. 771/1369) followed by others. Only the *Hanbalīs* and certain *Shāfī‘īs* denied the possibility of the extinction of the *mudjähids* even in theory (Hallaq (1984), 22 ff.). Despite its original notions, the neo-*Hanbalī* Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328) recognises the indispensable role of the *mudjähids* as partners in political power (Hallaq (1986), 136).

The development of the notion of *tagdīd* (renovation, restoration) according to which, at the turn of each century. God will send a renovator (mudjadād [q. v.]) to the Muslim community, in its turn influenced the concept of *idjtihdd*. Initially employed to legitimate the doctrines of the *mukallids* (mudjadād ḥadīth also provides an argument in proving the persistence of *idjtihdd*, the mudjadādīs necessarily being *mudjähids* of superior rank, the majority of whom were *Shāfī‘īs* (Hallaq (1984), 28; Landau-Tasseron (1989), 83, 113). But while *idjtihdd* is extensively discussed in jurisprudential and doctrinal literature, *tagdīd* is not a central concept in the evolution of medieval Muslim thought. It is above all an honorific title applied to strong personalities (idem, 83-4). The degree of importance of each *mudjähid*/*mudjadād* thus depends most of all on his own pretensions, the appreciation accorded him by his contemporaries or by posterity. Thus, al-Ghazzālī, while implicitly declaring himself the mudjadād of the 6th/12th century (idem, 86), also seems to consider himself the *tagdīd* (mudjadīd) of the *mudjähid* school. In addition he recognises two types of *mujtahids*, independent (mutlak) and limited (mukayyad) (Hallaq (1984), 17).

Until the end of the 8th/14th century, nobody was to dispute the claims of *mudjähids* to practise *idjtihdd* within the framework of their *maddhab*. However, in the 9th/15th century, al-*Suyūtī* (d. 911/1505) claimed the right of *idjtihdd* in its highest degree, his ultimate ambition being to have himself recognised as *mudjadād*. Although considered as such by some, he was vigorously opposed, especially by his adversary al-Sakhāwī. The later *‘ulama*2 remained divided on his claims (Hallaq (1984), 27-8; Landau-Tasseron (1989), 87-8). Following the departure of this great *mudjähid*, there was a marked reduction in the number of Sunnī jurists capable of exercising *idjtihdd* or claiming this right for themselves. This situation is reflected in the belated grading of *mudjähids* in categories of excellence (tabākāt) which ultimately led, in the 10th/16th century, to a classification of jurists in seven grades of which only the two or three highest were developed upon *mudjähids*, the lower grades being applied, in diminishing order of competence, to the *mukallids* (Hallaq (1984), 29-30). This need for the classification of jurists is most in evidence in the writings of Hanafs who, convinced that *mudjähids* have ceased to exist, deny the right of *idjtihdd* to latter-day jurists, and even ignore *idjtihdd* when it is prac-
tised. In fact, although not known as mudītahids, numerous jurists continued to practise the methodology of idīthād, especially in the Ottoman empire. 

From the 12th/18th century onwards, increasing numbers of Muslims, especially in the Ottoman empire and in Mughal India, while rejecting traditional tākhīd, launched an offensive against those who proclaimed the closure of the door of idīthād and the extinction of mudītahids. This resurgence of idīthād owes much to the attitude of Hanbalis, especially that of Ibn Taymiyya, who influenced the thinking of pre-modern reformists who, from North Africa to India, advocated the practice of a new and free idīthād, going much further than what had been permitted at the time of the formulation of Islamic law (idem, 30 ff.; Schacht, 72-3; tr., 65; Coulson, 202-3). This resurgence of idīthād owes much to the persistence of renovatory or renovist themes (tadīfīdh, idīshāh). The right to idīthād is also clearly established by movements or tarāk such as the Sanūsīyya or the Wāhhabīyya as well as by modern renovists such as Muhammad Abduh (Voll, 35 ff.; on the Sanūsīyya, see also Evans-Pritchard (1954); Zddeh (1958); and Laoust (1965), 353). This need for renewal of idīthād has also been advocated, for Muslims, by a modern humanist (Gardet (1962), 31).

This re-appraisal of idīthād was particularly vigorous in India where, alongside the persistence of the tradition of cyclical renewal (since the time of Ahmad Sirhindī, d. 1034/1624 [q. v.], the mudājjidd-i alf-i šāhī, i.e. of the second millennium) the al-īhād-i alf-i al-ībād [q. v.], influenced by Ibn Taymiyya and al-Shawkānī (d. 1253/1839), preached the necessity of reordering idīthād and modified the contents of the constituted schools (Laoust (1965), 358; Hallaq (1984), 32-3). The reformist Muhammad Ḳābd (d. 1938 [q. v.]) recommended a kind of collective idīthād (Esposito (1983), 187).

Controversies over idīthād, tākhīd, kiyās, idīghā, tafṣīlīdh, etc. have also been fuelled by the nature and limits of the influence and power of mudītahids. The problem of their training and their qualifications, their precise role indeed, seems to have been addressed at a very early stage (for al-Ghazālī, see Laoust (1970), 179-80; Hallaq (1984), 6-7). Their responsibility has partially been relieved by their right to be in error, since even one who commits a fault of judgement (khāfat [q. v.]) is entitled to a reward in Paradise, one who expresses correct judgement being doubly rewarded (Hallaq, ibid.). But, in spite of these divergencies of opinion or appreciation (idīshāh [q. v.]), numerous jurists give their support to the practical formula according to which every mudītahid has reason (kulū mudītahid mushṣīb) which derives from the thought of al-Shāfiʿī (see refs. in Calder (1983), 66-7).

II. In SHI'AH Twelver Imāmī Circles

A. Doctrinal and historic-geographical evolution

Formation and diffusion. Unlike other branches of Shiʿism, especially Zaydism and Ismāʿīlism, Twelver Imāmism has retained the notion of the absence or the concealment (ghyba [q. v.]) of the Imām of the Time. The lasting success of the traditional Imāmī formulation is linked to the activities of an elite of scholars who elaborated this theory with the object of exploiting loyalty towards the ʿAlids, while controlling the revolutionary element inherent in Shiʿism. Following the concealment of the twelfth Imām (ghyba: al-sughrī, approx. 260/874; al-kubrā, approx. 329/940), authority was centred on the Imāmī ʿulamāʾ who, at a time when the Sunni schools were already constituted, soon succeeded in establishing a corpus of Imāmī hadīthīyya and the elaboration of their own principles, both religious (waʿīl al-dīn) and judicial (waʿīl al-fikr): see Sachedina (1988), 57; Calder (1989), 57-8.

The elaboration of the doctrinal positions of Imāmism on idīthād and tākhīd, as well as the bases and extent of the influence of the Imāmī mudītahids have been tackled elsewhere [see MAERGIA-I TĀKHĪD]; we shall confine ourselves to presenting, in the context of doctrinal, historico-geographical and socio-economic aspects, the new elements brought to bear upon these ever controversial questions by the most recent studies.

The first Imāmī doctrinal formulation was produced in the era of the Būyids/Buwayhīds [q. v.] in an atmosphere of polemical opposition to the Sunnīs and the Muʿtāzīlis, each group considering, that unlike its opponent, it had a basis in knowledge (ʿilm) and not in personal opinion (zann). In this context, the ʿulamāʾ rejected kiyās (reasoning by analogy [q. v.]), idīthād and khabar waḥīd, i.e. the unique, isolated tradition, emanating from a single transmitter, as opposed to tradition attested in a continuous manner (muṭawaddīr). While criticising the Sunnī slogan kullu mudītahid musīb, al-Tusi (d. 460/1067) justified its acceptance of khabar waḥīd by employing the concept of divergence of opinion (al-ghayba [q. v.]), by means of which al-Shāfiʿī had succeeded in establishing the authority of the Sunnī religious class (Calder (1983); idem (1989), 62 ff.). This recognition of choice in matters of opinion introduced doubt as to the establishment of judicial values and reconciled the Imāmīs to the theory of idīthād, previously rejected in the name of tradition.

With the accession of the Saldjūkīs, intellectual activity and the elaboration of Imāmī asli entered a period of stagnation, as did tākhīd, i.e. imitation of al-Ṭūsī (idem, 63-4).
...the qualifications required for mudjtahids do not differ from those demanded by al-Tusi for a kadi or a shaikh al-hadis (Calder (1979); idem (1989), 76). Idem. Decisive evolution is constituted above all by the prerogatives of the mudjtahids in the capacity of representatives (sing. na∫ab) of the Hidden Imam and by the need for the mukallids to choose the wisest among them. Having regard to the mass of traditions and exegeses, the diverse factors (social, political, economic, personal) affecting the choice of a mudjtahid are not easily appreciated. However, the Imami theory of id∫ihad is formulated most authoritatively in the Ma∫·il al-din of Hasan b. Zayn al-Din (d. 1011/1602-3), a work which provided “the clearest expression of a possible methodology of doubt” and was to be attacked by the traditionalist Muhammad Amin Astarabadi (d. 1036/1626), at the outcropping of the polemic between ab∫bar and us∫ulis which would henceforward dominate Imami jurisprudence (Calder (1989), 76-7).

In Safavid Persia (1501-1722), Imami mudjtahids “imported” from Arab countries, charged with developing and imposing the doctrine, succeeded in establishing their authority to the detriment of Persian religious dignitariness. Their influence is particularly evident in the distinguished position attained by al-Karaki (d. 940/1534), given the titles of mudjtahid al-zamān, jurist, and al-munkar, which established the role of the Imam, jurists, culminating in the jurisprudence (revised and revived) was not to continue to exert decisively consolidated the influence of the Imami. Mudjtahids, and an ever more autonomous Sh† hierarchy (idem, (1984), 221 ff; Hairi (1988), 272 ff.). This problem of legitimacy became crucial with the proclamation of gjhād against the Russians which enabled Shaykh Dja∫ far, doyen of the mudjtahids (shaykh al-mudjtahidin), to authorise in the name of the hidden Imam, Fath Ali Shah (1797-1834), the exercise of this gjhād. (See references in Arjomand (1984), 221 ff.; Hairi, ibid.)

In spite of this level of power of the mudjtahids, the opinion according to which the emergence of the institution of marja'iyat-i taklīf constitutes, de facto, the establishment of an Imami hierarchy under a single authority, has been reconsidered. In fact, although theoretically founded on superiority of knowledge (al-amr bi 'l-ma∫·ruf wa 'l-nahy 'an 'l-munkar) the effective hierarchy of the mudjtahids depended largely on the degree of their respective influence over the mukallids. It was above all established on the basis of leadership (riya∫at) recognised by popular acclamation and by the payment of religious taxes. This concept of riya∫at, which can be traced back to the Imams, has evolved with political and socio-economic changes. Throughout the 19th century, it was in particular linked to the control exercised by the mudjtahids over socio-professional and ethnic religious-administrative networks (shaykh al-mudjtahids being slowly subordinate only to the sadrs, shaykh al-hadis and al-mu|^•lids). But, in spite of its importance, this office could not be considered as a “patrimonial” solution for the legitimacy of the power of mudjtahids or the illegitimacy of non-mudjtahid sovereigns remain variously interpreted, each scholar-jurist being obliged to exert his own id∫ihad on each particular case, the taklīf of the opinion of another mudjtahid, however eminent he may be, being forbidden him (see Modarressi (1904), 143; Hairi (1988), 277 ff.). With the final defeat of the Ottoman empire, the doctrine of the mukallids (qua Corsairs and Turks or Turkish-speakers): see Amanat (1988), 98 ff.

This delay in the structuring of the Imami hierarchy (already mentioned: see Calmard (1982)) is also linked to the controversies over sovereignty which persisted in spite of the formulation by Mollā Ahmad Naraghi (d. 1245/1829) of the doctrine of delegation of authority (wujūbat) devoted to the fukahd^l mudjtahids. Often contradictory bā∫hūs concerning the legitimacy of the power of mudjtahids or the illegitimacy of non-mudjtahid sovereigns remain variously interpreted, each scholar-jurist being obliged to exert his own id∫ihad on each particular case, the taklīf of the opinion of another mudjtahid, however eminent he may be, being forbidden him (see Modarressi (1904), 143; Hairi (1988), 277 ff.). With the final defeat of the Ottoman empire, the doctrine of the mukallids (qua Corsairs and Turks or Turkish-speakers): see Amanat (1988), 98 ff.

A little-known aspect of the growth in the influence of the mudjtahids remains the basis of their economic power. Those residing in the ṣāhba∫ [q. v. in Suppl.] enjoyed, from the end of the 18th century, the support of the Sh† merchants of Baghdad and of certain pro-Sh† elements in the local administration. After the accession of Fath Ali Shah, they turned towards Persia, where they could benefit from royal patronage. In spite of the deterioration of the politico-economic situation (the sack of Karbalāʾ by the Wahhā bids in 1802, the hardening of Ottoman control, tribal conflicts, factionalism and instability lasting until 1843), the mudjtahids gained by their administration of the increasingly substantial sums of money emanating from Persia, India and elsewhere. With the re-emergence of the ancient Imami notions of niyābat-i 'ismat-i wujūbat-i 'ismat, initially serving the interests of Shaykh Dja∫ far Nadja∫, the mudjtahids could reclaim their right to the administration of religious taxes, in particular the khāms, a part of which (zāhm-i 'ismat) was their due (Calder (1982); Amanat (1988), 103-4; for Sachedina (1988), 245, it is the precepts of Imami jurisprudence according to which in its 'amliyyat, they are 'amr bi 'l-ma∫·ruf wa 'l-nahy 'an 'l-munkar') which establish the role of the Imami jurists, culminating in the
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government of the jurist", i.e. wilayat-i fakih). Although the mudjtahids of the educational establishments of the 'utubāt were, in principle, courts of judges. This was also the case with the members of those councils. The caliph Ali, who lived in the 7th century, is recognized by the Imamides, whose leadership remained divided, not only on the question of the Imami community. It is possible to present the evolution of Imamī mudjtahids, see Algar (1969), 14 ff., 46 ff., 172 ff.; Momen (1985), 206-7; Amanat (1989), 103 ff.; see also section B below).

Mudjtahids exercised genuine political power as patrons and protectors of jayyids (self-styled or authentic) and of lulus ("marginal" types degraded to the status of urban brigands [q.v.]) who constituted formidable armed bands. With all these sources of support, the mudjtahids were able to work in conjunction with governments, dignitaries, other mudjtahids, etc. Their influence and their independence were boosted considerably with the weakening of Kādār power at the end of the reign of Fath 'Ali Shāh and under Muḥammad Shāh (1834-48 [q.v.]). Despite their reputation for integrity, deserved in some cases, other mudjtahids amassed vast fortunes by illicit methods, in particular by speculating on the price of cereals in times of famine. The caliphate, together with the holders of power, contributed to the rise of anti-clerical sentiment, before and after the constitutional revolution of 1905-11 (on the income of Imāmī mudjtahids, see Algar (1969), 14 ff., 46 ff., 172 ff.; Momen (1985), 206-7; Amanat (1989), 103 ff.; see also section B below).

It is possible to present the evolution of Imāmī religious leadership, from the end of the 18th century to the middle of the 19th, as a shifting of the authority of the madrasa towards the socio-economic life of the bāzār. "In this process, academic seniority was transformed in a collective direction, without giving way to a supreme collective authority" (Amanat (1988), 111). Although the mudjtahids became more autonomous, internal dangers (the rise of messianic tendencies derived from Shi'ism and finding expression in the Shaykhi and Bābī movements [q.v.]) constrained them to remain loyal to the state with which they shared a common interest in preservation of the status quo. The Bābī experience compelled them to reform their hierarchy through the elaboration of the doctrine of mardqāt, qiyās to the advantage of the great charismatic chief Shaykh Mūrtaḍā Ansārī (d. 1281/1864) whose leadership, exercised over all the Imāmī communities, was based on the re-assertion of the major Imāmī values (piety, equity and learning). With the repression of Babism and the elimination of charismatic chief Shaykh Murtada Ansari (d. 1312/1895), saw his authority disputed at Najaf by Hāḍīq Sayyid Husayn Kūh-Kamārāt (d. 1299/1881-2) and his Turkish-speaking disciples. In 1874, he emigrated to the United States and founded the Academy of the Hidden Imam, a town dominated by Sunnis. Associated with the commercial circles of southern Persia, Shīrāzī played a crucial role in the revolt of the tobacco-growers (1891-2). Some of the mujāhidīn who had followed him to Sāmarrá had an important role in the constitutionalist revolution of 1905-11 (Amanat (1988), 109 ff.; idem (1989), 405 ff.).

The problem of the Imāmī leadership remained unsolved after the death of Shīrāzī. In the 'utubāt, various mujāhidīn argued over the patronage of Turkish-speaking and Persian-speaking mujāhib and the rank of mardqāt-i taklīf. In Persia and elsewhere, the mujāhidīn remained divided, not only on the question of riyāsāt but also on the attitude to be adopted in the constitutionalist revolution, in which they played important and contradictory roles which have been variously interpreted by posterity. While certain authors (Algar in particular) have considered this "revolution" as the culmination of a long period of conflict between the ulama' and the state which they regarded as illegitimate, a recent study tends to minimise the role of the ulama', at least in the initial phase of conflict, which is viewed especially from the socio-economic angle (Amanat (1988), 109 ff.). In 1905-11, under the leadership of the ulama' mujāhidīn, candidates in most cases being pushed forward by their faithful adherents, has been reconsidered (see Lahidji (1988), 133 ff.).

In another sociological analysis, the ulama? mujāhidīn have been divided, according to their varied attitudes, into four groups, the first being that of the old-style unconditional traditionalists who refused to join in the anti-monarchical demonstrations of 1905 but allied themselves in 1907 to the anti-constitutionalist movement launched by Shaykh Fadl Allāh Nūrī (executed in 1909). Those who had at first accepted constitutional reform as a possible means of preserving Islamic values were divided into three groups when, in 1907, the principles of the parliametary regime became known and were discussed. Some, alarmed by what they saw as the destruction of Islam by dedicated reformists, placed themselves against the leadership of Shaykh Fadl Allāh Nūrī; this group gained in strength and included most of the ulama? at the time of the brief restoration of autocracy in June 1908. Although succeeding in retaining recognition of their judicial authority, those who, conditionally, remained loyal to the constitution were generally unappreciated. Finally, a group of unconditional constitutionalists, composed in the main of young ulama', who included the mujāhib of Akhūnd Khūrānī (d. 1911), considered that threats to their prerogatives were the price to be paid for reinforcing "the Shī'ī nation" of Persia (see Arjomand (1988 A), 34 ff., 78 ff.; idem (1988 C), 179 ff.; Lahidji (1988), 134 ff.; the opposing theories of Nūrī and of the constitutionalist Khāḥkhāli are revealed in texts translated and annotated by H. Dabashi (1988), 334-70; on the constitutionalist views of Nā'īnī, see Hāri (1977)).

During his rise to power and in the early years of his reign, Rūdā Khān (ruled 1925-41 [q.v.]), apparently maintained good relations with the mujāhidīn who saw in the preservation of the monarchical bulwark against the foundation of a secular republic on the Turkish model. But his policies of centralisation, modernisation and secularisation, which tended to bring a noticeable change in the political and legal structure, revived the conflict between the state and the ulama', whose leadership remained divided, with divergent political attitudes. The courageous opposition to Rūdā...
Khān (later Shāh) on the part of Sayyid Hasan Mudarris, exiled and killed in 1936, may be compared with the collaborativeist position adopted by the Ayatullāh Kāghānī (d. 1962) and Sayyid Muhammad Bihbāhānī (son of the great constitutionalist leader Bihbāhānī) towards Muḥammad Rida Shāh Pahlavī (1941-79 [q. v.]). Finally, after the rebirth of Kum [q. v.] as an educational centre in the 1920s, the Imāmī hierarchy was re-structured around a politically neutral figure, Ayatullāh Burūjirdī (d. 1961 [q. v. in Suppl.]), who became the sole mārdjā-i taklīd. After his death, and the disintegration of the mārdjā-i taklīd, the Imāmī leadership was once more strongly politicised with the emergence in 1962 of Khumaynī as a powerful opponent of the Pahlavī régime. The policy of modernisation and secularisation, which was accompanied by repressive measures against the mufīdhātāh and the educational centres of Kum and Mashhad, strengthened the hand of Khumaynī, who could present himself as the avenger of the Imāmī hierarchy, crusading against the Pahlavī dynasty. After the victory of the Islamic revolution, he ultimately turned his back on the intellectuals ("westerners", including those who had rejected westernisation) who, according to him, had incessantly duped the 'ulamā and, he conducted a maula'i campaign against them. Against the court at Mashhad (1980), 25 ff.; Bakhash (1986), 35 ff.; Arjomand (1988 A), 80 ff.) Nor were the 'ulamā[mufīdhātāh] to be spared. Largely dependent on the personal opinion of its author, the doctrine of utiṣayāt fakhr, formulated by Khumaynī and enshrined as an institution in the Islamic Republic of Iran, where it is taught in colleges, may be considered a veritable ideological revolution in Imāmī theology. Objections formulated by certain mufīdhātāh led in 1982 to an unprecedented crisis in the Imāmī leadership: the removal of Ṣarḥī at-Ḥanīfī from his position as mārdjā-i taklīd/ayātullāh al-'azmān; the purge of his supporters among the 'ulamā and of others opposed to the utiṣayāt fakhr (Arjomand (1988 C), 196-7). Since the end of the Iran-Irāk war (1980-8) and the death of Ayatullāh Imām Khomeynī, power has remained in dispute; there has been the influential role of Ḥāshim Raslandjānī, president of the Majlis, and of the Nasīrī family as well. The elder son of Sayyid Dildār, Sayyid Muhammad (d. 1284/1867), with lavish donations (Cole (1988), 50 ff; on atabād, see Rizvi, (1980)), the Nasīrī family played a leading role in the foundation of cultic establishments, a court of justice, etc. The elder son of Sayyid Dildār, Sayyid ʿAlī, father of the Nasīrī family increased its influence. In the second generation, the usuli muqaddimah asserted their hegemony, often acting in concert with their former teachers in the atabā'ī or in opposition to recently-arrived Persian Imāmī 'ulamā. The Nasīrī family played a leading role in the foundation of cultic sites (mosques, madrnasas [q. v.] and educational establishments, a court of justice, etc. The elder son of Sayyid Dildār, Sayyid Muhammad (d. 1284/1867), and his younger son Sayyid Ḥusayn (d. 1273/1856) presided jointly over the supreme court of appeal of the mufīdāt. On the strength of a vision seen by his
father, Sayyid Muhammad declared himself adoptive son of the Twelfth Imam and engaged in conflict with the Nasrī family, who did not succeed in imposing control over the Imamī hierarchy in his capacity as "royal" representative of the Twelfth Imam. Sayyid Dīdār was to be credited (posthumously, in the 'atā'ī or the title of hukam al-mudjtaḥīds. The Nawwāb Amjād-Allāh Shah (1842–77) conferred on Sayyid Muhammad the titles of mudjtaḥid al-'amāl and sūfī al-'ulamā' (Cole (1988), 173 ff.; on the descendents of Sayyid Dīdār, see Rizvi, ii, 139 ff.).

In the third generation of 'ulamā' al-μučātāy, the influence of the Naṣīrābādī family was maintained at Lāhūn, where the supervision of the madrasa was entrusted to Sayyid Muhammad Tākī (d. 1289/1872), younger son of Sayyid Husayn. Applying to their own advantage the principle of accommodation with ruling powers, the 'ulamā' al-μučātāy, al-μučātāy, seldom showed hostility towards the British until the 1840s and 1850s, when they engaged in conflict with a British administration intent on annexing Awadh or transforming it into a protectorate. Like the majority of Imamīs, a number of 'ulamā' joined in the great Mutiny of 1857-8, but they subsequently were at pains to minimise the extent of their involvement. Although several of his sons participated actively in the revolt, the leader of the mudjtaḥīds, Sayyid Muhammad Naṣīrābādī, prudently remained aloof. When the British sought reconciliation with local elites, some Imamī 'ulamā', including Sayyid ʿAli Akbar (d. 1900), sixth son of Sayyid Muhammad, entered the British administration (Cole (1988), 251 ff.).

Despite certain positive aspects (the development and diffusion of Shi'i culture, in particular through proselytism), the activities of the mudjtaḥīds of Awadh had the effect of creating a "social closure" of the Shi'i community which, with its own particular rituals (especially in the celebration of Shi'i funerary rites), came to resemble a caste. This also encouraged the rise of "communalism" (struggles between Sunnis and Shi'i, with the Hindus siding with one faction or the other) and ultimately assisted movements aimed at restoring Sunni control and creating structures designed to further Muslim separatism, given substantive reality by the formation of national states (although the Shi'i of India were, in the main, opposed to the creation of a State of Pakistan dominated by Sunnis, many emigrated to Pakistan, unlike the Sunnis: see refs. in Momen (1985), 276 ff.; Batatu (1986); Ramazani (1986), 59 ff.; Kedourie (1987)).

At the same time as the mudjtaḥīds of Irāq were opposing the British, the Shi'i of Bahrayn considered the latter their protectors against oppression on the part of the Sunni tribal hierarchy. Sporadic sectarian violence occurred, even after independence (1970), in spite of elections favourable to the Shi'ī who were suspected of supporting the Shah's claims to Bahrayn (formally abandoned in 1971). Tensions between Sunnis and Shi'ī were revived after the Iranian Revolution of 1979, with the authorities taking steps to protect their majority Shi'i population from Iranian influence (Momen (1983), 272 ff.; Ramazani (1986), 48 ff.).

Although indigenous Imamī communities, sometimes augmented by recent immigration, exist in other states of the Arabo-Persian Gulf, particularly in Saudi Arabia (notably in al-Qatif and al-Ḥaṣā), in Kāṭar, in the United Arab Emirates (Dubai in particular), and Oman, no eminent mudjtaḥīd seems to have emerged in these regions. The same applies to the North African countries, where the Imamī population is estimated at 40,000 (for a worldwide assessment of Shi'i populations in 1980, see Momen (1985), 280 ff.).

The Shi'i community of Lebanon, established at a very early stage and essentially rural, has played an important role in the development of Imamī. Its great mudjtaḥīds, originally from the ʿAquāb of Amīl, were the driving force behind the elaboration and diffusion of Shi'i in Safawī Persia (see Hourani (1986)). But, although a certain ʿUṣūlī tradition was maintained in the region, under Ottoman control the Imamīs, like the other communities (Sunnis, Druses and Christians), were worn out by the internecine factional struggles which continued after effective independence (in 1943). On the initiative of the leader of the Shi'i community, Hādīdī Sayyid Abd al-Ḥusayn Sharāf al-Dīn (d. 1957), trained at Najaf, a revival of Imamī teaching took place in Tyre. In 1959, the senior mudjtaḥīd Imam Mūṣā al-Ṣadr—coming from Persia but in ancestry from the ʿAquāb of Amīl—became the head of the Shi'i community and established himself in Tyre. After much hard work on behalf of Imamī, he entered the political arena and his supporters founded the politico-military movement Amāl which was to maintain close links with the revolutionary movement of Iran. In August 1978, he disappeared mysteriously in Libya. Deeply involved in all aspects of Middle Eastern politics, Lebanese Shi'imism has not resigned itself to the disappearance of Mūṣā al-Ṣadr and has not appointed a new charismatic leader (Momen (1985), 264 ff.; Cobban (1986)).

Before coming under the influence of the Iranian Revolution, al-μučātāy of Lebanon, Irāq and Syria regarded the influence of Persian Shi'i practices, especially in funerary rites (Ende (1978)).

B. Qualifications, functions, influence and titles of the Imamī Mudjtaḥīds.

The necessary preconditions to be a mudjtaḥīd (maturity, intelligence, faith, fairness or integrity
According to the share', being male and of legitimate birth) are the same as those required, a fortiori, to become mujtahid (although a woman may attain the rank of mulla [q.f.], she can only in exceptional circumstances be promoted to that of mujtahid (on the disagreement of the Imam 'ulama' regarding the validity of the ijtihad of Banu Amin, a female mujtahid of Ifsahan, see Fisher, 163; Momen (1985), 245, n. 3). The aspiring mujtahid must complete the three stages of study common to all tulib (muqa'ddamin, preliminaries; dhiy or rul, study of basic texts, dars al khardig, including statements and debates). After the third stage has been completed, the student composes a treatise which must be presented to a mujtahid who confers on him his ijaza, i.e. authorisation to practise ijtihad. Certain mujtahids have established preconditions which stipulate scholastic qualifications in subjects such as theology (kalim), principles of Luth (usul-i dita) and of jurisprudence (usul-i faikhi), mastery of the Arabic language, of logic (manjik), of Kur'anic exegesis (tafsir), of tradition (hads), and its narrators (raddil), etc. for attaining the rank of ijtihad. In addition to theoretical knowledge and the practice of equity, piety (wara', takwaw) is also an essential quality for the exercise of ijtihad. Since the time required for these studies is very long, it is unusual to obtain ijtihad before the age of thirty, and some are still tulib after the age of forty. In addition, the worth of the ijtihad depends on the reputation of the mujtahid who has conferred it. Tulib who wish to make a name for themselves seek the award of ijtihad from numerous eminent mujtahids in order to become fully qualified (qimni al-shariyi) or absolute (muluk) mujtahids. Whatever their standard of qualification, newly-qualified mujtahids must, in their turn, obtain renown and most of all a clientele of mujtahids. Those who do not succeed in this respect are sometimes called mujtahid mukhtat (Algar (1969), 85 ff.; Fischer (1980), 247 ff.; Momen (1985), 200 ff.; Amanat (1988), 98-9).

Once qualified, mujtahids can exercise any function which falls within the purview of 'ulama' in the administration or direction of religious affairs, the most important of all a clientele being that of the sada'). Followed by those of shaykh al-Isldm and mulla-biikht in the Safawid period, the official functions of shaykh al-Isldm and imam djamha forming the link with the independent hierarchy of power (the institution of marja'iyati) in the Kadjar era. In practice, the prerogatives of mujtahids are multifarious, as the functions corresponding to the titles mujtahid, faikhi and mulk may be exercised by a single person. They are also guarantors and trustees to whom goods, the property of minors and the care of orphans are entrusted. The administration fee (mutawalli) of the most important waqf is paid to them. They certify the legality of all kinds of documents. The collection of religious taxes (zakat, khums, etc.) is within their responsibility. Their most important official function is the administration of justice in the capacity of kadi or mujt. The function of teaching (mudarris) is most often exercised by the most scholarly ones, who keep themselves separated from the practice of power (Algar (1969), 11 ff.; on the mudarris and their teaching, see Fischer (1980), 61 ff.; Momen, op. cit.). Having multiple sources of revenue at their disposal (see above), the mujtahids consolidate their influence and their popularity by matrimonial ties with the mercantile community or with eminent families of 'ulama' or with dignitaries close to the institutions of power. The mullahs often give them valuable assistance in the levying of religious taxes and the execution of various administrative taxes (on matrimonial relations between families of 'ulama' and between 'ulama' and merchants, see Fisher (1980), 89 ff.). As has been noted previously, in the Kadjar period certain eminent mujtahids surrounded themselves with bands of urban agitators in order to challenge the ruling authorities. Similar elements were used in the Islamic Revolution of 1978-9. Whether incorporated into the Hizbullah party or acting as guardians of the revolution (jamarat) they constitute the most solid nucleus for the support of radical 'ulama' and for revolutionary militancy (see Momen (1985), 199; Bakhsh (1986) index, s.v. bezbolahi, pasdaran-e engelab).

Although in principle exerting control over 'ulama' of inferior status, in the Kadjar period the mujtahids acted in conjunction with the mullahs who enjoyed enormous popularity among the general public in their capacity as preachers (wa'd, raudkhaban) at Shi'i funeral assemblies, which increasingly came to resemble political rallies. While the majority of mujtahids used to have a critical, even reproachful or contemptuous attitude towards popular Shi'i piety, its principal themes (cult of the martyr, 'paradigm of Karbal'a') were to be widely employed in the Islamic Revolution and Republic (Algar (1969), 20; Fathi (1980); Fischer (1980), 170 ff.; Momen (1985), 238 ff.) Khumayni actively encouraged the mujtahids to promote his ideas through the mullahs. It has been claimed that, by the mid-1970s, he had trained five hundred mujtahids and that twelve thousand students had followed his teaching in the years preceding his exile in 1964. Often of rural or provincial origin, the young mujtahids profited considerably from the coming to power of the Imam hierarchy (Arjomand (1988 A), 98).

The influence enjoyed by the mujtahids, in circles of power as well as among their peers or their followers, is reflected in their ever more emphatic and grandiloquent honorific titles, which do not always correspond to a hierarchical rank. At the beginning of the 19th century, after Kadhif al-Ghita' had been awarded the title of shaykh al-mujtahidin (see above), Muhammad Bakhir Shait (d. 1260/1454) was called budgat al-Isldm, a quite unconventional title which was henceforward to be current among the Imams (Arjomand (1984), 238, after Habibaddadi, Makhirim, iv, 1616). Although his eulogists do not award him the title of mardja', Ansi is honoured with that of khdtam al-mujtahidin (Amanat (1988), 114). Analogous to the Sunni tradition, the major figures of Imamism have been granted the title of mujtahid (partial list in Momen (1985), 206). But the titles which have become most prestigious are ayatullah and mardja' ('i taklid, while that of Imam is applied in a quite exceptional manner to Khumayni and Musa al-Sadr (see ibid., 289 [on the full range of Imam titles, see Ayatullah, in Suppl.; Mardja' ('i taklid]; Djafal Matini (1983)).

In spite of the pompous titles attributed to them, some mujtahids, such as Fisher (1980), 89 ff. or false modesty, to be known by more humble titles, such as mullah or agha, which may remind them of the early stages of their religious careers. The respectful title aka' is also used, often in conjunction with mulla.
movements were born in an atmosphere of decline and decadence from which the only ones to profit were those in possession of power and authority, religious or legal. Although rejecting the idjihād and taklīd of the Usūlī mujtahids, the Shākhīs considered that in principle every believer has a vocation to idjihād, the only authority to be emulated (taklīd) being that of the hidden Iman (Corbin, iv, 252 ff.). The Bāb himself [see bābīs] does not seem to have rejected the notion of idjihād, although he considered void and unlawful any judgment independent of his authority (Amanat, 1989, 205). In a eulogy, the Bābī Muḥammad Khūrāsānī is called mujtahid (idem, 263). Attacked by wāḥidī mujtahids, the Shākhī Muhammad Karlm Khan Kirmanī opposed the Bābis and gradually restored the doctrine of the rukn-ī rābī‘ (fourth pillar) to the point where it became indistinguishable from that of the collective delegated authority of the Imāmī mujtahids (Bayat, 1982, 75 ff.; Amanat, 1989, 291 ff.). Opposed both to the Shākhīs of Khūrāsān and to Bābīs, some moderate Shākhīs of Tābrīz went over to Usūlīsm and became very influential mujtahids in the second half of the 19th century (Bayat 1982, 59; Amanat, 1969, 411, uses the expression “conservative shaykhī mujtahids”).

But, in general, the practice of idjihād is a prerogative jealously guarded by the Usūlīs. Those who, from the Saʿādī tide onwards, refused to embrace Shīʿism were to become outcasts condemned to suffer popular or official punishment. After the Sunnīs—Sufis in particular—the Bābīs and legalised their execution (Momen (1989), 324). Bibliography and abbreviations: On the notions of idjihād, taklīd, idjmāʿ, etc. according to the various schools, which have not been addressed in this article, recourse may be had to the works of jurisprudence and the numerous studies of Islamic law listed in the major bibliographies, in particular the Index Isamicus: biographical details relating to the mujtahids are to be found in the abundant literature of ansāb, tabākāt, tadhkīrāt, riḍāl, etc. On the wājīl and Imāmī biographical works, see MARJĀʿ-1 TAKLĪD AND MOLLA, BIBL., also containing numerous titles of studies concerning the Imāmī ‘ulamāʾ; with a few exceptions, only those mentioned in the present article will be repeated here, as well as collective works comprising important contributions and bibliographical data. On the abundant literature concerning Persian Shīʿism since 1978-9, see the Abstracta Iranica which also deal with Indian Shīʿism; on the particular case of the Shīʿism of Deccan, a collective study is now in progress under the direction of B. Scarcia Amoretti.) Sh. Akhavi, Religion and politics in contemporary Iran, New York 1980; H. Algar, Religion and state in Iran 1775-1906, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1969; A. Amanat[1988] = In between the madrasa and the market place: the designation of clerical leadership in modern shīʿism, in Authority, 98-132; idem, Resurrection and renewal: the making of the Bāb movement in Iran, 1844-1850, Ithaca and London 1989; S. A. Arjomand, The Shadow of God and the Hidden Imam, Chicago-London 1980; Arjomand 1988 A = The turban for the crown. The Bāb, the Islamic revolution in Iran, New York 1978; Arjomand 1988 B = The Mujtahid of the age and the Mullā-bākhī. An intermediate stage in the institutionalization of religious authority in Shi‘ite Iran, in Authority. 80-

Theoretically, it comprises three feet: mustafīlun / 5ū‘lā‘īn / 5ū‘lā‘īn (w—w—/—^—/—^—) to each hemistich, but in practice, there is just one single foot.

Mustafīlun can become mustafīlun (w—w—) or even mustafīlun (w—w—), whilst 5ū‘lā‘īn (w—w—) or even 5ū‘lā‘īn (w—w—) and, in the darb (the second hemistich) by one of the two preceding feet or by mustafīlun (w—w—).

This metre is not used by the ancient poets, and it is not impossible that it was invented by al-Khalîl [q. v.]. (cf. St. Guyard, Thèorie nouvelle de la métrique arabe, in JÁ (1877), 168, 272 ff.).

Bibliography: See the Arabic dictionaries as well as the books and articles relating to the literature of entertainment (notably MĀKĀMA). (Ch. Pellat)

MUDMAR (A.) “implicit”; a technical term of Arabic grammar synonymous with damīr, designating a noun in which the person is disguised by means of a mark (‘ulāma). This term is the converse of muzhar (‘explicit’), designating a noun in which the person is revealed in a clear manner. The category of the implicit noun corresponds to that of the personal pronoun in Western grammar.

Al-Mubarrad defines the implicit noun as that which can only be employed after mention (dikh) of the person, and Sibawayhi considers it defined (ma‘rfa), since it is understood that the interlocutor knows the identity of the person who is supposed to be individually designated (bi-laynīth).

The implicit nouns are used to indicate three persons: the speaker (mutakallim), the interlocutor (mukhabah) and the absent party (ghabih), who is the object of the discussion (mukaddath ṣarha). From a formal point of view they are of two kinds: separated (manfaṣil) or contiguous (mutasāil). All implicit nouns have an evident (bānī) mark in expression (lafs), except in the verb where the mark of certain persons is hidden (mustair). Unlike explicit nouns, in which the final syllable is flexible (ma‘na), that of implicit nouns is fixed (nabī). According to the grammarians of Kufa, the term which designates the implicit noun is ma‘nī (“supplied”).

In syntax, the term mū’dmar “implicit” denotes the governing word (5ū‘mil) which, through dissimilation (idnār), does not appear in an explicit (mash‘ah) manner in the conversation, but which is supposed (mukād‘ah) to exist in the intention (naṣīb) of the speaker; i.e.
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old poetry could reserve them (cf. Aghāni, v. 172, and Yākūt, Иyshād, vii, 171). It is also recorded that al-Mufaddal once caught Hammād in the presence of the caliph passing off verses of his own as the work of Zuhayr b. Abī Sulmā. The kasidas which Hammād was reciting began with da‘īdh, and when the caliph asked for the missing nasib he added several nasib verses. Al-Mufaddal, however, said quite rightly that there had probably been a nasib before the surviving verses, but no one any longer knew it (cf. Renata Jacob, Studien zur Poetik der altarabischen Qasida, Wiesbaden 1971, 17). Hammād was thereby forced to admit his forgery. It is interesting to learn that, as is recorded in this passage of the Aghāni, Hammād was rewarded for his recitation but the sum given to al-Mufaddal was considerably greater. Al-Mufaddal was given his reward, not only for his knowledge, but also for his fidelity and honesty in transmission (cf. Aghāni, loc. cit. and Yākūt, loc. cit.).

Al-Mufaddal worked in different fields of Arabic philology. He was considered an authority on rare Arabic expressions, celebrated as a grammarian and was also an authority on genealogy and on the Arab battles (Ayyūm al-‘Arab). He wrote a number of books: a Kitāb al-Amthil (on proverbs), a Kitāb al-‘Arud (on metres), a Kitāb Muṣ’ta‘īy ‘l-gharîn’ (on the meaning of poems) and a dictionary Kitāb al-‘Alfāz. His principal work, however, is a collection of old Arabic kasidas called the Mufaddaliyya, which he compiled for his pupil, the future caliph al-Mahdi. Al-Mufaddal himself is said to have given another story of the origin of this anthology, which is one of the most valuable Arabic collections. When on one occasion 'Abd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh was in hiding in his house, he brought him some books to read at his request. Ibrahim marked a number of poems, and when he collected them in one volume because Ibrahim was a good critic of the old poetry. This collection was later called the Ḥikṣyāt al-Mufaddal (cf. Flügel, Gramm. Schriften, 144, n. 1).

The Mufaddaliyya contains 126 poems, some complete kasidas of many verses, some fragments of small size, while in Abu Tammān’s collection, the Ḥamṣa, only short fragments of poems or separate verses are contained. The latter are composed in six years later; at first it was much more popular than the Mufaddaliyya, and more frequently annotated. But al-Mufaddal’s anthology is of outstanding merit. The great bulk of it is the work of pagan poets and muḥammadān, while only 6 of the 67 poets represented were born Muslims. Two of the poets whose kasidas are contained in the Mufaddaliyya were Christians. The poems, the date of composition of which can frequently be deduced from events mentioned in them, are in some cases very old. The earliest are those attributed to Mūrakkiḫ al-Eldar (q.v.), which probably belong to the first decade of the 6th century A.D.

Al-Mufaddal’s anthology offers a rich selection of the old Arabic poetry, the value of which is increased by the striking absence from the Mufaddaliyya of the most famous pre-Islamic poets. The same source, again quoting Abū ʿĪṣām, provides the information that al-Mufaddal selected 80 poems out of 126 and that the number was filled up to 120 by the Basran philologist al-Asmaʾi (d. 213/928 [q. v.]) and his students when they studied the collection. There is a different story recorded by Abu ʿl-Farāḍj al-Isfahāni (d. 356/967 [q. v.]) in his book on the ‘Alids written in 377/987, it is referred to as the Mufaddaliyya.

Of the numerous biographical sources mentioning al-Mufaddal, only a few refer to his anthology and its origin. These are divided with regard to the two traditions. Yākūṭ (d. 626/1229 [q. v.]) follows the Fihrist (Udābī, iii, 173), and so does Ibn al-Kīfī (d. 646/1248 [q. v.]), who also reports the second tradition, however, with some embellishment, in a different place (Inḥāb al-nasab ‘alā ankh al-muḥātib, iii, 302, 304). The story of Ibrahim b. ʿAbd Allāh, confirming al-Mufaddal’s text, is further looked by al-Safādi (d. 764/1365 [q. v.] (cf. Flügel, Die grammatischen Schriften der Araber, Leipzig 1862, 143-4), and by al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505 [q. v.]), who gives
the Fawdʾd of al-Nadjirami (d. 423/1031) as his source (al-Muzhir, ii, 319). Thus the “Shīʿi” tradition was obviously favoured by later authors. It is discussed and accredited by S.M. Yousif (The original corpus of the Majaddalayyat, in: C. xviii (1944), 206-6). There seems to be no way to prove for certain which of the two reports is authentic. However, one would have expected Ibn al-Nadim, who was a Shīʿi like Abu 'I-Faraḍ al-Iṣfahani, to know the second tradition and to mention it, had it seemed convincing. A further point in favour of al-Kālī’s story is the reference to the mukillun. It is a likely criterion of choice, if al-Mufaddal was the compiler, but it hardly fits Ibrahim b. ʾAbd Allāh, who selected the poems for his own pleasure, as the story goes. Why should he have preferred minor poets? A combination of the two traditions is suggested by A.M. Shakir and ʾAbd al-Salam M. Ḥurīn in their introduction to the Cairo edition (13, see Bibli.). According to them, al-Mufaddal followed the caliph’s request, offering Ibrahim b. ʾAbd Allāh his collection with some additions of his own. Later, al-ʾAsmaʾi and his students added to it.

The majority of sources agree on the point that there was first an anthology of 70 or 80 poems and that their number was complemented later. The question remains, who made the additions, al-Mufaddal himself or al-ʾAsmaʾi? It is discussed by C.J. Lyall in the introduction to his edition (ii, pp. xv-xvi, see Bibli.), who favours al-Mufaddal, but believes that the question admits of no certain solution. The editors of the Cairo edition (14-19), on the other hand, accept al-ʾAsmaʾi’s contribution and further maintain that his own anthology, the ʾAsmāʾiyā, had become mixed with the Majaddalayyat at an early stage of transmission, as indeed is mentioned in a manuscript unifying them both (op. cit., 19; cf. also Lyall, i, p. xvii). The point is strengthened by the fact that a sequence of poems was transmitted, with some variations, in both collections (Muf. nos. 100-18 = Asm. nos. 71-89). However it may be, the two anthologies are evidently related and should be studied together. Since al-ʾAsmaʾi was highly esteemed as a scholar, no doubt is shed on the authenticity of the corpus, even if some of the texts were selected by him.

2. Recensions and commentaries.

It is to be assumed that al-Mufaddal dictated the collection to his students and that different traditions existed from the beginning. Five recensions with commentaries are known (cf. Sezgin, GAS, ii, 54; three of them are preserved. The first commentator in the chronological order is Muhammad b. al-Kāsim al-Anbari (d. 328/940 [q.v.]), whose recension goes back to Abū ʾIkrima and Ibn al-Aʿrābī, the most reliable line of transmission according to the Fihrist (loc. cit.). In his extensive commentary, al-Anbari mainly quotes scholars from Kufr, but al-ʾAsmaʾi and other Bāṣrāns are referred to as well. Some explanations come from al-Mufaddal himself, although he was not regarded as an authority on grammar and lexicography, and disclaimed all merit in these fields (Abū ʾI-Tayyib, Marāṭib al-muṣyūṣ, ed. M. Abū ʾI-Fadl Ibrāhīm, Cairo 19742, 116). Judging from quotations in mediaeval sources, al-Anbari’s text seems to have been the standard recension of the time. It is edited and translated by Lyall, whose introduction and notes to his translation are still an invaluable guide to the poetry, especially as regards historical information (cf. also W. Caskel, Ein Missverständniss in den Majaddalayyat, in: Orient, vii (1954), 290-303).

The second recension by Ahmad b. Muḥammad al-Marzūkī (d. 424/1030 [q.e.]) is unedited, but studied and taken into consideration in other editions. It contains 109 poems, their sequence varying considerably from al-Anbari’s recension (cf. Lyall’s comparative tables, i, pp. xxi-xxvi). In his commentary, al-Marzūkī relies on al-Anbari, and so does the third commentator, Abū Yahyā al-Tibrizī (d. 502/1109 [q.e.]), who uses material from both his precursors. In his commentary he is more concise and to the point, however, leaving out many of the shamsahd quoted by al-Anbari. The recension contains 128 poems, their sequence corresponding approximately to al-Anbari’s text. It is available in two editions, one of them incomplete (see Bibli.).

3. Analysis of content.

In Lyall’s edition, the anthology consists of 126 poems by 67 poets and one (anonymous) poetess; four texts are added in an appendix. The majority (48) belong to the pre-Islamic period (= 94 poems). 14 poets (= 24 poems) are muḥājaramūn, i.e. poets who reached the time of Islam, and six (= 8 poems) lived in the first Islamic century. Thus, unlike the Muṣallakāt (q.e.), a collection of pre-Islamic odes, the texts extend over a period of about 200 years. They are not limited to one genre, moreover, but present a fairly comprehensive survey of ancient Arabic genres and motifs. There is no evidence that verses were extracted from other poems, as became a literary fashion 50 years later, starting with the famous Ḥummās (q.e.) of Abū Tammām (d. 231/845). From all we know it is safe to assume that even the shortest texts (2-4 lines) were reproduced as they had been preserved, and that lacunae are due to faulty transmission before al-Mufaddal’s time.

The only information we have as to the original order of the texts is the remark by Ibn al-Nadim (loc. cit.) that the Majaddalayyat began with the ode by Taḥābba Ṣihā (no. 1). Attempts to detect any internal or external principle of arrangement are in vain. Even the verses of one poet are not always listed together. Sometimes texts referring to the same historical event seem to be arranged together, which suggests that historical content may have occasionally motivated selection. A further criterion of choice, besides scholarly interest in the mukillūn and in “rare words” (gharīb), was suggested by W. Stoetzer in a recent study of Arabic prosody based on the Majhadalayyat (Theory and practice in Arabic metrics, Leiden 1986, 70-1). From his analysis it would appear that only kāriṣ was selected, a term applied by Stoetzer to metres of a certain length.

The collection contains a few pre-Islamic texts by Christian poets, Džābir b. Ḥunayy (no. 42) and ʾAbd al-Masih (nos. 72, 73, 83), without distinctive features, and an ʿUmayyad ghaḍal by an anonymous Jewish poet (no. 37), in which the adversities of love are ascribed to God’s decree. Although many texts are fragmentary and difficult to classify, the material can be roughly divided into three categories: (a) 61 polythematic odes; (b) 7 elegies; (c) 58 monothematic poems. There are only a few inedible fragments, i.e. verses that must have formed part of a greater unit. These are counted within the last category.

(a) From the aspect of structure, two main types of the polythematic ode (kaṣida) are to be distinguished, the tripartite form (22) with a camel section following the amatory prelude (nasīḥ), and the bipartite form (39), where the amatory prelude is followed, mostly without transition, by one or more topics of the poet’s present concern. There are only ten odes ending with a panegyric, none of them tripartite, which suggests that the tripartite ode was favoured for panegyrical
purposes at an early stage. In the majority of odes, the final section is devoted to the beloved (no. 105, 1-11), who is habitually pictured as a young girl, and another describing the journey of the parting beloved instead of his own (no. 9, 5-10).

The odes of the brigands (ja‘dik) Ta‘abbata Shāhre (no. 1) and Ṣanfarā (no. 20) deserve special attention, as they do not conform to tribal poetry in several respects (cf. S. Pinckney-Stetkevych, in JAOS, civ [1984], 661-78, and IJMES, xviii [1986], 361-90).

(b) The second category, the elegy (marthiya), represented by seven texts only, appears heterogeneous as to composition and style. In spite of the great diversity of content and various traces of individual composition and style, the anthology gives the impression of homogeneity resulting from its common social background. Whether the tribal poet recounts his experience in love and war, or reflects in old age and death, he displays the same indomitable spirit, the "heroic attitude" as defined by A. Hamori, whose essay The poet as hero is based on the Mufaddaliyyāt (On the art of medieval Arabic literature. Princeton 1974, 3-30).

The poet's recklessness and pride are most clearly expressed in his self-praise, but they appear equally striking in verses on the transitoriness of life, where hope is abandoned and fate accepted without submission or humility. It seems significant that the question of human destiny is treated predominantly in texts of mukhadramun, i.e. on the eve of Islam. The answer they provide could not satisfy Arabic society any more; pre-Islamic metaphysics had reached an impasse. But the proud verses of the Mufaddaliyyāt document that there was a long way to go, till the "Bedouin hero" would be transformed into the " servant of God."


MUFĀKHARA (A.), maqār of the third form III verb fāṣkara (synonymns fāṣkār, ḥīṣār, ḥīṣār), has both a reflexive meaning, that of self-praise, and an active one, that of contest for precedence and glory, rivalry with other tribes or groups (hence also synonymous with tafāḥkūr, Kur‘ān, LVII, 19; manṣūra; munṣūra; tafāṣīd, al-Kuraqhi, Dijamhara, Būlāk, 170 i. 4). The manṣūra must have originally been a mufāhkara, the difference being of numbers only (cf. the term takāḥkūr, sūra CII, 1, and the commentaries of al-Tabarī, Cairo 1321, xxx, 156; al-Wāhīdī, Abābī al-nasīl, Cairo 1315, 341. See further Ḥassān b. Thābit, Cairo 1927, 196-20, Kudáma b. Dīsār, Nāḥal al-šīr, Constantinople 1302/1885, 30).
1. As self-praise. Self-praise may have been one of the earliest poetical expressions of the Arabs, for the short battle-sayings, mostly expressed not yet in the later metres but in rhymed prose (safāʾ) or râghâs, contained, next to derision of the enemies (hidžâ) above all self-praise. These sayings were part of the battle, and were supposed to have magical influence on the own fighters as well as on the enemy through the power of expression. The hero or the tribe often presented themselves with the formula "I am so-and-so", or "We are so-and-so", and then added an assertion of their own power or a violent expression (see M. Ullmann, Unterrichtungen zur Ragazpoesie, Wiesbaden 1966, 16 ff.). Other introductory formulas were "Just ask so-and-so about me (us)...!", or "So-and-so know(s) that I (we)...." Either a tribe or a beautiful girl were named as possible informers about the exploits of the poet. Concern about a beloved one being aware of the poet's exploits was also expressed in longer monothematic self-praise poems (kaṣīda), now no more composed in safāʾ or râghâ alone (see A. Bloch, Qasida, in Asiatische Studien ii [1948], 109-10). This relation with the beloved one offered a good starting-point to connect fakhr with nasî (q.v.), and thus to integrate it into the polythematic kaṣīda (q.v.): on the morning of separation, the poet tried to keep back his beloved one by recalling his exploits to her. G. Richter, Zur Einteilung der Dichtung bei den Arabern, in ZDMG xcvii [1938], 552-69, went so far as to conclude that the entire kaṣīda was self-praise intended as a proposal. In fact, the great majority of the old Arabic kaṣīdas contain self-praise as their main part, but not all of them. The main reason why Richter's thesis fails is that the nasî is not a proposal, but grief over a past love. In any case, fakhr became, with nasî, the most important part of the kaṣīda, but it also continued to live on in monothematic poems.

The qualities praised by the poet in himself and his tribe are: courage in battle (a favourite topic are the slain enemies, left as carrion to the birds), generosity, a well-balanced judgment in tribal council meetings, and a talent to enjoy the pleasures of life, sc. women, gambling, wine and hunting.

The poet boasts not only about his personal qualities, but also about his possessions: helmet, sword, suit of armour, horse, and above all his camel, the most precious property of the Bedouin (see G. Müller, Ich bin Labid und das ist mein Ziel, Wiesbaden 1981, 41 ff.). With this a good connection is found, inside the kaṣīda, with the aṣāla scene: the poet tears himself away from the memories called up by the deserted camp, and takes comfort in his property, which heightens his sense of self-esteem. Since the most important part of this property was the camel, the description of the animal first developed, from the rest of the fakhr, into an independent theme, known as waṣṣ al-djamal, and then, after the panegyric of rulers (mâdhî) had become the main theme of the kaṣīda, into the travelling by camel (râhil) to the praised one (mândî) (see Renate Jacobi, The Camel-Section of the panegyric ode, in JSL xiii [1973], 35-36).

A further starting-point for fakhr, inside and outside the kaṣīda, was the topic of old age. The ageing poet recalls his earlier exploits (e.g. Abu Kabir al-Hudhâlî (q.v.)). Specific themes are found in the fakhr of the "bandit" poets (ṣuʿîkî, pl. ṣuʿîlîk (q.v.)). Naturally, praise of the tribe came second to self-praise for the poet who was an outcast from his tribe. The peculiar code of honour of the ṣuʿîkÎ made him praise his poverty, hunger and physical neglect (e.g. al-Shanfara). Poverty of the outlaw, undoubtedly, was appreciated more highly than that resulting from a lower social level (cf. Urwa b. al-Ward). The ṣuʿîkî even boasted of fleeing before the enemy because it proved his swiftness (e.g. Taʿlābata Sharrān). Already early times, fakhr had, in battle-sayings, a magical function related to hidžâ. In the old Arabic period, hid¿ was hardly ever separated from fakhr inside and outside the kaṣīda. Even in later times, both remained closely connected. Derision is found intermingled with self-praise, in the new form of hidžâ during the Umayyad period, in the nakâd (reciprocal satiric poems) of al-Farazdak, Djarir and al-Akhtal (q.v. vo.). This did not change in the 'Abbâsid period. Thus the famous hid¿ bâʿîya poem of Abû Nuwâs contains at least as much self-praise of the South Arabs as it contains derision of the North Arabs. The Shuʿūbî poets, too, joined self-praise of their royal Persian ancestors with derision of the miserable Arab Bedouins (see section 2, below).

Indigenous scholars of Arabic literature have paid little attention to fakhr because they considered it part of the basic category of praise: mîdî is praise of a living person, tilîh is praise of a deceased person, and hidja is praise of oneself (see G. Schoeller, Die Einteilung der Dichtung bei den Arabern, in ZDMG cxxiii [1973], 9-55). This view is also expressed by Ibn Raghib, who does have a separate chapter on fiškâr ("Umda, ed. M. M. Abû al-Hamîd, Cairo 1955, ii, 143-7) but skips the distinction between praising the fakhr given above, provides only examples. The fiškâr chapters in the Diwan al-muʾâša of Abî Hâlib al-ʿAskari (q.v. (ed. Cairo 1352/1933, i, 76-91) and other anthologies are also only collections of examples. In the diwan recensions arranged according to subject, a chapter fakhr wa-balâh is found for the first time in Abû Tammâm (recension of Abî B. Hamza al-Isfiḍâhî), and then, completely independent, in al-Buthûrî, Ibn al-Muʿtazz and others.

nament of honour, performed an important social function. In a way it was a kind of religious ceremony. Indeed, the religion of the pre-Islamic Arabs, a poor and ineffectual one, yielded place to honour inasmuch as the latter, thanks on the one hand to its sacred character and on the other to the mfudhadhat (the elements of leitmotiv of which were connected on the psychosociological plane with strictly religious beliefs and practices), periodically revived in the Arabs this state of intense social life in which the individual forces were stimulated to the extent of bringing about a complete transfiguration of the individual.

This explains why the mfudhadhat was an important social institution. Did it not survive the obsequies of the Kur'an and the reprimands of the Prophet (who did not, nevertheless, fail to indulge in it)? With Islam, however, to the elements that constituted pre-Islamic honour there came to be added elements from the new religion or belonging to the new culture or the new social organisation. Sometimes in post-Islamic times, mfudhadhat were held in the presence of the caliphs who were not ashamed to take part in them (sometimes rulers and great lords presided over them). Finally, we may note that the aim of the Shu'ubiyya [q.v.], while protesting against the arrogant pride of the Arabs, was to assert in their eyes their own claims to pre-eminence at the expense of their quassid and in gathering those like those of pre-Islamic days, but with the pen and the word. This new kind of feud was no less violent than the old one: polemics, personalities and insults (I'did, ii, 85 ff.; cf. Goldziher, Muhammadanische Stud., i, 167 ff.; cf. also the Mathlibi-al-'Arab). (One of the poets of the Shu'ubiyya, Isma'il Yasir, had already roused the wrath of the caliph Hisham b. Abd al-Malik by celebrating exuberantly the memory of the Shu'ubiyya [q.v.]) while protesting against the arrogant Shu'ubiyya [q.v.].

From mediaeval times, the dissolution of all Islamic contractual partnerships was governed by the same considerations as those governing the dissolution of all Islamic contractual partnerships. Nevertheless, the post-Islamic mfudhadhat—revived for a time and under another aspect as the quarrel between Arabs and non-Arabs—was no longer anything more than a survival doomed to gradual extinction, because Islam had dispossessed it of its function, had fought it so far as it was a social institution and had broken it up by condemning a number of the elements of honour, notably al-sharaf (nobility) and al-husn (the example of one's forefathers).


MUFARRIDI B. DAGHFAL [see QARAKHIDH].

MUFiswaDA (A.), a legal term denoting a form of commercial partnership and having different meanings within different schools of Islamic law. From mediaeval times, the mfudhadha has been most prominently associated with the Hanafi school, whose law restricts the conduct of partners in the operation of partnerships to a far lesser extent than that of the other schools, a phenomenon thought of as having its origins in the close relationship between independent reasoning (ra'y) and juristic preference (istehban) in early Hanafi jurisprudence. For the Hanafis, the mfudhadha, which "is perhaps best translated as a universal, or unlimited, investment partnership" (Udovitch, 40; see Bibl. below) is one of the two classes of commercial partnership into which their law divides individual one, yielded place to honour inasmuch as the latter, thanks on the one hand to its sacred character and on the other to the mfudhadhat (the elements of leitmotiv of which were connected on the psychosociological plane with strictly religious beliefs and practices), periodically revived in the Arabs this state of intense social life in which the individual forces were stimulated to the extent of bringing about a complete transfiguration of the individual.

This explains why the mfudhadhat was an important social institution. Did it not survive the obsequies of the Kur'an and the reprimands of the Prophet (who did not, nevertheless, fail to indulge in it)? With Islam, however, to the elements that constituted pre-Islamic honour there came to be added elements from the new religion or belonging to the new culture or the new social organisation. Sometimes in post-Islamic times, mfudhadhat were held in the presence of the caliphs who were not ashamed to take part in them (sometimes rulers and great lords presided over them). Finally, we may note that the aim of the Shu'ubiyya [q.v.], while protesting against the arrogant pride of the Arabs, was to assert in their eyes their own claims to pre-eminence at the expense of their quassid and in gathering those like those of pre-Islamic days, but with the pen and the word. This new kind of feud was no less violent than the old one: polemics, personalities and insults (I'did, ii, 85 ff.; cf. Goldziher, Muhammadanische Stud., i, 167 ff.; cf. also the Mathlibi-al-'Arab). (One of the poets of the Shu'ubiyya, Isma'il Yasir, had already roused the wrath of the caliph Hisham b. Abd al-Malik by celebrating exuberantly the memory of the Shu'ubiyya [q.v.]) while protesting against the arrogant Shu'ubiyya [q.v.].

From mediaeval times, the dissolution of all Islamic contractual partnerships was governed by the same considerations as those governing the dissolution of all Islamic contractual partnerships.

According to a brief general outline given by the 5th/11th century Hanafi jurist of 'Irak, al-Kuduri [q.v.], in his Mukhassar, a mfudhadha was the forming of a partnership by two people of equal wealth, religion and freedom of action, and was accordingly permissible between two free Muslims of full age and sound mind, but not between a Muslim and an unbeliever, a minor and one of full age, a free man and a slave; full powers of agency and liability attached to each partner, the arrangement thereby amounting to mutual procurement (isqala) and suretyship (kafla); the whole property of each partner was engaged except for food and clothing for the family, and equal liability attached to both for any obligation assumed by either of them in exchange for anything that was valid within the partnership.

The hallmark of the Hanafi mfudhadha was equality, relating not only to the amount of each partner's investment and to profits and losses but also to personal status and religious affiliation. In this connection it should be noted that a mfudhadha between two Christians, two Jews or two adherents of any other protected religion was lawful, as was a contract between two women of the same faith. The only exception to the rule of equality was in respect of personal status and religious affiliation.

Despite the denial, by Islamic legal theory, of the validity of documents, which it held to amount, at the most, to nothing more than corroborative evidence, the desirability of written contracts was recognised as early as the 2nd/8th century by al-Shaybani, the true father of Hanafi law, whose celebrated K. al-Afi incorpored formuals for partnership contracts. The latter include a suggested formula for a general mfudhadha contract, followed by a direction that each partner should write and retain his own copy of the contract agreed upon.

Whether a mfudhadha could be validly contracted without the express use of that precise term was a question on which there was a difference of opinion. Abu Hanifa's reported ruling was that if the term mfudhadha was not used, the partnership was to be construed as a general limited investment partnership.

However, the importance attached by Islamic contract law to intended meaning rather than to forms and phrasing conduced to the view that, if the parties to a mfudhadha contract were aware of the rules of mfudhadha and its meaning, the actual term need not be used.

In Islamic law the mediaeval Hanafi mfudhadha was the closest approximation to a corporate entity because, from the point of view of commercial principles, the partners were as one person. All the partners' eligible capital and all their commercial activities were included in the mfudhadha partnership, and, accordingly, each partner was held fully liable for all the commercial activities and commitments of the other. The claims of third parties, on the one hand, were actionable against either of the partners, and, on the other hand, either partner had the right to claim against a third party, even without his having been involved in the transaction giving rise to the claim. In the matter of third parties, then, "dealing with the individual mfudhadha partner is equivalent to dealing with the partnership firm. In this respect, the mfudhadha approaches the modern [non-Islamic] conception of the partnership" [Udovitch, 100].

The dissolution of a mfudhadha partnership was governed by the same considerations as those governing the dissolution of all Islamic contractual partnerships. The hallmark of the Hanafi mfudhadha was equality, relating not only to the amount of each partner's investment and to profits and losses but also to personal status and religious affiliation. In this connection it should be noted that a mfudhadha between two Christians, two Jews or two adherents of any other protected religion was lawful, as was a contract between two women of the same faith. The only exception to the rule of equality was in respect of personal status and religious affiliation. Despite the denial, by Islamic legal theory, of the validity of documents, which it held to amount, at the most, to nothing more than corroborative evidence, the desirability of written contracts was recognised as early as the 2nd/8th century by al-Shaybani, the true father of Hanafi law, whose celebrated K. al-Afi incorporated forms for partnership contracts. The latter include a suggested formula for a general mfudhadha contract, followed by a direction that each partner should write and retain his own copy of the contract agreed upon.

Whether a mfudhadha could be validly contracted without the express use of that precise term was a question on which there was a difference of opinion. Abu Hanifa's reported ruling was that if the term mfudhadha was not used, the partnership was to be construed as a general limited investment partnership. However, the importance attached by Islamic contract law to intended meaning rather than to forms and phrasing conduced to the view that, if the parties to a mfudhadha contract were aware of the rules of mfudhadha and its meaning, the actual term need not be used.

In Islamic law the mediaeval Hanafi mfudhadha was the closest approximation to a corporate entity because, from the point of view of commercial principles, the partners were as one person. All the partners' eligible capital and all their commercial activities were included in the mfudhadha partnership, and, accordingly, each partner was held fully liable for all the commercial activities and commitments of the other. The claims of third parties, on the one hand, were actionable against either of the partners, and, on the other hand, either partner had the right to claim against a third party, even without his having been involved in the transaction giving rise to the claim. In the matter of third parties, then, "dealing with the individual mfudhadha partner is equivalent to dealing with the partnership firm. In this respect, the mfudhadha approaches the modern [non-Islamic] conception of the partnership" [Udovitch, 100].

The dissolution of a mfudhadha partnership was governed by the same considerations as those governing the dissolution of all Islamic contractual partnerships.
(e.g. expiry of the stipulated term of the contract, attainment of the agreed goal, termination by mutual consent of the partners, death of a partner). However, there was one factor leading to dissolution that was peculiar to the Hanafi mufawada: the lapse of equality in eligible capital which had been a condition of the formation of the partnership. Such a lapse could occur if, for instance, one of the partners was given or inherited such property as was eligible for partnership investment. In the case of inheritance, the partnership would terminate only at the time when the partner in question took possession of the inherited property.

Investment form and the formation of joint capital, deposits and pledges, loans, purchase, sale and debts, partners’ expenses, investment with third parties, limit of mutual surety (e.g. by a crime committed by one of the partners), etc., are matters on which information may be most conveniently derived from Uudovitch since they are aspects of the Hanafi mufawada which cannot be treated here.

Like the mufawada of Hanafi law, that of Malikī law is an early mediaeval institution with a history dating certainly from the first half of the 3rd/9th century and having its roots in the latter half of the 2nd/8th. In the context of Malikī law, the term mufawada is perhaps best translated as ‘general mandate partnership’ (cf. Uudovitch, 143) because it denotes a partnership in which each of the contracting parties confers on the latter refrained from usurious business activities and other religiously unacceptable practices. With the exception of the lapse of equality in eligible capital, which has no place in Malikī mufawada arrangements, the same factors as those leading to dissolution of the Hanafi mufawada partnership were applicable to the Malikī counterpart.

As the case of the Hanafi law of mufawada, it has not been practicable to cover here all that needs or be said about the various aspects of the Malikī mufawada, and yet again Uudovitch may be recommended as the most convenient source of information on the more important points.

As viewed by al-Shāfi‘ī (d. 204/820), mufawada, whether in the Hanafi or Malikī understanding of the term, was an approximation to the proscribed practice of gambling since the obligations undertaken by the partners to the contract were not wholly known to and controlled by that contract. For him, the basis of profit or gain from any common commercial undertaking could only be cash invested by each partner party to the contract, and to charge the profit and loss of all commercial activities undertaken by the partners, whether singly or jointly, to a common partnership fund was an arrangement in which there was too great an element of the unknown. In Shāfi‘ī law, then, the mufawada was and is not a valid commercial partnership as conceived by the Hanafi and Malikī schools of law.

As regards the Hanafi school, there are authorities sharing al-Shāfi‘ī’s view of mufawada, but at the same time some, such as Ta‘lī al-Dīn al-Futuhī (d. ca. 980/1257), inclining to the Hanafī position. Ibn Kudūmā [q. e.], writing more than three-and-a-half centuries earlier in al-Mughni, a work that acquired, and still enjoys, a great reputation, held the only lawful partnership be a partnership in which each of the different forms of partnership investment, viz. money, labour and credit, were combined.

It remains only to touch on the Ibbā‘īs, whose sect is particularly prominent in ‘Umān. Their concept of the mufawada is an unlimited association of two or more persons in all areas thereof. Each partner is to have equality of authority over the property of his partner(s), and all profits and gains (apart from inheritance, blood-money and bride-price) are equally divisible among the partners. Some Ibbā‘ī authorities reject the Hanafī requirement of equality in respect of both capital and shares in profits.

At the present day, mufawada is by no means a dead letter: it is, in particular, one of those commercial modes of operation traditional to Islamic jurisprudence to which modern Islamic financial institutions have adapted. As they observe the challenge presented by what they see as the secular systems of commercial law operating in the West.


2. Secondary works: For English-speaking peoples with no Arabic, A.L. Uudovitch, Partnership and profit in medieval Islam, Princeton 1970 is the work of reference par excellence (see especially 29-39, 40-118, 144-5, 150-69). N.A. Saleh, Unlawful gain and legitimate profit in Islamic law, Cambridge 1986, is also useful, but in the use of his sources the author is somewhat eclectic, presumably because his thought is directed towards the re-assertion of Islamic law in the modern world. As almost all the
important secondary literature is contained in the bibliographies of Udovitch and Saleh, they need not be listed here. Special mention must, however, be made of D. Santillana, *Istituzioni di diritto musulmano malchita con riguardo anche al sistema sciafiti*, 2 vols., Rome 1925-38.

(F. L. LATHAM)

**MUFEFFITHE** [see Supplement].

**AL-MUFID**, Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Al-Nu'man al-Haritii b. 'Abd-Karbi, Imam Shii theologian and jurist, was born on 1 Dhul Qa'da 330/23 May 948 (other dates mentioned, 335 and 338, seem less likely) in Suwaykat Ibn Imam! Shii theologian and jurist, was born on c. 948/949 in Ukbara. After his father's profession, al-Mufid was also known as Ibn al-Mu'allam. He came to Baghdad as a boy and already in Muharram 347/April 958 heard hadith from a large number of the Hidden Imams. He taught and held the head of the Baghdad school of the Mu'tazilis, as against the Basran Mu'tazili school, as against the Basran Mu'tazili doctrine of the intermediate position of the grave sinner between believer and unbeliever [see *AL-MANZILA BAYN AL-AMANIZALAYN*] as incompatible with Shiiism and affirmed the Imam! belief in the effective intercession of the Imam! or pro-Shiite theologians like Ibn al-Nadim, writing in 377/987-8, describes him as a disciple of the Imam! al-Balkhi (d. 377/987-8), of Sunni traditionalist theologians like Ibn al-Balkhi, al-Wasiti, Ibn al-Khalid, Abu 'Abd Allah al-Asadi, and Abu Djafrar b. Babuya (d. 378/987-8), whom he heard presumably during his stays of Baghdad in 352/963 and 355/966. There is no evidence that al-Mufid ever visited Kumm.

He soon became the leading theologian and spokesman of the Imamiiyya. Ibn al-Nadim, writing in 377/987-8, describes him as such, and Abu Hayyan al-Tawhidi characterises him in this period as a resourceful and persevering debater with a pleasant resourceful and persevering debater with a pleasant
dance with their actions. Concerning the Kurân, he upheld the Imam! belief in the effective intercession of the Prophet and the Imams for the sinners of their community. He rejected the Mu'tazili doctrine of the intermediate position of the grave sinner between believer and unbeliever [see *AL-MANZILA BAYN AL-AMANIZALAYN*] as incompatible with Shiiism and affirmed the Imam! belief in *aqidat*, the return of some of the dead to life at the time of the advent of the Mahdi. The Imam! doctrine of *badr* [q.e.] he cautiously explained as identical in substance with the general *nashikh*,, the abrogation of religious law, and the Mu'tazili doctrine about God's changing man's life-span and sustenance in accordance with their actions. Concerning the Kur'an, he held that there were neither substantial additions nor deletions in the *Uthmanic* text, but that the enemies of 'Ali had changed the arrangement of verses and suppressed the commentary contained in his codex. In agreement with earlier Imam! theologians like Higham b. al-Hakam, Abu Sahl b. Nawbahar and his teacher Abu '1-Djafrar, he rejected the materialist Mu'tazili identification of man with the body, or part of it, and defined the essence of man as spirit and a simple substance (ghurar basî). In the religious law, al-Mufid repudiated the use of *idhtih* and analogy (kiyds) and criticised his older con-

Kullab and al-Karabisi; of Kurgan experts like Kutrub and Tha'lab; of the Sufi followers of the Hallâd; and of Imam! scholars with whom he disagreed like Ibn Bûbaya, Abu '1-Asadî, and Ibn Djunayd al-Iskâfi. The wide recognition of his authority among Imamîs outside Baghdad is reflected in his written answers to questions sent to him from the communities in Khâraza, Naysabûr, Djafran, Sariya, Tabaristanî, Sâhân, Dinawar, Khuzistân, Fars, al-Rakkî, al-Hârîr, and 'Ukrab, besides answers to named individuals elsewhere. Despite his outspoken anti-Sunnî polemics, his relations with the Sunnîs were generally good. The Bayûtî ('Abd al-Rahîm b. Dawa) is said to have visited him often. Together with other prominent Imamî leaders, he signed the document impugning the genealogy of the Fâtimid caliphs drawn up at the order of the 'Abbasid caliph al-Kâtîr in 402/1011-12. During riots between Sunnîs and Shii in Baghdad, he was three times, in 392/1002, 398/1008 and 409/1018, banished from the town, although he does not appear to have been involved in starting them. Each time the order was either revoked or he was soon allowed to return. Abu Mansûr al-Tabrisî (al-Tabarî) quotes two letters which he is said to have received from the Hidden Imam! in Safar 410/June 1019 and Dhu '1-Hijja 420/1022 (al-Tabarî, *Nâdirj*, Nâdirj, Na�irj 1367-8/1966, ii, 318-25). Later sources mention a third letter. In one of them he is addressed with his honorific form of Abu '1-Djafrar al-Mu'tazili school, as against the Basran Mu'tazili doctrine prevalent in Baghdad in his time. He wrote a book on "the agreement of the Baghdadis of the Mu'tazila with what is related from the Imams". Excluded were subjects which touched on vital Imam! dogma, the imamate and related points. Against the Mu'tazili affirmation of the unconditional punishment of the unrepentent sinner in the hereafter, he upheld the Imam! belief in the effective intercession of the Prophet and the Imams for the sinners of their community. He rejected the Mu'tazili doctrine of the intermediate position of the grave sinner between believer and unbeliever [see *AL-MANZILA BAYN AL-AMANIZALAYN*] as incompatible with Shiiism and affirmed the Imam! belief in *aqidat*, the return of some of the dead to life at the time of the advent of the Mahdi. The Imam! doctrine of *badr* [q.e.] he cautiously explained as identical in substance with the general *nashikh*,, the abrogation of religious law, and the Mu'tazili doctrine about God's changing man's life-span and sustenance in accordance with their actions. Concerning the Kur'an, he held that there were neither substantial additions nor deletions in the *Uthmanic* text, but that the enemies of 'Ali had changed the arrangement of verses and suppressed the commentary contained in his codex. In agreement with earlier Imam! theologians like Higham b. al-Hakam, Abu Sahl b. Nawbahar and his teacher Abu '1-Djafrar, he rejected the materialist Mu'tazili identification of man with the body, or part of it, and defined the essence of man as spirit and a simple substance (ghurar basî). In the religious law, al-Mufid repudiated the use of *idhtih* and analogy (kiyds) and criticised his older con-
temporary Abu ʿAlī Muhammad b. Ahmad b. al-Ḍunayd al-Iṣkafī, whom he met in Baghdād and from whom he related traditions, for advocating their employment. He was equally critical of the Imāmī traditionalist school of Kumm, which he accused of accepting often contradictory single (ṣaḥīḥ) traditions of the Imāms as a basis of the law. He held that single traditions were valid only if they could be supported by one of the sources of certain knowledge, reason, a Kurʿānic text, a widely transmitted (mawāṣit) tradition, or the consensus of the Muslims or of the Imāmīyya. Many of the traditions which he transmitted to his disciple al-Tūsī were incorporated by the latter in his K. Tadhīb al-akhbām, one of the canonical collections of Imāmī traditions. The first part of this book, written still in the lifetime of al-Mufīd, is a commentary on the former’s theological and legal compendium al-Risāla al-muknaʿa. On the question of the length of the month of Ramadan, which was disputed at the time, al-Mufīd at first followed his teacher Ibn Kūlūyā in holding that it always must number a full thirty days, a doctrine adopted in Fātimid Ismāʿīlī law. Later, he changed his position and supported the view that the length of Ramadān is determined by the sighting of the new moon, which became standard Imāmī doctrine. In his criticism of Ibn Bābūyā’s creed he also rejected his belief that all Imāms had been murdered by their opponents. 

Al-Mufīd died on 3 Ramadān 413/29 November 1032. The funeral worship was led by his pupil al-Ṣarīf al-Murtadā and was attended by a huge crowd. He was buried at first in his house and later in the Makārīn Kuraṭābī next to his teacher Ibn Kūlūyā and near the Imām Muhammad al-Dawād. Virtually all the leading Imāmī scholars of the following generation were his students: the Ṣarīf al-Tūsī, al-Nadajī, al-Karāḏiḏ, Sālār al-Daylāmi, Abu ʿl-Ṣalāḥ al-Halābī and others. Al-Mufīd’s influence on later Imāmī theology remained restricted, however, since the Ṣarīf al-Murtadā, followed by Ṣayykh al-Tūsī, adopted Basran Muṭaṣīlī doctrine in preference to his.


**MUFRAD (A.),** a technical term of Arabic grammar, which can have four ranges of meaning. In general, it means "singular", being synonymous with wahdān in opposition to muḥṭār "in the dual" and muḥṣmūn "in the plural". In morphology, it means "simple", as opposed to muṣākkab "compound" and designates a noun made up of a single element. In syntax, it means "in isolation", as opposed to muṭāfīd "in annexation" and designates a noun which is not followed by a determining complement. In lexicography, more often used in the plural muṭfaḍāt, it means "the words taken in isolation in the lexicon".

**Bibliography.** G. Troupeau, Lexique-Index du Kitāb de Sībawayhi, Paris 1976, 159. (G. TROUPEAU)

**MUFTĪ** [see FATWA.]

**MUGHALS,** an Indo-Muslim dynasty which ruled, latterly with decreasing effectiveness, 932-1274/1526-1858.

1. History
2. External relations
3. Administrative and social organisation
4. Economy and internal commerce
5. External commerce and European trade connections with Mughāl India
6. Religious life
7. Architecture
8. Carpets and textiles
9. Painting and the applied arts
10. Literature
11. Numismatics

1. History. This article, like the section on History in hind, iv, above, aims at being no more than a guide to the numerous articles on the history of the Mughal dynasty in India to be found elsewhere in the Encyclopaedia, and to relate these to a chronological framework.

The Mughals were given their first foothold in Indian territory in 801/1398 when Pīr Muhammad, governor of Kābul and a grandson of Timūr, attacked ʿUṯr and Mūltān, and established a governor in Dīpalpur; when this governor was attacked and killed, Timūr [q.v.] himself sacked Dīpalpur and Bhaṅṇī, marching through Pānpāt to Dīhilī, which was occupied, sacked and plundered, and many of its inhabitants massacred. When Timūr withdrew in 801/1399 the Dīhilī sultanate was left in anarchy and bankruptcy; Mūḥammad Tughḥūl returned to Dīhilī almost powerless, and in the Pandjab the Sayyid Khīḍr Khān [q.v.] ruled as governor owing allegiance to Timūr or his son Shāḥ Rukh [q.v.]. The Dīhilī sultanate later fell to Khīḍr Khān in 817/1414-4, and he and his house ruled until 855/1451, without however causing any further Mughal concern. For this period see TIMŪR; SHAH RUKH; KHĪÐR KHĀN; MĀHMŪD TUGHĪLUK; for Timūr’s ancestry, see TIMURIDS.

Bābur, b. 888/1483-4, was descended in the fifth generation from Timūr, and on his mother’s side from Činghiz Khān [q.v.]; heir to the small kingdom of Farghānā [q.v.], his early years were mostly spent in conflict with his cousins of the petty principalities of Afgānīstān and Transoxiana which were what remained of the Timūrid legacy, never conclusively successful against Sarakhsī, but eventually (910/1504) taking possession of Kābul [q.v.] and gaining suzerainty over Ḥāznān; possession of the strategically important Kandahār [q.v.] in 928/1522 strengthened his hand. He had already made minor forays into India; he was invited to intervene in the affairs of the Dīhilī sultanate (disputed between three members of Lāhawr), but soon showed that his action was more in his own interest than that of the Lōdīs when he defeated the combined Afghan armies at the first battle of Pānpāt [q.v.] in 932/1526. He moved on
to occupy Dihli and Agra [q.v.], then eastwards to Dihnpur [q.v.] and Gházípur, and brought about the important victory of Khánúr-ud-dín against the Rájápur army of Ráñá denny [q.v.] of Cítáwar in 933/1527; a later victory over Afghán in the east extended his dominions to the edge of Bengál. He was critical of Indian gardens, and brought the concept of the symmetrical Mughal garden to India. For this period see MÁ VARÁ AL-NÁHÍR; BÁBÚR (the article BÁBÚR 2. refers to Bábúr’s literary works, in Cátáháyt Türk); DÍHÍ SULTÁNAT; DÍHÍ; MÉHÁRÁK; RÁNÁ SÁNGA.

After Bábúr’s death in Agra in 936/1530 he was succeeded by his son Humáyún, who assigned Kábúl, Kandáhár and the west Pandjáb to Mírzá Kárámán [q.v.], whose ambitions caused Humáyún anxieties about the defence of his western front. Opposition from nobles of the old Lódi régime was suppressed, but the most able general among them, Shér Khán, the future Súrí ruler, continued active preparations against Humáyún, at one point entering the Mughal service in order to find out more about Mughal organisation. Humáyún’s brother-in-law Muhammád Zamáñ Mírzá [q.v.] allied himself to Bahádúr Sháh of Gujrárat, leading to war with that country; the pursuit of Bahádúr Sháh led Humáyún to the capture of both Mándú [q.v.] and Cámppánér [q.v.], and the first Mughal occupation of Gujrárat in 941/1534. But Humáyún was unable to prevent his rebellious and independent-minded Timúrdír confederates [for these see Mírzá] from causing him much trouble in Gujrárat, and Shér Khán, in attempting to establish Afghán rule in the east, had already occupied Bihár [q.v.] and was moving to take the capture of Gawf, the Bengál capital. Humáyún, pursuing, found that Shér had cut his line of communication, was defeated in two major battles, and forced into Sind, where he was taken over by Akbar and still persists as the Grand Trunk Road. Humáyún was at last able to reoccupy Kábúl, whence he marched to reconquer the successor to the Súrí régime, at Sirmínd in 962/1555, going on to recapture Dihlí; after six months he died from a fall from a height. In his entourage he had brought from Persia some painters from Sháh Táhsírsíp’s court, who were fundamental in bringing into being the Mughal school of painting [see 9. Painting and the applied arts, below, and TÁHSÍR]. For this period, see especially HUMÁYÚN; BÁHÁDÚR SÁH; GUJÁRÁT; DÍHÍ; MÉHÁRÁK; MÁLÁWÁ; MÁNÍ; MÉHÁRÁK; MÉHÁRÁK SÚR; SÓRS; DÍHÍ. For Humáyún’s tomb at Dihlí, see DÍHÍ (plan) and 7. Architecture, below.

The young Akbar, succeeding to the Mughal throne at the age of 14, was at first under the tutelage of the general Bayrám Khán [q.v.] and under the influence of the atga khágí, his former wet-nurses and foster-mothers, their husbands and children. Since Bayrám Khán was a Shíí, there were necessarily tensions in an otherwise nominally Sunní court. A rival, the orthodox Shíi Dírábí Múhámmád, had been banished to Sind and was recaptured at Dihlí himself. Humáyún, painging on behalf of the dispossessed Díhí sultans, was killed in the second battle of Pánípat [q.v.], and lost territories were recaptured under Akbar’s generals, after which Akbar was able to free himself from the influence of the “haram party”, and moved his court from Dihlí to Agra. The rebellion at Mándú [q.v.] was crushed by Akbar in person in 951/1556, and an attempt at Afghán independence in Bihár [q.v.] was put down in the same year. There were rebellions from an Uzbék faction at the Dihlí court, and of more consequence that of the Mírzáz [q.v.], who, having at first received small assignments in Kafár [q.v.]; see also KÓHLÍKÁNHÁN], moved at first to Afghan independence, in 952/1557, with interesting repercussions: religious toleration was preached in the Mughal court, largely the result of the influence of Akbar’s ministers Abú’l Fáqi and his brother Faydí [q.v.]; see also DIYÁN, PARS!], and the European influence became obvious in Mughal painting [see 9. Painting and the applied arts, below]; since the “toleration” appeared to exclude Islam, rebellions arose, suppressed by Akbar, who, in 990/1582 promulgated his syncretistic faith, the Din-i Iláhi [q.v.]; two years later he introduced an Iláhi era [see TARH], dates are important in the interpretation of Mughal coins, and extended beyond Akbar’s time. For hostile attitudes to Akbar’s innovations, see BADÁLÚNÍ, ʿABD AL-KÁDÍR, AND AHMÁD SIRÍNÍ. Kaštímír [q.v.] was annexed in 994/1586, Síndh, Káfíwár and Ufísí [q.v.] had submitted by 1001/1593, and the province of Bárár [see BÉRÁK], and the fortresses of Gáwílgáth, Nár láh, Amdánagar and Ásírágh [q.v.] had all fallen into Mughal hands by 1010/1601; Khándésh [q.v.] of which Ásírágh was the principal stronghold, thus became a Mughal sítá, and for a time bore the name Dándésh after Akbar’s youngest son Dáníyál. Akbar died in 1014/1605 and was buried in a large garden tomb at Síkándrá, near Ágrá [see 7. Architecture, below]. For Akbar’s time, see, in addition to the references above, ABAR; DÁNÍYÁL; MUHAMMÁD HÁKIM; MÍRZA ʿAṬÍZ KÓRA; MÁN SÍNH; MÉHÁRÁK AND RÁJÁSTÁN; ADMIÉR; ÁGRÁ; FÁTÍHÚR SÍRKÍ; LÁHÁWÁ; ROHTÁSÁGÁR. For Akbar’s revenue system, and its relation to that of Shér Khán, see DÁRÍBÁ; 6b; also FOŠÁR MALL, and references under MÍSÁHÁ; for Akbar’s reorganisation of the provinces, see under SÚRA; references to literature in Akbar’s time also in HINDÍ AND ʿABD AL-KÁHÍM, KÁHÁN AND KÁHÁNÁN; for Akbar’s coinage see 11. Numismatics, below. Large projects of historical writings and architectural innovations were initiated for the millennium (1000/1591-2); see 9. Painting and the applied arts, below.
Djahangir, after a short attempt at independence in his father's lifetime, succeeded Akbar on his death, although his rule was essentially defensive. His son Khurram, in order to punish the leaders of the rebels which followed, the Sikh [q.v.] leader Guru Arjun Singh was executed, an act which provoked the Sikhs into lasting enmity with the Mughal power. A Persian claim to Kandahar caused Djahangir to move for a time to Kabul; there was a renewed conflict with Mewar [q.v.], and operations, at first largely unsuccessful, were started against the Deccan, but a former Habsi [q.v.] slave Malik 'Anbar [q.v.], using guerrilla bands of Maratha soldiers, recovered Ahmadnagar, and further loss of territory in the Deccan followed. Not until 1039/1621 did the prince Khurram, the future Shāhdjahān, meet with some success there; but on the fall of Kandahar to Shāh 'Abbās of Persia in the following year, Khurram, ordered to retake it, went into open rebellion against his father; in the confusion Malik 'Anbar was able to retake the Bidar [q.v.] province. Djahangir was not an active patron of building like Akbar, but was however a connoisseur of painting (helped by Sir Thomas Roe, ambassador from Elizabeth I of England) [see 9. Painting and the applied arts, below, also MURAKKA].

Djahangir was not an active patron of building like Akbar, but was however a connoisseur of painting (helped by Sir Thomas Roe, ambassador from Elizabeth I of England) [see 9. Painting and the applied arts, below, also MURAKKA].

After this, the young prince Awrangzib was succeeded by his second son Mahall, his brother Shahriyar was also proclaimed; there had been rebellious uprisings in Bundelkhand [q.v. in Suppl.]. Asaf Khān [q.v.], his strongest and ablest supporter, was his father-in-law, for Shāhdjahān had married his daughter Mumtaz Lodi. Asaf Khān reached its zenith his memoirs (Tuzuk-i Djahangiri) reveal him as an enthusiastic traveller and a great lover of nature. He died in 1037/1627. For his period, see Djahangir. Nūr Dāhān; Asaf Khān; Agra; Lahawr, Māndū, Nārnaw; Būstān; Kāshmir; Shāhrnagar; in addition to section 9 on Painting below, see especially Mānshār and Mānṣūr. For the Mughal kitchen up to Shāhdjahān's time, see MATBAKH. 4.

Kandahar was recaptured in 1037/1627 as Shāhdjahān, after a war of succession (involving Dawar Bakhsh, the son of Khursaw, who was once proclaimed with kutha and sikka; his brother Shahrīyār was also proclaimed; there had been rebellious uprisings in Bundelkhand [q.v. in Suppl.]). Asāf Khān [q.v.], his strongest and ablest supporter, was his father-in-law, for Shāhdjahān had married his daughter Mumtaz Lodi. Asāf Khān reached its zenith his memoirs (Tuzuk-i Dāhān) reveal him as an enthusiastic traveller and a great lover of nature. He died in 1037/1627. For his period, see Dāhān. Nūr Dāhān; Asāf Khān; Agra; Lahawr, Māndū, Nārnaw; Būstān; Kāshmir; Shāhrnagar; in addition to section 9 on Painting below, see especially Mānshār and Mānṣūr. For the Mughal kitchen up to Shāhdjahān's time, see MATBAKH. 4.

After this, the young prince Awrangzib [q.v.], was appointed viceroy and commander-in-chief of the Mughal forces in the Deccan, and Shāhdjahān returned to the north to start building his new capital of Shāhdjahānābād [see DECCAN]. Northern campaigns against Kandahār and Balkh [q.v.] having largely failed, it was the Deccan which engaged Mughal attention [see DAKHAN], thanks largely to Awrangzib's generalship [see AWANGZIB and DAKHAN]. Shāhdjahān's sickness in 1067/1657 led to a quarrel for the throne between his four sons, in which Awrangzib was ultimately the victor [see DĀRĀ GHUROI, MURAD BAKHSH, DĀRĀ BAKHSH; for his place in the court, see DAKHAN]. He failed in his efforts to retain the Mughal authority in his dominions; the Radjāpūrs [see RADJĀPŪRS] were in rebellion in Dōjpur [q.v.], the Sikhs [q.v.] in the Pandjab, and the Marathas were consistently harrying the Mughals in the south. The last Sikh guru, Govind Singh, in fact a supporter of Bahādur Shāh, had died in 1120/1708; but followers of his produced a "sham guru", known as Banda, who declared a mission to rouse the Sikhs against the Mughal empire. In addition, Bahādur had provoked resentment among the Muslims by commanding the introduction of Shāh forms in worship. On his death in 1124/1712, the break-up of the Mughal power was intensied; Dāhānābād Shāh [q.v.]

Before Awrangzib's formal accession (1068/1658), with the regnal title of 'Alamgīr, the Deccan had been ravaged by the Marāthah adventurier Shivādī [q.v. see also MARATHAS]. He eventually surrendered to the Mughals in 1076/1666, though the final treaty gave him the right to taist, a quarter of the revenues of in, the ceded district; the Marathas, however, exacted this tribute from whatever region they later conquered [see also HAYDARABĀD, b.], so that when these districts later fell to the Mughals their resources had already been seriously depleted. When Awrangzib moved to Hasan Abdād [q.v.] for two years after 1062/1671, in order to quell risings by Yūsūfzay and Afrīdi Pathāns, Shivādī pursued his depredations in the Deccan undisturbed, and virtually created a nation out of the Marathas, who had formerly been the subjects of the Muslim sultanates of Ahmadnagar and Bijāpūr, and who were to become the Mughals' main challengers.

Awrangzib moved to the Deccan in 1093/1682 and spent the remaining 25 years of his life in almost perpetual warfare there, the 'Adil Shāh sultanate of Bijāpūr falling in 1097/1686 and the Koth Shāh sultanate of Bijāpūr in 1097/1686 and the 1118/1707, to be buried in the nūrād in the necropolis village of Khuldābād. For his period, see SHADJA-

HAN, AWARGZIB, DAKHAN, and entries under the regional Deccan sultanates; MARATHAS, SHIVADJI; references to his bigotry under DJIZYA, iii; for an important digest of Mughal history as coming by his orders, see AL-FATĀWĀ AL-ŠALAMGIRĪYĪA; for AWANGZIB's buildings, see HINDI, VII. Architecture; DHI. LĀHAWR, and 7. Architecture, below; for his (rather uninspired) coinage, see, 11. Numismatics, below.
was soon followed by Farrukhsiyar [q. v.], Rafi* al-
Daradjat and Rafic al-Dawla (= Shahjahan II)
[q. v.], who governed, all puppets in the hands of the
local kingmakers [see SAYYIDS of BAHRI], whose
regions were counted in months rather than years, until
the Sayyids produced Muhammad Shah (1131-
61/1719-48 [q. v.]). Through lack of confidence in the
monarchy, and even less in the Sayyids, provincial
governors were able to assume independence more or
less at will; thus Kamar al-Din Cm Kile Khan, enti-
tled Nizam al-Din [q. v.], eventually, by defeating his
deputy at the battle of Shakkarkhelâ [q. v.], made
himself independent in the Deccan with Haydarâbâd
as his headquarters, and all Dihlî could do was to con-
ciliate him by bestowing the title of Asaf Dijâ—since
borne by his descendants, the Nizâms [q. v.]
of Haydarâbâd. He supported the Marâthâs, the new
Pâlêwâ [q. v.], Badâr Râo, becoming governor of
Mâlwa whence he constantly harried the Mughals
by demands for fresh territory and tribute. A growing
power around Dihlî and Aigrâ was that of the Dijâs
[q. v. of Bharatpur [q. v.], with whom the Sayyids
made a separate treaty; the nav wi of Awadh [q. v.],
while nominally acknowledging Mughal authority,
became virtually independent from the time of Sa'dât
Khan, better known by his later title of Bûrân al-Mulk [q. v.], in 1134/1724, the mûsâmât with which he began his independent reign being the first of the nav wi of Awadh. His successor Mûsâ
Muktâm Abû 'l-Mansûr Khan, entitled Safdar Djang
[q. v.], wielded the real political power in the Mughal
empire. A former imperial officer 'Ali Muhammad
Khan was practically independent in Kafahr
[q. v.], by now more commonly called Rohilkhand [q. v.], where his followers were increased by numbers of Afghans
[q. v.], Kânrân Abû Muhammad CÎ Kilic Khan, entitled Dârshân Djang, ruled as 'Alam C Î Kilic
Khan, until he was defeated and killed by the
nav wîs of Awadh, Dihlî, and the trans-Indus territories to him in 1130/1728. Nàdîr Shâh was murdered in 1160/1747, but an
opportunistic commander Ahmad Khân took over the
royal possessions as Ahmad Shâh Durrânî [q. v.],
and behaved in much the same way: three invasions had
by 1165/1754 brought the Durrânî armies Lahawr,
the Pendjâb, and Mûltân; Dihlî was again ransacked
in 1170/1757. In 1174/1761 the Durrânîs, joined by
Mughal, Awadh and Rohilla troops, broke the
Marâthâ power in the north at the third battle of
Panipat [q. v.]. The sâba of Bengal, however, was less
disturbed than the centre under succession of strong
governors; see MUGHALS: ADELAWS, A MIRAI
AL-DAWLA, 'ALI WARDI KHAN, SRÂJ AL-DAWLA; MUR-
ÎSIDBÂD. The political strife, however, was at least
not reflected in the sphere of religion, thanks largely
to Shâh Wali Allah Dihlawi (1115-76/1703-62 [q. v.]).
Muhammad Shâh had died in 1161/1748 and had
been succeeded by his son Ahmad Shâh Bahâdur, who
was declared incapable, deposed, imprisoned and
blinded in 1167/1754; he was succeeded by 'Alamgir
II, assassinated in 1173/1759, Shâhjahan III,
deposed the following year, and Shâh 'Alam I, 1173-
1221/1179-1806 [q. v.], none of them with any
authority or power; a local ditty ran at Dihlî ut Pâlâm
bhâdshah Shâh 'Alam bhi; it was the ball village
outside Dihlî where Delhi airport now stands. The
real power belonged to Awadh, the Rohillas and the
Djâs. The Marâthâs were now again rising to power
under Sindhi [q. v.], and Shâh 'Alam came under British protection between 1765 and 1771. In 1788 a
Rohilla, Ghulâm Khân, had attacked Dihlî and
blinded the emperor, who came again under British
protection in 1803 when the Marâthâ army was
soundly beaten by the British general Lord Lake,
interestingly commemorated in the Mughal coinage
(see 11. Numismatics, below). But he, Akbar II
(1221-53/1806-37) and Bahâdur Shâh II [q. v.],
deposed in 1857 after the Mutiny, were no more than
titurial figures, for the Mughal empire had long ceased
to exist and the last emperor's authority did not
extend beyond the Red Fort in Dihlî. The 19th cen-
tury saw the rise of Urdu poetry, the emperor
Bahâdur Shâh himself writing verse under the
takhalla of Zafar; see also DARD, DHAWK, GHALÎS,
mUùMIN, and URDU. For Bahâdur Shâh's buildings,
of some merit, see 7. Architecture, below.

Bibliography: The bibliographies to the articles
referred to above should be consulted.

( J. BURTON-PAGE)

2. External Relations. Introductory. The
Mughal Empire, the Safawid monarchy and the long-
established Ottoman Empire were the three leading
Muslim powers of the 10th/16th and 11th/17th
centuries. The Uzbeks of Central Asia were another
power competing with the Safawids for the control of
Khurasan and Bâlkh, and the shahs of Persia
would seek allies among the other Muslim
states according to its current territorial interests.
Moreover, the Timûrî nostalgia for ancestral
homelands in Central Asia was also a psychological
factor of considerable pull which the freshly-uprooted
Bâbur, as well as the ambitious Shâh Dijâhân, found
difficult to resist, and this involved them in much
fruitless hostilities in Central Asia.

Bâbur and Humâyûn. Even though Zahir al-Dîn
Bâbur [q. v.] had been in active contact with Shâh
Ismâ'îl Safawî since after the historic battle of Marw
(Ramadân 916/December 1510), his relations with
Persia, as the sovereign of the Mughal empire, began
only after his assumption of that status at Dihlî in
Djumâda II-Radjab 932/April 1526. Two embassies
arrived from Shâh Tahmâsî I after that date, the
second to report on his great victory over the Uzbeks
in the battle of Djam (935/1528); and one was sent by
Bâbur to report on his almost meaningless throne, and returned
to Persia loaded down with treasure, including the Pâlâm and Pachchîs [q. v.]. Shâh 'Alam I, son of Zafar; see also DARD, DHAWK, GHALÎS,
mUùMIN, and URDU. For Bahâdur Shâh's buildings,
of some merit, see 7. Architecture, below.

Bibliography: The bibliographies to the articles
referred to above should be consulted.
sent his first mission to Persia when he was in flight from India after his two successive defeats (946/1539, 947/1540) at the hands of the Suri Afghans under Shah (regn. 947-52/1540-5). When, during the flight, he was in immediate danger of falling into the hands of his hostile brother Kâmrân Mîrzâ [q. v.], virtual ruler of Kâbul, the unfortunate Pâdshâh, on the advice of his faithful adviser and friend Bayram Kân [q. v.] sought and found refuge in Persia. The story of Humâyûn’s one-year stay there (practically the whole of 951/1544 including some three months’ stay with the Shah), and the accounts of the receptions, festivities and banquets held in Humâyûn’s honour, make interesting reading, but the details need not detain us here. Two things, however, stand out: that it was with the unexpectedly extensive military help of Tâhmasp that it was possible for Humâyûn to recover Kandhâr, which in turn became the stepping stone for the recovery of Kâbul and later of Dihlî, and two, Humâyûn’s fine sensibility in the matter of art and calligraphy (see Riazîzî Islâm, Calendar of documents of Indo-Persian relations, Calendar no. Tx. 326) could not fail to impress the Persians; and several outstanding Persian artists, including Mir Sayyid ‘Ali and Khâdja Abîl Alî-îl-Samad, joined Humâyûn’s service and eventually became instrumental in founding the Mughal school of painting at Dihlî (Riazîzî Islâm, Indo-Persian relations, 166; P. Brown, Indian painting under the Mughals, Cambridge, 1924, 54-56). After the seizure of Kandhâr from Kâmrân’s forces, Humâyûn handed over the fort to a Persian commander in accordance with his promise to Shâh Tâhmasp. But as he and his men were now without any shelter whatsoever, he reoccupied the fort and sent an explanation to the Shâh, who accepted the fait accompli with a good grace. In the remaining cheque decade of his life—right up to his restoration at Dihlî and eventual death—Humâyûn was able to maintain good relations and exchange friendly embassies with Tâhmasp.

Akbâr. During his long reign, the Emperor Akbâr had dealings with four Safawid monarchs, including the famous Shâhs Tâhmasp I and ‘Abbas I. Within a couple of years of Bâdshah Humâyûn’s death, Tâhmasp sent a force to occupy Kandhâr (965/1558). Akbâr was then in no position to do anything to save the fort, but its loss rankled in his heart. An embassy sent by the Shâh, evidently to mollify the young Mughal ruler, failed in its purpose. No return embassy was sent.

Ascending the throne a dozen years after the demise of his grandfather Shâh Tâhmasp, Shâh ‘Abbas I was in a desperately difficult position, with pressure from the Ottoman Turks in the West and with the Uzbeks in occupation of Khorasan. He sent a full-scale embassy to Akbâr (999/1591), principally for the purpose of seeking Mughal support against the Uzbeks. ‘Abd Allah Khân Uzbek’s occupation of Khorasan and Uzbek marauding activity in the Mughal frontier region, were no less worrying for Akbâr, who stayed for about fourteen years in the Pandjâb to keep a watch on the frontier. Placed thus, Akbâr had to conduct his foreign relations cautiously. Hence for a good while he discouraged ‘Abd Allah Khân Uzbek’s proposal for a joint Mughal-Uzbek invasion of Persia (985/1577), and when, later, he signified agreement (994/1586), he did so to keep the Khân humoured, fully knowing that the contingency of such a Mughal-Uzbek invasion was hardly ever likely to occur. Akbâr’s real interest was in the recovery of Kandhâr for which he awaited a suitable opportunity. Finding that they could not save it from the burgeoning Uzbek power and losing hope of support from the Shâh in distant Kâzîwân, the Persian governors of the fort gladly handed it over to Akbâr’s men and accepted his conditions. The ceremonies attended the cession of the fort to Akbâr, of which Shah did not particularly mind Mughal occupation of Kandhâr, for this bore far less ill for his power than an Uzbek occupation would. The Uzbeks were still strong in Khorasan, and the Shâh needed as good relations with Akbâr as possible. The embassy which he sent to the Mughal court in 1006/1598 was aimed at securing the Emperor’s blessings for his projected campaign for the recovery of Khorasan. The demise of the two Uzbek Khâns now paved the way for its recovery. With this accomplished, the Shâh’s position greatly improved at home and abroad. Thus when the next embassy from Akbâr led by the distinguished litigator Mir ‘Alî-îl-Samad, came in 9/1599, I made it wait for a long time before granting it the first audience and, when dismissing the envoy, sent no return embassy. Undoubtedly, this was intended to express his dissatisfaction over continued Mughal occupation of Kandhâr.

Djahângîr. The reign of Djahângîr opened with a carefully-planned Persian attack on Kandhâr under the leadership of the governor of Harât (1014/1606). The attack, which was launched in the hope of taking advantage of the situation arising from a change on the throne, was disowned by Shâh ‘Abbas I when it failed. The Shâh now changed his strategy. He professed brotherly love for Djahângîr (with whom he had been in correspondence even before the latter’s accession). In 1018/1609-10 the Shâh sent a major embassy to the Mughal court. This was the first of the many missions that he sent to the Emperor during the next dozen years—some full-scale embassies, some čâpar ones (small, fast-travelling missions), and some comprising simply a noted merchant on a normal trading trip to whom a royal missive was given for delivery to the Emperor. The purpose of these numerous missions was to allay all apprehensions on the score of Persian interest in Kandhâr and to build up a relation of confidence and trust with Djahângîr. The Shâh played the long diplomatic game with great finesse, achieving in the end complete success. Djahângîr’s pride in his brotherly relationship with the Shâh was considerable, and he sent him the most magnificent of all embassies ever sent by the Mughals. It was accompanied by more than a thousand servants and was led by a distinguished noble, Khân ‘Alâm by title, whom Djahângîr used to address as brother. Iskandar Beg Mughî records that no embassy like it had ever come to the Safawid court. It received a magnificent reception, and the Shâh treated the ambassador on terms of personal friendship. The upshot of the whole diplomatic exercise was that Djahângîr came to place so much trust in the Shâh’s personal friendship that when the latter led an expedition to Kandhâr, there were only 300 troops in this strategically vital fortress. Djahângîr’s attempt to form a Sunnî alliance with the Uzbeks and his plans
to send an expedition under Prince Shah Djahān for the recovery of the fort, all came to nothing. Shah Djahān, Combining ability, ambition and vigour, Shah Djahān was well-equipped to follow an active and assertive foreign policy. His accession to the Mughal throne was followed within one year by the death of the great Shah ʿAbbās I, whom Shah Djahān as prince used to address as uncle. Shah Djahān had “three main objectives in foreign policy each of which was related to Persia directly or indirectly. He wanted to recover Qandahar, to enlarge the power of his house in his ancestral land in Turān, and to assert his suzerainty over the Deccan kingdoms and destroy their alliance with Persia. It was naturally his aim to preserve friendship with Turān when striking at Qandahar and to keep Persia neutral when invading Turān.” *(Indo-Persian relations, 99)* So he proceeded energetically to establish relations with both sides. A major embassy was sent to the Safawid court, now presided over by the inept Shah ʿSafī I, ʿAbbās I’s grandson, who had been brought up in the andarun. A return embassy also arrived from Persia. But Shah Djahān also started secret negotiations with the Persian commander of Kandahār, ʿAli Mardān Khān. This distinguished Persian noble was in mortal danger, for Shah ʿSafī had summoned him to the court, and he had interpreted this as a threat to his life. Shah Djahān sent his commanders to take over Kandāhār, (“ʿAli Mardān was given a very high position in Mughal service.” The Emperor now sent several missions to the Safawid court in order to mollify Shah ʿSafī and, later, his son and minor successor Shah ʿAbbās II, with the purpose of winning Persian neutrality, if not friendship, in his next ambitious venture, sc. the conquest of Turān; but the Persians remained sullen and cold towards these approaches.

Meanwhile, Shah Djahān had launched his over-ambitious plan of the conquest of Turān. The motives for this were sentimental rather than realistic. Though successful at the outset, the plan inevitably failed, and the Mughals had to beat a costly retreat after only fifteen months’ occupation of Balkh. The Mughal retreat from Balkh paved the way for a Persian advance on Kandahār.

Shah ʿAbbās II sent Shah Djahān a politely worded request for the restoration of Kandahār. But he issued the letter from Khūrāsān when he was already on his way to invest the fort. The energetic young Shah, ignoring the rigours of winter, captured the fort after three months’ occupation of Balkh. The Mughal expeditions sent one after the other for the recovery of the fort failed in their purpose. The point worth noting is that seizure of Kandahār by one party at an opportune moment, and acquiescence in the accomplished fact by the other, had been the norm of Mughal-Safawid relations till the time that Shah Djahān introduced the element of war into them.

Awrangzīb, Awrangzib, who ascended the throne after only fifteen months’ occupation of Balkh. The Mughal expeditions sent one after the other for the recovery of the fort failed in their purpose. The point worth noting is that seizure of Kandahār by one party at an opportune moment, and acquiescence in the accomplished fact by the other, had been the norm of Mughal-Safawid relations till the time that Shah Djahān introduced the element of war into them. The Emperor, who now ordered arrangements for its regular supply to the capital Iṣfahān. The ambassador was dismissed with many presents.

A return embassy sent by the Emperor was well-received at Iṣfahān at the outset, but later faced much rebuff an insult at the hands of the Shah. The ambassador, Tarbiyat Khān, was curtly dismissed and handed an insulting letter addressed to Awrangzīb. The Shah even threatened to invade India and indeed marched out of the capital, but died in Khūrāsān. The change in the Shah’s attitude is not easy to explain. It could be attributed to a faux pas on the part of Tarbiyat Khān, or to a sudden change in the mood of the strong-tempered Shah, who was given to much drinking, or to a relapse into sectarian fanaticism on his part. In any case it was a most unfortunate occurrence from the point of view of Mughal-Safawid relations, for these were not resumed out of his lifetime.

The post-Awrangzīb period. Mughal-Safawid relations in the post-Awrangzīb period were “spasmotic and inconsequential”. It is interesting to note that, once again, it was the question of Kandahār which brought some animation into these relations which had been dormant since 1077/1666. In 1121/1709 Mir Wārs, the Ghilzay Afghan chief of Kandahār, threw off the Safawid yoke, declared for Persia, and was in no position to resist an Mughal attack. Shah Sultan Husayn sent a major Persian embassy to Kandahār, which had far-reaching consequences.
behind the Mughal and the Safavid passion for the fortress seem to have been prestige and strategy; the appearance of the Portuguese naval power in the same region. Towards the end of this phase, the Turkish Admiral, Sidi 'Ali Reis, was detailed by the Sultan to help the Muslim kingdom of Gogurāt against the Portuguese. Suffering defeat at the hands of the latter, he decided to find his way back home by the land route and thus reached Dihli, where he was accorded a grand reception by the Emperor Humāyūn. The Emperor's accidental death occurred during the Admiral's stay in Dihli. The royal letter which he carried on his way back was, in our view, prepared when Humāyūn was alive (as evidenced by the reference to "re-establishment on the throne"); but was issued in Akbar's name. This letter, addressed to Sultan Suleymān, does not appear to have evoked any response. Akbar's long reign remained barren in regard to relations with the Ottomans, who are indeed reported to have been suspicious of the great Mughal's role in matters affecting Ottoman regional interests in the East.

Djahāṅgīr was so taken up with his friendship with Shāh 'Abbās I that he gave no thought to cultivating contacts with the Ottomans. He paid little attention to an Ottoman embassy that arrived at his court in the early years of his reign on account of its uncertain status. Shāh Djahāṅgīr, who pursued a vigorous foreign policy, was the first Mughal Emperor to send a fully-fledged embassy to the Ottoman court. He was motivated by a desire to build up a Sunni front against a hostile Safavid Persia, but his letter was couched in a mood of self-exaltation. A nāma-yi humāyūn (royal letter) brought by the Ottoman envoy, Arslān Agha, caused much annoyance to the Emperor because of its lack of a proper address. Subsequent correspondence failed to dispel the diplomatic vacuum that had risen between Dihlī and Isfahan,倒是 while the diplomatic vacuum was filled by contacts and negotiations between Dihlī and Isfahan were at a standstill and distance and the length of time taken in the exchange of embassies robbed these relations of any substance. Proposals made from time to time of alliance against Persia were merely chimerical. The great Mughal Emperors kept a vigilant eye on all areas which were of interest to the Empire. Thus Akbar kept in touch with Kāshghar and was eager to occupy an intermediate position between China and Persia, and about that in Europe. He further maintained regular diplomatic contacts with the Sharīfs of Mecca (Calendar of documents, no. Ott. 381.1). The same could be said, with varying emphasis, of other Emperors down to Awarangzīb. The Mughal Emperors also maintained contact with men of learning in Persia. Thus Akbar received regular reports about them from highly-placed agents assigned for this purpose (Calendar of documents, nos. A.21, A.24, A.32, A.33).

and the intelligence service. He had his own subordinates (bakhshis) in the sābās. The sābā al-judur was in charge of appointments as judicial officers and charity grants, again with subordinates called sābā posted in each sāba.

Akbar divided the Empire into sābās, each having a governor (sipahsāhī, sīhāb-i sāba, nāzim) appointed by the Emperor. The governor’s powers were greatly restricted by other officers, the diwan, the bakhshī and the sābā, who were directly subordinate only to the respective ministers at the centre. Each sāba was divided into sābārs, maintained largely for territorial identification. Faujdārs maintained law and order over areas which did not necessarily coincide with sābārs. Each sābara was divided among parganas, each having a Muslim judge (kādī) and two semi-hereditary officials called kānīngā and chaudhāri, who were concerned with tax-collection.

None of the higher offices ever became hereditary before the 12th/18th century and had, in actual practice, only short incumbencies. These were filled by persons who were awarded mansābs or numerical ranks. Each mansāb was marked by dual numbers. e.g. 5,000 tāh, 3,000 suwar (now conventionally represented as 5,000/3,000) [see MANSĀB and MAN: see the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Transactions of Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 63, 1966; Riazul Islam, Indo-Persian relations, 1970, 238-69.

(i) For a detailed bibl. of primary (ms. and published) and secondary sources on the subject, see Riazul Islam, Indo-Persian relations, Tehran 1970, 238-69.


N.B. (i) For a detailed bibl. of primary (ms. and published) and secondary sources on the subject, see Riazul Islam, Indo-Persian relations, Tehran 1970, 238-69.


(iii) For an inconsequential attempt on the part of Shīr Shāh Sūrī to open up diplomatic relations with Persia and Turkey, see Indo-Persian relations; Appen- dix F, which is based on S.A. Rashid and R.P. Tripathi, Tawārid-i-dawat-e-Shīr Shāhī, by Hasān ʿAlī Khaṇ, in Medieval India Quarterly (Aligarh, July 1950).

RIAZUL ISLAM

3. Administrative and social organisation.

Its centralised administration, organised on systematic lines, was a notable feature of the Mughal Empire. Very largely it was a creation of Akbar (963-1014/1556-1605). At the centre, the Emperor appointed ministers such as the wakil, whose office after Bayram Khaṇ (d. 967/1656) became largely titular and was often unoccupied. The diwan-i aḥār or head of the revenue and finance department came to be the most important minister. He controlled revenues realised in the Emperor’s personal domain (khāliṣa), determined the assessment figures (dāma3) on whose basis dāğiīr [q.v.] was assigned, and was in charge of payment of all expenditure, including cash salaries. He issued instructions to his subordinates, called advocates in the provinces (sābārs).

The mir bakhshī was in charge of grants of mansāb [q.v.] (salary-determining ranks), upkeep of the army
but, as a rule, the Emperor normally nominated a scion of the ruling house. Nobles who were not zamin-dārs did not normally hold any place as watan. As a concession to these mansabdārs, Dājangārīhānīr instituted allūn-tamgha dājīrōn to be held permanently. But these dājīrs were confined to small localities and could not compare with the great watanams or ancestral dominions of the Rādjpūt chiefs.

Regarding fiscal rights of the dājīrōrās, the assignment orders described in practically set terms the rights which the Emperor granted to the dājīrs. The dājīrōrās were entitled to collect authorised revenue (māl-i wadāghī) and all claims of the state (hukkā-i ditwān). No other right except that of collecting the land revenue and authorised taxes was delegated to the dājīrōrās, and he was expected to exercise this right, too, in conformity with imperial regulations. Simple statements requiring the dājīrōrās to take not more than half of the produce occurred in the revenue records and other literature of Awrangzāb's reign.

The dājīrōrās had to employ his own agents to collect the revenue and taxes within his dājīrōs. His chief agent (gumāshā) was the tämīl, also known as dhikrār; he would be assisted by an amīn (revenue assessor), a fiṣṭādar (treasurer), and a kārkān (accountant). Sometimes, under smaller dājīrōrās, the duties of the amīn and the fiṣṭādar (or also kārkān) were also encharged to the tämīl. Often these persons had to deposit securities (kahb) with the dājīrōrās, while they drew their remuneration from the revenues they collected. A practice which appealed especially to the smaller dājīrōrās was that of idār or revenue farming. It became very common during the reign of Shāh Dājahān and was held to be one of the causes for the ruin of the peasantry.

The main function of the dājīrōs was to maintain law and order. In discharging this duty they were able to put their wishes into effect without any check from the Emperor and administration. The dājīrōrās did not possess within his dājīr an absolute power over its inhabitants. On the contrary, his authority was checked by an almost parallel system of administration under the direct control of the ruler and his ministers. In the field of revenue collection, the ruler's interests were represented in every parganā by two officials known as kānīngā and chāhadhār (deshmukh in the Deccan). These offices were hereditary. The fanaqūrās (q.v.) or military commandants appointed by the Emperor had the task of maintaining law and order. In discharging this duty they could also operate within the dājīrō. The dājīrōrād had no judicial powers, a matter of kādā appointed under an imperial farman heard and settled criminal cases. Finally, there were the news reporters who sent their reports on the conduct of the dājīrōrās and their agents.

The dājīr system in its standard form worked with tolerable efficiency down to the middle of Awrangzāb's reign (1669-1188/1659-1707). But towards the close of that reign, owing to the increasing strain of the Deccan wars on the financial resources of the Emperor and the dilapidation and the administration owing to the Emperor's absence from Northern India, the complicated machinery under which dājīrs were assigned began to weaken. The crisis which shook the dājīr system appeared in the garb of what a contemporary writer called bi-dājīrī (absence of dājīrīs). More commanders and officers had to be accommodated on the imperial payroll than could be found dājīrs. Inevitably, influence and money began to count more and more in all dājīr assignments.

A struggle for dājīrīs thus developed among the mansabdārs. It had not become an armed struggle during the reign of Awrangzāb, when it was fought out in the form of factional rivalries. Anand Rām Muḥās suggests that during the reign of Farrukh Siyar (1120-30/1713-19 [q.v.]) dājīr assignment by the court became a matter of mere paper orders, so that a large number of persons who were granted mansabs never got dājīrīs. Once this happened, all was over not only with the dājīrī system but with the Mughal Empire as a whole.

The Mughal nobility was theoretically the creation of the Emperor. It was he alone who could confer, increase, diminish or resume the mansab of any of his subjects. It would be wrong, however, to suppose that the Mughal nobility was open to all who could fulfill certain criteria of merit and competence to the satisfaction of the Emperor. The mansabdārs were not only public servants but also the richest class in the Empire and a closed aristocracy; entrance into this class was not easily available to ordinary subjects, and there was not even a method of promotion, usually by birth. As a result the mansab was a hereditary position which was taken into account when nobles were appointed was heredity. The khanasārīs, or sons and descendants of mansabdārs, had the best claim of all. But sons did not normally succeed to the full mansab of their fathers. As a result, a large portion of recruits always consisted of persons who did not belong to families of those already holding mansabā. Such persons came from a variety of classes. A number of them were zamindārs or chiefs within the Empire. The inclusion of zamindārs among the officers of the state was no innovation of the Mughals, but it is true that Akbar gave it very great importance by granting mansabs to a large number of zamindārs, pre-eminently the Rādjpūt chiefs. Their ancestral domains were left to them, being treated as their watan-dājīrīs, but as government servants, to which dājīrīs were assigned to them in all parts of the Empire.

There were nobles and high officers of other states who were given a place in the Mughal nobility on account of their experience, status and influence or of the contingents which they commanded and the territories which they controlled. For the Persian and Uzbek nobility, India had traditionally been an El Dorado where fortunes could be rapidly made. In the Deccan, military necessity required that the large number of nobles and officers of the independent states, both in times of peace and war, be won over to the Mughal side. They had to be granted mansabs high enough to induce them to betray their own states. Almost all the Deccani mansabdārs, e.g. Bījāpurīs, Haydārabādīs or Marāfshāhs, belonged to this category. A small portion of the Mughal nobility was recruited from those who had no claims to high birth but were pure administrators or accountants. Such were the members of the castes of Kharīts, Kāyasths, Nāgar Brahmans, etc. Finally, mansabs were also awarded to scholars, religious divines, men of letters, etc. Abu 'l-Fadl in the time of Akbar and Sa'd Allāh Khān and Dānjīmn Khān during the reign of Shāh Dājahān owed their high ranks to their talents as men of letters. A few theologians and religious scholars were also awarded mansabs.

These various elements were incorporated into the Mughal service largely as a result of historical cir-
curnstances, but partly also as a result of planned imperial policy. Akbar's policy seems to have been to integrate all these elements into a single imperial service. He often assigned officers belonging to various groups to serve under one superior officer. At the same time, the distinct or separate character of each group was respected. Akbar's policy of sulh-i kuli, universal peace, was at least partly motivated by a desire to employ elements of diverse religious beliefs—Sumnis, Shi'is and Hindus—and to prevent sectarian differences among them from interfering with their loyalty to the throne.

From a close scrutiny of the sources, it is clear that a marked expansion of the nobility did not take place till Awrangzib embarked on the policy of annexing the entire Deccan. As a result of fresh recruitment made during this period, the internal composition of the nobility changed in some material respects. Abu 'l-Fadl Ma'nurri summed up the changes by saying that the khānāzīds, i.e. nobles belonging to families previously connected with imperial service, were the chief losers. There may be some element of exaggeration in his statement, but our evidence largely bears him out. Recruitment from aristocratic families of central Asia and Persia still continued, but on a much smaller scale. There was very little opportunity of entry left for the non-aristocratic educated classes. The Mughals have always preferred scholars like Bakhšāwar Khān and Ināyat Allāh Khān, but their number was limited. There was, however, room for adventurers, who first organised their troops and established themselves as chiefs or rulers in areas outside the control of the Empire and then sought to enter imperial service. Many Marāfah chiefs offer an excellent illustration of this curious procedure.

Mughal India had a currency system based on the silver rupee (178 grains); but the system was formally trimetallc, with gold and copper coins circulating at rates based on their metal values. The Mughals succeeded in issuing a coinage of great purity and uniformity from numerous mints throughout their empire. See further on Mughal coinage, 9 below, Numismatics.

The imperial structure existed a more stable class, that of zāmīndārs. Mukhīs (ca. 1750) defined a zāmīndār as "literally meaning master of the land (jāthī-ī zāmin) but now (actually) the mālik (proprietor) of the land of a village or township, who also carried on cultivation". With such superior "land-owners" at one extreme, the zāmīndār also comprised the various tributary chiefs and autonomous Rādjās, who were also called zāmīndārs by the Mughal chancery. It is a remarkable fact that general revenue regulations issued in the period from Akbar and Awrangzib exclude the zāmīndārs from the framework of the standard revenue machinery. On the other hand, there is considerable evidence that the zāmīndārs paid the revenue on behalf of whole villages. A possible explanation seems to be that every locality had some land under zāmīndārs, who from the point of view of the revenue authorities were often simple revenue-payers or ādam.

Summary assessment of land revenue and collection through zāmīndārs must in general have considerably simplified the task of the dīgārdārs and their agents. Yet it was also from the zāmīndārs that they met with the greatest opposition. A heavy assessment would deprive the zāmīndārs of their income and, in that case, they might use their armed retainers, backed by the support of the peasants, to defy the dīgārdārs. For such defiance, a zāmīndār might forfeit his zāmīndārī rights. But a zāmīndār could not be disposed or appointed by any one except by the Emperor.

The reign of Awrangzib saw a great increase in the pressure of the administration of the dīgārdārs upon the zāmīndārs as a class. Manucci declared that "usually the viceroys and governors [of the Mughal Empire] are in a constant state of quarrel with the Hindu princes and zāmīndārs—with some because they wish to seize their lands; with others to force them to pay more revenue than is customary." There was usually "some rebellion of the Rādjās and zāmīndārs going on in the Mogul Kingdom".

The peasants were largely comprised by the names ra'sā, ra'syyat (hence the Anglo-Indian "ryot"). That the peasants were a greatly differentiated class is suggested by the distinction made between mukaddams (headmen), kalantran (higher-level men), etc., on the one hand, and the reṣā'īd (small peasants), on the other. A formādār of Awrangzib makes a separate category for peasants who were so indigent as to depend wholly on credit for their seed, cattle and subsistence. Whether the peasants had ownership rights on the land may be doubted; but since land was not scarce, the authorities were more interested in keeping the peasants tied to the land which they had been cultivating rather than in stressing their claim to evict them. There was, in fact, a considerable migration of population among the peasants, often called pākāblī, peasants tilling land away from their home villages.

The village was the unit around which peasant society revolved. It was also the real unit of assessment of the state's revenue demand, which was then distributed among villagers by the headmen and the village accountant (paykar). It had thus a financial pool, from which apart from taxpayments, minor common expenses (khaqānī-i dīb) were also met. This seems to have formed the basic factor behind the formation of the celebrated, but often elusive, Indian village community. The village had its own servants, whose status and functions have been studied by Fukazawa in an important paper based on documents from 18th century Maharashtra.

Commercial relations have greatly penetrated the village economy, since the peasant needed to sell his crop in order to pay his tax. He had little left, however, with which to buy urban products. Even so, commerce must have intensified the differentiation which uneven possession of agricultural and pastoral goods (seed, plough, cattle) must already have created. There was, however, a simultaneous tendency towards peasant pauperisation generated by the regressive land tax. The peasants were divided among castes. Even the administration recognised caste hierarchy by varying the revenue rates according to peasant castes, as the documents from Rajasthan especially show. The menial and "untouchable" castes were generally excluded from the land and formed the bulk of agricultural labourers.

By and large, the artisans were in the same position as the peasants: they were technically "free", but hemmed around by many constraints. Though some of them were bound to render customary services as village servants, most of the artisans could sell their wares in the market. Need for advances, however, often forced them to deal only with merchants, brokers or other middlemen. A very small number worked in the workshops (kāhānas) of nobles and merchants.

Merchants formed a numerous and fairly well-protected class in the Mughal Empire. It was also
quite divergent. There were, on the one hand, the large bands of bandjards, or transporters of goods, moving with load-carrying bullock-owners over many distances; on the other, there were specialised bankers (sarrāfs), brokers (dallāls) and insurers. Some of them, at the ports, also owned and operated ships.

The theory has been put forward (e.g. by van Leur, Steensgaard) that the merchants in Asian and Indian commerce (sea-borne as well as inland) were essentially "pedlars", so that the intrusion of the Dutch and English East India Companies introduced radically superior commercial techniques for controlled response to price-variations in different markets. There is, however, little justification for this thesis. There were small men in Indian commerce undoubtedly, men like the small jewel merchant Banarsidas, who has left his memoirs. But then there were also large merchants (sahs) who had numerous agents (baparis, banjaras) at different places. One of such large merchants, Virji Vora of Surat, often financed the English East India Company. He had agents not only in all important towns in India but also in several ports abroad. A fairly efficient system of bills (hundis) and insurance (bina) were great aids to the smooth functioning of commerce.

An interesting debate has been going on for quite some time as to whether the Mughal Empire had a middle class and so contained potentialities to develop into a capitalist economy. Reisner, W.C. Smith and Iqtidar Alam Khan have argued that this was so. Karen Leonard has recently tried to apply the "Great Firm" theory to explain the decline of the Mughal Empire. Essentially, proponents of the theory point to the development of commerce, banking and large professional classes. Opponents of the thesis, including Irfan Habib, who has argued that the Mughal urban economy and commerce rested heavily on the system of land-tax extraction and was incapable of independent development into capitalism. The debate continues.


followed a little later. Sericulture had been practised in Bengal earlier, but now it underwent considerable expansion as Bengal silk appeared on the world market. Indigo had a similarly prosperous phase, though owing to competition from chemical substitutes, the plant is no longer grown commercially.

Horticulture was widely pursued, new grafting techniques leading to improved varieties of oranges and mangoes. Pineapples were introduced by the Portuguese.

The village community. Agriculture was largely a peasant enterprise, certain castes being exclusively peasant ones. But artisans and rural labourers also undertook petty cultivation as supplementary occupations. The caste system, by excluding the "untouchables" from the ranks of land-holders proper, provided a large reserve of labour for agricultural operations in return for artificially-depressed wages. The dominant peasants, appearing in the shape of headmen or "councillors" (pans), often disposed of the waste lands, collected taxes on behalf of the state and operated a village fund. Some of the headmen could become rich enough to move into the class of zamindars.

(c) Industry

Minerals. Mughal India produced considerable quantities of good iron, though copper production in Rādjasīhān seems to have been on the decline. As for precious stones, the South Indian diamond mines (in Golkondā and Bīdīpūr) were celebrated throughout the world. Salt was mined in the Salt Range of Western Pāndījāb. Gold, silver and tin mines were no longer worked, and these metals had to be imported.

Crafts. Textile production was perhaps the largest sector, in terms of employment, after agriculture. A large variety of cotton cloth, muslin, calico, long cloth, chintz, etc., was produced and found markets the world over. Gūdjarāt specialised in the interweaving of cotton, silk, and silver and gold wire, and was the home of the ingenious patola device (warp and weft pre-dyed). India also produced good steel, leather, and lacquerware. With the introduction of artillery guns and rockets, a market for substitutes, the plant is no longer grown commercially.

Production organisation. The rural artisan was often tied to his village by the hereditary allotment of land for subsistence in lieu of which and of some petty shares in the villagers' crop, he had to render certain customary services to the villagers. Thus villages had their own hereditary carpenters and blacksmiths, barbers, leather workers, etc. But there were a large number of independent artisans who worked on orders of individuals or put their products directly on the market. Once they came into contact with merchants, they began to receive from them advances to cover costs of raw materials in return for their pledging to meet their orders on time and at predetermined prices. This led to a kind of putting-out system where the material for work being expensive, the merchant provided it himself (e.g. silk). Finally, the artisan became a wage-worker in the workshops (kārkhanās) of merchants and nobles, where he worked for wages, provided by the master with the material to be worked on (gold, jewellery, silk, etc.). The typical Indian artisan, however, seems to have worked at home, often heavily burdened with advances from the merchant-usurers.

(c) The fiscal system

The taxation system was a very important component of the economy, since it was the large land-tax, generating "induced trade" in the countryside, and the expenditure of the tax-money, from the establishments of the Emperor and the nobility, which maintained directly or indirectly a very large part of the urban population. Though the rate of the land-tax, as portion of actual produce, varied according to crop, kind of land, category of revenue-payer and locality, the tax nevertheless comprised such a large part of the surplus that it could be legitimately confused with rent. This was not only what François Bernier thought, holding the King to be the proprietor of the soil, but the Indian pārārī (Kādī, Muḥammad A’lā) also held this too, deeming the land-tax to be adīrā (rent) and not kharādj. In the 11th/16th century documents, half the produce is held to be a fair amount of tax [see further, Pārība, 6 (b) and (c); Kharādj, IV].

The state also levied taxes on crafts, goods in transit, exports and imports, all grouped under the term sādār. It is difficult to estimate the full magnitude of such taxes, the burden of which, of course, fell on the consumer. These do not seem, however, to have been excessively heavy. The custom duties, for example, did not exceed 5% ad valorem.

A feature of the Mughal system was the combination of tax-collection with salary payment; taxation rights in particular areas (dīgārī) were assigned to nobles (dīgīdārs) who could collect the amounts due to them by this means, it being so arranged that the dīrāmī (or estimated net revenue) of the area placed in their dīgārī was equal to their pay-claim (jalab). This necessitated constant transfer of these assignments, as the nobles were posted to other places, or an increase or decrease in their pay required alteration in the size of their dīgārī [see further, Gardān and section 3 above].

The pattern of expenditure of the tax-resources contributed much to the shaping of the urban economy. A very large part of the tax-income passed into the hands of the high nobility: the top 25 princes and nobles in 1595 obtained over 30% of the estimated tax-income. They maintained an exceptionally large "service" sector (kāraṃ, attendants, musicians, dancers, etc.), and spent heavily on luxuries (jewellery, fine clothes, gold and silver articles, animals, etc.), thus creating on the one hand, a mass of unproductive servant population and, on the other, giving employment to craftsmen and professionals, concerned with luxury articles and court culture only.

A very large part of the tax-income, about half, went into maintaining the army, which meant an enormous expenditure on horses (largely imported) and their maintenance; here again the mode of life of a cavalry trooper supported a large service sector.

Towns grew to provide subsistence goods as well as craft-goods to this tax-generated market. Since productivity was so low, L. Habib has argued that a very large urban population became necessary to provide for the needs of the population directly maintained by tax-expenditure. Foreign travellers of the period certainly found many Indian towns to be very large, Agra [g.v.] in the 11th/17th century well exceeding half-a-million in population.

Only a small part of the tax collected in the villages seems to have been spent in the countryside. This was almost certainly the case with what the zamindars collected. These hereditary right-holders obtained a part of the revenue collected (10% in most parts of Northern India) for their assistance in collecting the revenue, and also had rights to levy their own Imposts, which brought them an income, officially computed as equal to 10% of the land tax in Northern
India and 25% in Gudjarat. They also had further fiscal claims of a lesser magnitude as local hereditary officials (chowdhuris, desais, drakhunique etc.). The zamindars thus provided a semi-aristocratic rural market for certain crafts; but how far they depended on towns is not entirely clear.

(d) Internal commerce

Monetary system. Taking over from Sher Shah Lodī (947-52/1540-43), the Mughals maintained a trimetallic system of great uniformity and purity. The silver rupee gradually replaced the copper tanka as the major money unit for larger transactions, and in the 11th/17th century, there was a great contraction in Mughal copper coinage. The gold mohur [q.v.] remained in use mainly for hoarding purposes. The influx of silver into India in the 10th/16th century did not cause a large rise in prices owing to the absorption of silver-money as substitute for copper; but in the next century a moderate inflation seems to have taken place [see further, below, section 11].

Credit. The use of bills (handis) in the Mughal Empire was so extensive that bill-money must be deemed to have substantially supplemented coined money in the major markets. The handis could also be insured. The jarafs or bankers, who specialised in discounting bills, also accepted deposits, so that a rudimentary system of deposit-banking existed, with even credit-money being created by allowing payments through bankers on bankers' books. The interest rates were higher in India than in Western Europe, and lower in Gudjarat and Northern India than in Bengal and the Deccan. But they distinctly fell about the middle of the 11th/17th century, varying in commercial transactions in Gudjarat between 0.5 and 0.75% a month. Annual interest rates were not quoted.

Commercial organisation. It has become common to assume, after van Leur and Steensgaard, that the basic unit of Indian and Asian commerce was "the pedlar", or the merchant with small capital, who made the volume of trade large in the aggregate only because his class was so numerous. There have been doubts raised on this (T. Raychaudhuri, I. Habib), since merchants (sabins) of large capital, with numerous factors (byuparies, gusmahus) are so frequently encountered. "Avog", a kind of bottomry or respondentia arrangement, also enabled the use of large capital resources by shippers and other merchants. Brokers were a universal element in Indian commercial organisation (South India being an exception); they provided supplies as well as credit, in which case they sometimes acted as bankers. All merchants normally dealt through brokers, for convenience and possibly as a kind of protection against fraud. Insurance (bima) itself was fairly well developed. Bills could be insured against non-payment, and merchandise against loss. The adarjus even insured merchandise against transit taxes, for payment of which they made themselves responsible. "Avog" arrangements appear to have led to a species of marine insurance, which even the English East India Company [see below, section 5] freely made use of.

Bibliography: For general studies of the economy of Mughal India, see T. Raychaudhuri and Irfan Habib (eds.), The Cambridge economic history of India, I. Cambridge 1982; W. H. Moreland, India at the death of Akbar, London 1920; idem, From Akbar to Aurangzeb, London 1923; R. K. Mukherjee, Economic history of India, 1600-1800, 2nd. ed., Allahabad 1967; and S. Moosvi, The economy of the Mughal Empire, c. 1595, a statistical study, Delhi 1987. For detailed economic matters, see Irfan Habib, Atlas of the Mughal Empire, Delhi 1982. The conditions of agriculture and agrarian conditions are described in the same author's Agrarian system of Mughal India, 1556-1707, Bombay 1963, which also revises and corrects Moreland's pioneer study The agrarian system of Moslem India, Cambridge 1929, on many points. See also S. Nurul Hasan, Thoughts on agrarian relations in Mughal India, Bombay 1973, and Noman Ahmad Siddiqi, Land revenue administration under the Mughals (1700-1750), Bombay 1970. S. P. Gupta offers a detailed scrutiny of agrarian relations in a restricted region in his The agrarian system of Eastern Rajputan (c. 1650-c. 1750), Delhi 1986. The economic role of the nobility is touched upon in M. Athar Ali, The Mughal nobility under Aurangzeb, Bombay 1966. On industrial and commercial organisation, see Habib, Potentialities of capitalist development in the economy of Mughal India, in Enquiry, Delhi, N.S., iii/3 (1971). For the position of classes not included in the nobility, see Iqtidar A. Khan, Middle classes in the Mughal Empire, in Proceedings of the Indian History Congress, Allahabad (1975) session. N. Steensgaard, The Asian trade position of the seventeenth century, Chicago 1974, extended the "pedlar" hypothesis to India; for a contrary view, see Habib's essay on Indian merchant communities in The rise of merchant empires, ed. J. D. Tracy, Cambridge 1990.

5. Commerce and European trade connections with Mughal India.

In the regions of the Mughal empire which were at peace, trade was active, and, for the period, highly organised. Funds were ordinarily transmitted by bills of exchange, which could be negotiated in all the principal towns, and in some centres outside the empire. Merchants were, however, disinclined to carry large stocks of commodities, and preferred to utilise their funds in money-lending; the rate of interest on commercial transactions was commonly about 10 or 12 per cent, but the charge was much higher when the element of risk was great.

External land-trade was almost limited to the two caravan routes westward by way of Kābul and Kan-dahār, though there was some small traffic with Tibet. By sea, Gudjarat [q.v.] had old-established connections with the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf, with East Africa, and with Sumatra, Malacca and further East; on a much smaller scale, Sind had relations with Persia; while Bengal dealt chiefly with the south of India and with Burma and Siam.

During the 16th century, all the sea routes connecting India with the rest of the world were dominated by the Portuguese, who had in 1510 conquered Goa from the Adilshahis [q.v.], and subsequently took over Diu [q.v.] and Dāmão in the Kathiawar peninsula in 1535 and 1538 respectively [see HIND. iv. History, at III, 422a], and for the remainder of the century it was the Portuguese who controlled European commerce with the Mughal lands. They were concerned rather to exploit than to develop; the chief extension of trade due to their efforts was the supply of cloth to Brazil and West Africa, but most of this was drawn from the Coromandel coast, which was outside the Mughal empire until almost the end of the 17th century.

But the Portuguese monopoly was challenged when the English East India Company, following on the success of the English Levant Company's trade with the Eastern Mediterranean lands of Islam, was incor-
porated by royal charter in 1600. A "factory" or trading agency was established in Surat (q.v.) against strenuous Portuguese opposition, and its position secured by a grant from the Emperor Djahangir in 1618. Surat was replaced by Bombay (q.v.) as the Centre of the English trade with the east coast of India, being acquired from the Portuguese in 1661 as part of the dowry brought by Charles II's wife Catherine of Braganza; the fortunes of the Company were to be exactly coeval with the Mughal dynasty, for in 1688, after the Indian Mutiny, the Company lost its charter and was legally dissolved.

Various separate Dutch companies began trading with India and the Far East, but a merger in 1600 led to the formation of the powerful United East India Company, the Vereenigde Oost-Indische Campagnie (VOC), which also had a factory at Surat from 1617. In the course of the first two-thirds of the 17th century the Dutch dealt severe blows at the Portuguese Estado da India, blockading Goa by sea and capturing Colombo in Ceylon and Cochín in mainland India in 1639 and 1663 respectively. During the 18th century, however, the Dutch were gradually excluded from India by the British and concentrated their efforts on the East Indies and the Far East; the VOC itself was dissolved in 1800 and its functions transferred to the Dutch state, the Batavarian Republic as it then was.

A French East India Company, the Compagnie des Indes Orientales, was first founded by Colbert in 1664 and the factory at Pondicherry opened in 1674, but its operations were on a smaller scale than those of the British and Dutch and it was re-organised in 1721 and 1725, and henceforth it was well-capitalised and strongly supported by the state. Until the Treaty of Paris of 1763 confined French trade to the five ports in southern and eastern India, the two Companies and the state apparatuses behind them were to be rivals for political control, and the involvement of the two powers in local dynastic conflicts was to be a factor in the loosening of Mughal control over the provinces and the final ephemerality of the Empire during the 18th century. Smaller trading companies were also founded by e.g. Denmark and Sweden and from Ostend, with a Danish factory at Tranquebar on the south-east coast since 1620.

The acquisition of trading rights by the English and Dutch in western India in the early 17th century owed much to the Mughal authorities' strained relations with the Portuguese at this time. From Sūrat the two companies speedily expanded their trade inland to the commercial centres of textile weaving, not only at places near the coast like Broach [see BHARO] and Ahmadābād (q.v.) in Gujārāt (q.v.) but also to more distant places like the great emporia and imperial capitals of Burānghūr, Agra and Dihlī (q.v.), and hence eastwards to Bihār, Orissa and Bengal. Factories were established by the English, Dutch and then French on the Hooghly river in Bengal from the 1630s onwards, lured by the agricultural richness of eastern India, its textiles, indigo, etc., and likewise on the south-eastern Coromandel coast, including at Madras (q.v.), by the English, Dutch, French and Danish. Trade developed in silk, saltpetre, fine calico and other products, and the influx of the wealth of the weight of change of fashions in Europe produced a great demand for muslin and prints, which was met partly by Bengal, and partly by Madras, by this time technically within the limits of the empire.

The outstanding feature of all trade with India was the need for importing gold and silver. India bought little beyond the industrial metals and luxury goods, but was eager to sell produce for cash; and, since Western Europe could not supply what was most in demand, the operations of the trading Companies were necessarily so organised as to direct streams of gold and silver to India from those countries which would part with them, notably, at this period, gold from China, and silver, and later gold from Japan. The seafords serving the empire were thus brought into a complex but efficient organisation, which took whatever they had to sell, supplied whatever they wanted to buy, and, so far as was possible, satisfied the demand for gold and silver.

Inland transport was necessarily less efficient. The Indus, the Ganges, the Dūmna, and the waterways of Bengal were largely used, but the bulk of the empire depended on what were then called roads, unmetalled tracks, sometimes defined by lines of trees, with halting-places which were generally walled or otherwise defended against robbers, and usually furnished with supplies. Transport was effected by carts and pack-animals, generally oxen but in some places camels. Passengers travelled on horseback, in palanquins, or in carts drawn by fast oxen. There were excellent arrangements for the rapid transit of letters, but these were for official use, and were not ordinarily available for private persons, who hired messengers when required, or in a few cases, clubbed together to send messengers periodically.
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When speaking of Mughal religious life, most scholars, and general readers, will think almost exclusively of Akbar's din-i i'lhi [q.v.], that syncretistic religious movement which has been considered by some to be heresy, if not plain apostasy from Islam, while others would rather classify it as a kind of mystical "secret society" comprising a very limited number of court-related elite. Akbar, the prototype of "mystical electricity", who liked to select the very best from all the religious traditions which he had encountered during his famous discussions in the "black tent", has become in many respects the quintessential Great Mughal. However, his attempt at a reconciliation of the major trends inside his vast country was only one in the plethora of religious movements during Mughal times.

When settling in the subcontinent, the Mughals found a considerable Mahdawi influence [see MAHDAWIS]. The Mahdi of Djabnpur had died in 911/1505, but his followers became once more powerful during the Suri interregnum, and apparently continued to live under the surface, influencing a number of mystically-minded people. On the other hand, Bâbur himself brought with him, if not an affiliation with, at least a great respect for, the Nakshbandi order; he even translated Ubayd Allah Abrâr's Risâla-yi Wûldiyya [see ABRAR IN SUPPL.]. One century later, it was the famous Nakshbandi order in India that Akbar shrewdly used to counteract Akbar's lenient religious policy and found its most remarkable representative in Ahmad Sirhindî (d. 1034/1624 [q.v.]).

For Indian Islam has always displayed two faces which one might call, for want of a better term, the India-oriented mystical, inclusive one, and the Mecca-oriented prophetic, exclusive one. These two trends are visible from early times and became once more evident in the conflict of Akbar's ideals and those of the Nakshbandiya at the beginning of the 11th/17th century. They are fully developed in the conflict of his great-grandsons Dârâ Shikoh and Awrangzib [q.v.] in the second half of the same century.

Akbar, like his father and grandfather, had been a great believer in the Sûfis, particularly the Châhti order [see CHÂHTIYAH], but his assumption of the role of supreme arbiter in religious affairs, as promulgated in the mohdar, the so-called "infallibility decree", after his great vision in 988/1579, should perhaps be understood as being influenced by the approaching turn of the millennium: the year 1000 A.H. (corresponding to 1591-2) could be imagined as the beginning of a new, ideal phase in the history of Islamic peoples in the Indian subcontinent. But against such mystical claims stands the militant power of the nudjuddi-i al-farâb. The Renovator of the second millennium, Ahmad Sirhindî, who regarded himself as the kayûn upon whose being the world relies. The role assumed by Akbar, and to a lesser extent by his two successors Djahângîr and Shâh Shâh, is that of the king as the carrier of the humanistic and theocratic conception of the khwâdgerâ, the wholesome luminous power: The ruler, as Akbar's admirers would claim, is the insân-i kâmîl [see AL-INSÂN AL-Kâmîl], the Perfect Man, of whom Sûfism had been dreaming for centuries. In the case of Djahângîr and Shâh Shâh, the emphasis seems to shift slightly toward the king's role as the heir to Solomon, the Kur'anic prophet-king who had power over men, jinn, and animals (Friedrich Koch, in her Shah Jahan and Orpheus, Vienna 1988, has rediscovered the Solomonic imagery in Mughal palaces). But while the royal mystique was fitted into a more orthodox framework under Akbar's two successors, Shâh Shâh's heir-apparent Dârâ Shikoh once more tried to follow his ancestor's attempt to unite the two main religions of India in order to reach the magfîn al-bâyân (sura XVIII, 90), the consequence of the two oceans. That is the title of his book in which he emphasised the essential unity of the great religious traditions by leaning heavily on the concept of wâhdat al-wujûd as it had become the hallmark of the followers of Ibn 'Arabi (active in India since the late 8th/14th century) which seemed to be the Islamic equivalent of the Vedantic concept of advaita, non-duality. The temptation being, on the one hand, his brother Awrangzib that led to his own execution brought about a rule of the Mecca-oriented type of Indian Islam for nearly half a century, much to the chagrin of many Sûfîs, Shi'i groups, and Hindus.

This highlights the fact that another tension that marks the Mughal period is that between Sunni and Shi'i groups, which became increasingly problematic owing to the constant influx of Persian nobles who took office in the army or at court, particularly after Djahângîr's marriage with the Persian lady Nur-Djâhan. The struggle against the Shi'a was carried out largely by scholars close to the Nakshbandi order. That is true also for the 12th/18th century, when the Nakshbandi-Shi'i conflict found a tragic expression in the case of the staunch Nakshbandi leader and poet Mazhar Djandjanân, who lost his life when ridiculing a Muharram procession. The fact that the Deccan kingdoms were predominantly ruled by Shi'i princes gave the orthodox defender of Mughal Sunni supremacy in the 11th/17th century an additional reason for caution, if not aversion.

But it was not only the movements on the higher levels of society such as the imperial experiments, or the ardent letters of Ahmad Sirhindî, who urged the nobles to return to a sober Islam, that mark the religious situation in Mughal India. One may even say that, in the long run, another trend was more important than these theological issues, and that is the development of religious literature in the vernaculars.

During early Mughal days, Kâdi Kâdan, a Mahdawi mystic from Sind (d. 959/1551), wrote what seems to be the first mystical verse in Sindhi, using the indigenous form of the dâki and the imagery of the countryside, thus laying the foundations for a great poetical tradition. (It may be mentioned at random that Kâdi Kâdan's grandson Miyan Mir was Dârâ Shikoh's source of inspiration.) Shortly after Kâdi Kâdan's death, mystical literature appears in the Northwestern Frontier region, where Bâyazid Anşârî, the pîr-i rawshân "luminous Pîr", composed religious instruction in his native Paghî [see RAWSHANYYA]. And while Dârâ Shikoh was still alive, he may have heard of the mystical bard Mâdîh Lâi Hunsâyn, who—again for the first time—used his Pandjâbi...
mother tongue to sing of the intoxicating power of love. It is quite possible that Akbar's generalissimo Khwāja Khān Şah Ruh of Ahmadshah [see above and supra] was acquainted with him; he too joined those who wrote mystical verse in the vernacular, in his case, in Hindī.

After Awarangızís deceased in 1118/1707, India, and especially Dihlí, was reduced to a most deplorable state; and yet the 12th/18th century was a time of amazing religious and literary activities. One has only to think of those Sūfīs who wrote in the regional languages, the wand of Bulūh Shīrāzī, and, somewhat earlier, Sultan Bāহā for Pandjābi, of Şah ʿAbd al-Lāḥīf Bihātī for Sindhi, and of Rahmān Bāhā for Pāہtā, are proudly mentioned in the countryside, and their works have given people in the rural areas a treasure of wisdom and mystical imagery which has permeated their lives and has inspired the literature in those languages to our day. In the Deccan, Dāfīghi Urdu had flourished for a long time, and was then transported to the north where Urdu developed into a rich literature after Awarangızís death. Great mystical writers continued to live in Dihlí despite material disasters, and tried to offer the people some consolation with their writings and preaching.

Mīr Dārī [q.v.] is famous for his tender mystical Urdu verse, but produced also numerous Persian works in Divān-e-Nawwāb, whose father had founded, a mystical sub-order of the Nakhsha-bandīyā; the later, the tarīka muhammadiyya, was to turn into a belligerent movement against the Sūfīs and the British. Mazhār represented the stern Nakhsha-bandi line, while Şah Wali Allāh [q.v.], initiated into various tariqas, including the Nakhsha-bandīyā, tried for the first time a more modern approach to the problems of his time by analysing the causes of the downfall of Muslim power. By translating the Kurān into Persian, he sought to help his compatriots to understand its simple meaning without relying on the fossilised commentaries and supercommentaries; and, as "vicegerent of the Prophet in blam ing" he chastised the numerous un-Islamic customs, including pilgrimages to certain saints' tombs. All three of the Dihlí mystics expressed equal aversion to popular mysticism and the activities of the "miracle-mongers" who apparently swarmed about in the country.

The position of the Muslims was becoming increasingly difficult during the later Mughal days, partly owing to the divergent trends among themselves. But they had also to deal with the Sikh community, which had developed from a mystically-minded fraternity in the Pandjāb into a militant power, since Dāhānīr and later Awarangız very unwisely had given up Akbar's tolerant attitude towards them. Under political pressure, the Sikh power had grown to become a deadly enemy of the later Mughals; its soldiers wrested most of the Pandjāb from them. But perhaps the most tragic part of later Mughal times is that the worst pillages were inflicted upon the inhabitants of northwestern India, not by the Dārsī, Sūfīs, or even Mahrātās, but by their Muslim religious and political activities.

Increasing British influence on Indian life was to change the political and economical status of the Muslims for the worse by introducing legal and fiscal measures that led to the impoverishment of large groups of Muslims, as well as to a decrease in Muslim education. Lucknow continued to develop a Shīʿī sub-culture of its own, and it seems that the ideals of the Nakhsha-bandīyā and the tarīka muhammadiyya survived in some of the leading figures in Dihlí during the last decades of Mughal rule.


7. Architecture.

Various aspects of Mughal architecture have been treated under HIND VII. Architecture. The Mughal school; Agra, 1973; for the role of building see BURJ, iii, 4; BŪSTÂN, iii; MAḤĀL, VI; MAḴBĀRĀ, 5; India; MAḤĀNĪ, 2; INDIA; MAGHĪZI, H. The architecture of the mosque. II. In Muslim India. This section gives an overview of the stylistic development and of architectural types. Names and monuments between quotation marks are that of local usage not supported by historical evidence. The use of Persian terms follows the practice of the Maghul sources. Abbreviated references inserted in the text are quoted in full in the Bibliography at the end of the article. Muslim architecture owes to the patronage of the Mughuls one of its most creative and richest periods. As recent research has begun to show, no other period of Muslim architecture before the Mughals has left us such a wealth of secular and religious buildings. The Mughals were highly aware of the potential of architecture as a means of self-representation as well as an instrument of royalty (Kandahārī, 144 F., 147, Eng. tr. Brand and Lowery, 1985, 290-1, 294; Kanbū, iii, 1972, 18; Eng. tr. of the latter, Koch, 1982b, 259). Consequently, at least up to Awarangızís reign, the formative phases of Mughal architecture were determined not by individual architects but by the committed patronage and informed judgment of each emperor. Mughal architecture created a supremely confident synthesis of the most heterogenous elements: Central Asian, Timurid, Indian, Persian and European. The supra-regional character of the increasing British influence on Indian life was to change the political and economical status of the Muslims for the worse by introducing legal and fiscal measures that led to the impoverishment of large groups of Muslims, as well as to a decrease in Muslim education. Lucknow continued to develop a Shīʿī sub-culture of its own, and it seems that the ideals of the Nakhsha-bandīyā and the tarīka muhammadiyya survived in some of the leading figures in Dihlí during the last decades of Mughal rule.


7. Architecture.

Various aspects of Mughal architecture have been treated under HIND VII. Architecture. The Mughal school; Agra, 1973; for the role of building see BURJ, iii, 4; BŪSTÂN, iii; MAḤĀL, VI; MAḴBĀRĀ, 5; India; MAḤĀNĪ, 2; INDIA; MAGHĪZI, H. The architecture of the mosque. II. In Muslim India. This section gives an overview of the stylistic development and of architectural types. Names and monuments between quotation marks are that of local usage not supported by historical evidence. The use of Persian terms follows the practice of the Maghul sources. Abbreviated references inserted in the text are quoted in full in the Bibliography at the end of the article. Muslim architecture owes to the patronage of the Mughuls one of its most creative and richest periods. As recent research has begun to show, no other period of Muslim architecture before the Mughals has left us such a wealth of secular and religious buildings. The Mughals were highly aware of the potential of architecture as a means of self-representation as well as an instrument of royalty (Kandahārī, 144 F., 147, Eng. tr. Brand and Lowery, 1985, 290-1, 294; Kanbū, iii, 1972, 18; Eng. tr. of the latter, Koch, 1982b, 259). Consequently, at least up to Awarangızís reign, the formative phases of Mughal architecture were determined not by individual architects but by the committed patronage and informed judgment of each emperor. Mughal architecture created a supremely confident synthesis of the most heterogenous elements: Central Asian, Timurid, Indian, Persian and European. The supra-regional character of
Mughal architecture sets it apart from the earlier Muslim architecture of India and gives it a universal appeal.

Since the Mughals were direct heirs to the Timurids, the sustaining element of their architecture, especially in the initial phase, was Timurid (in the older literature often taken to be "Persian"). A fact that is not generally recognised is that essential ideas of Timurid architecture, such as symmetry of plans reflected in the elevations, as well as complex vaulting, came to fruition much more in Mughal architecture than in Safavid Persia, which was also heir to the same tradition.

Babur (932–7/1526–30).

The initial phase under Babur is difficult to evaluate because of the discrepancy between his own writing about architecture, which sets high Timurid standards (Babur-nama, Eng. tr. A.S. Beveridge, London 1921), and the few buildings that have survived. Although he is celebrated as a founder of gardens, it is his mosques in Sambhal (933/1526), Ayodhya and Pānpat (both 935/1528–9) that remain from his brief reign. Of Babur's gardens in India, the rock cut Bāgh-i Nāūlar at Dholpur is preserved to some extent (933–5/1527–9). Only fragments remain of his famous Čahār Bāgh (Čār Bāgh) or Bāgh-i Hašṭ Bīhīst at Agra. According to an 18th-century plan of Agra in the Jag Mandir, the garden was situated on the other side of the Yamunā or Jumna almost opposite to the later Tādj Mahall. According to Zayn Khan (Tabakat-i Baburi, Eng. tr. S.H. Askari, Delhi 1982, 160 f.), Babur's nobles followed his example by building gardens "on the models of Khurāsāni edifices". Other amenities of Central Asian life style, such as "four royal hot-baths", were constructed "in the cities of Hindūsān" to content the "Khurasanis and Samarqandīs" who had come with Bābur to India (ibid.).


A heterogenous picture of Mughal architecture prevails during the next period, that is, up to the middle of the 16th century, the two phases of Humāyūn's reign. The Timurid strand is represented by almost pure imprints such as the mosque at Kaspura, Aṅā (937/1530–1), which shares its main features with the 16th-century Namakghār at Karshi (q.v.) to the southwest of Samarqand. Two anonymous tombs at Dihlī, the "Sabz Burgā" and the "Nīlā Gumbād", introduce on North Indian soil a late-Timurid formula for octagonal tombs [see MUMHUMMĀN]. The common features of the two buildings are their elegant proportions (more pronounced in the "Sabz Burgā", Pl. XXII, 1), which reflect late-Timurid ideals with its elongated pūghīsī (sc. portals in the form of a monumental arched niche in a rectangular frame), and a slightly bulbous dome set on a high cylindrical drum housing an inner lower dome), their four-centred arches, their outer facing with tile work arranged in geometrical patterns and the painted plaster decoration and arch-netting of their vaults. The ground plan of this tomb type is in the form of an irregular octagon. The Timurid element was soon to merge with local building traditions, in particular with regard to the facing of buildings and architectural decoration. The main source of inspiration was here the revival of the ornamental sandstone style of the early Dihlī sultanate. It had gone out of fashion during the 14th and 15th centuries in Dihlī, but continued uninterrupted in provincial centres (Pers., e.g. Kanawdi) leaving an architectural deposit from which early Mughal and Sūrī architectures could draw their inspiration (Koch, Arch. form., 135 f.). Characteristic of this style is, inter alia, a highly ornate revetment of buildings with red or buff sandstone. Typical examples are the buildings of the fort of Purī at Dihlī (the palace citadel founded in 939/1533 as Dinpanāh by Humāyūn and altered consequentially by Shēr Shāh Sūrī and probably also by Akbar), particularly the mosque in it, which, on the basis of literary evidence, must be attributed to Shēr Shāh Sūrī (early 1540s). The only surviving palace building in the citadel, the two-storeyed octagonal "Shēr Mandal", represents the vaulted chambers (Bāwī) with a painted cruciform interior and arch-netted vaults (for a plan, see Petruccioli, 1988, fig. 237). None of Humāyūn's own palace buildings described by Kīndāmīrī (cf. mahalī) seems to have survived. The first preserved Mughal residential building that can be dated is the recently-identified pavilion of Muhammad, Humāyūn's bahādūr (Pl. XXIII). It was built in 940/1533–4 near the tomb of Shāvīyā Khālid in the fort of Vidisya-mandirīgāh, Bayānā (Dhāŋghārī, Tūzūk, ii, 63; cf. Iqtidar Alam Khan, New light on the history of two early Mughal monuments of Bayana, in Muqarnas, vi). The small two-storeyed stepped pavilion of red sandstone is a key building of Mughal palace architecture because it contains in nuce two constituent elements: that of flat-roofed post and beam construction and, in its main floor, the configuration of a closed central block with an ambulatory verandah.


General considerations. After these architectural preludes, Mughal architecture attains its distinctive character during the reign of Akbar, whose syncretic genius had its impact not only on the political affairs of the Mughal empire but also on the development of the arts. Military conquests were reflected in architecture, a process helped by an influx of craftsmen from the new provinces to the Mughal court. Akbar's architectural activity surpassed even that of the Tughluks, who had already shown a mania for building. Akbari architecture developed into a supra-regional dramatic synthesis characterised by a most sweeping extraction of features from earlier Indian, Central Asian and Persian styles. Stylistic clashes resulting from the amalgamation of such heterogenous elements were absorbed by the favourite building material, red sandstone, whose unifying hue carried an additional attraction in being the colour reserved for imperial tents.

In the uninhibited interaction of styles, however, a certain predilection prevails for particular types of buildings. The Timurid influence makes itself most felt in vaulted masonry architecture employed for mausolea, individual palace buildings (pleasure kiosks), gate houses (serving often residential purposes), hammāms, kārahānsardūs and smaller mosques. This category belongs the first major building enterprise of Akbar's period, the tomb of his father Humāyūn, the first of the grand dynastic mausolea which were to become synonymous with Mughal architecture (Pl. XXII). Here Mughal architecture reaches for the first time the monumental scale which was to be characteristic of imperial projects. The tomb is situated in the centre of the first preserved Mughal garden of a four-fold tār bāgh pattern (for a sketch plan, see Ṣūqī, fig. 6). The intricate ground plan of the main body of the mausoleum, which stands on a large podium housing some 13 vaulted chambers, elaborates on the four-fold plan or haqīt bāghī, derived from its late- (or post-) Timurid versions. The complete nine-fold plan consists of a square or rectangle (sometimes with cor-
niers fortified by towers, but more often chamfered so as to form an irregular octagon—the Mughal mut'amman baghāli (blocks) divided by four construction lines crossing each other into four domed chambers, rectangular open halls in the middle of the sides—either in the form of a šāhī-nākh or a flat-roofed verandah supported by pillars (the Mughal "tīwān")—and double-storied vaulted corner rooms (blocks) reflected on the façade by superimposed vaulted niches.

The plan of Humāyūn's tomb is composed of four such quadrangular units which in turn form the corner elements of the main north-south axis, a design process apparently inspired by Humāyūn's boat palace (Khwāndamīr, 52 ft., tr. 37 ft.). In Akbar's period, the ninefold plan became the ground plan par excellence, used both in residential and funerary architecture. It was particularly popular for pleasure houses in the context of garden or water architecture ("Todar Mal's Bāradāri"). Fathpur Sīkri, 1571-85; the water palace of Shāh Khūli Khatān at Nārānāy, 990-1001/1590-93, for which see G. Yazdani, *Naraun avd its buildings*, in *JASB*, N.S., iii [1907], 641-3; illus. in Parihar, pl. 48).

The Central-Asian–Timūrid influence showed itself most extensively in those building types which were patronised also by the nobility and religious circles, i.e. garden houses and small palaces, secular and religious mausolea, hamamān, kārāwānsāras and smaller mosques. The overall Akbari synthesis took place in the great imperial projects, the fortress palaces and the large dāwmis mosques.

Fortress-palaces. Almost coeval with the construction of Humāyūn's tomb was the rebuilding of the old mud brick fortress of the Lōlāt at Agra [q. v.] by Kāsim Khān (972/1569-74) is the first of the giant courtyard mosques. The fortification follows apparently the irregular outline of its predecessor. The overall symmetrical planning of imperial residences became only binding in Shāh Djiāhān's reign [see MAHAL]. The gates and other fortificatory elements of earlier Indo-Muslim architecture [see Būrg, iii] were brought to an unsurpassed grand scale and aesthetic refinement, not least by the stunning red sandstone veneer (PL. XXIV, 2). Only a few elements remain in the Agra Fort of "the 500 buildings in the wonderful designs of Bengal and Gedjarāt" of which Abu 'l-Fadl speaks (cf. Nūr Baksh, *The Agra Fort and its buildings*, in *ASI*, AR [1905-4]). They seem to have been arranged in a bandlike succession of courtyards along the river front, a scheme which was preserved in Shāh Djiāhān's thorough reconstruction (pl. XXVIII, 1).

The rebuilding of the fort of Agra was followed by the construction of Fathpur Sīkri [q. v.] (ca. 1571-85; new plans in Petruccioli, 1988) [see also HIND and MAHAL], Akbar's architectural response to the absorption of Gudjarat into the Mughal empire. The architectural synthesis draws here from the "Dīwān-i Khās" and the "Khvābghā", and the zanāna with "Dīodh Bā'ti's palace" in its centre. The architectural synthesis draws here from its diverse sources (Gedjarāt and the greater Gedjarāt-Māwā-Gedjarāt tradition, the ornamental style of the Dillī sultanate, Central Asia) what was most suitable for a monumental building programme in sandstone whose affluence with wood favoured the integration of forms derived from timber architecture. Dominant is the influence of Gedjarāt sultanate architecture, which provided in itself a model for a successful synthesis of pre-Islamic Hindu and Dījayn building traditions (Koch, 1988a; eadem, *Arch. forms*).

The time of the construction of Agra and Fathpur Sīkri coincides with the founding of Akbar's fortresses-palaces at Dijawnpur (973/1566), Lāhawr, Adīmār, Allāhābād and Atak Banārās on the Indus [q. v.] (989/1581). According to Kandahārī (42), the city (šahar) of Lāhawr (which must have included the fort) was completed before 1580. The reconstruction of the Lāhawr Fort by Djiāhānghīr and Shāh Djāhān left very little of Akbar's structures [see LAHAWR]. The fortified quadrangle of Akbar's palace at Adīmār (978/1570) [see MAHAL] stands out for the symmetry of its plan (O. Reuther, *Indische Paläste und Wohnhäuser*, Berlin 1925, pl. 26); within Akbari fortress-palaces it represents a reserve of zanāna courtyard buildings. Its wings made by rows of vaulted chambers enclose a pavilion on a rectangular nine-fold plan with pilastered verandahs (PL. XXIV, 1) anticipating the later Safavid Hāght Bāgh at Isfahān. The zanāna enclosure (now walled in by later military structures) in the fort of Allāhābād (991/1583) is modelled on the same pattern. Its central pavilion, the "Rānī kī Mahall" (according to Abu 'l-Fadl Akbar's khalwatgāh-i khās, private retiring room), enriches the imperial pavilion type of Fathpur Sīkri by the superb pillaring of the surrounding verandah (PL. XXV), and by the exchange of the inner rectangular hall for a block on nine-fold plan (Koch, *Architectural forms*).

Mosques. The mosques of Akbar's period show the same variety of styles [see also MASJID. H. II. B. The monuments. Mughal empire]. The earliest phase continues local traditions while merging them with the Timūrid ideas, such as the Khayr al-Manazil at Dīhīlī [q. v.], one of the first mosques of the reign, built by Akbar's wet-nurse Māham Angā opposite the Purānā Kīla in 969/1561-2. The one-aisled three-bayed mosque of the Dillī Sultanate is adapted by the Mughals and continues to be used as "quarter mosque" (mosque of Shāyk Zībūd-nābī, 983/1575-6, combined with a courtyard, see *ASI*, Memoir i [1912]) or as funerary mosque in tomb complexes ("Afsarwala" Mosque, 1560-7, PL. XXI, 2; Naqvi, 16; for examples at Lāhawr see Chaghatai, 1976). One of the first mosques commissioned by Akbar is entirely in the Timūrid idiom. It is in the dāwmā of Shāyk Shāyi nānī Al-Din Simīh at Adīmār (ca. 1570; PL. XX, 1; Abu 'l- Faḍl, Akbar-nāma, Eng. tr., ii, 511; see also Sarda, 87). It combines the prayer hall of the Humāyūnī Kalpura Mosque (with a towering pishtdḵ preceding a high, narrow, domed mirāb chamber) with a court framed by arcades of dome-covered bays corresponding in height and shape to the low aisles of the prayer hall. The original architectural decoration is obscured by a heavy layer of whitewash.

Akbar's dāwmis Masājdī at Fathpur Sīkri (ca. 976- 81/1568-74) is the first of the giant courtyard "mosques now typical of Mughal cities" (PL. XX, 2). Like the imperial residences, this imperial dāwmis was the place for a great Akbari synthesis. The scheme of a great courtyard mosque with pilastered iwān and rūstān reflects in a general way the Arab archetyp. Its immediate source is Indian Sultanate architecture (for plans, see Petruccioli, 1988, figs. 258 A, D, E).

Public and utilitarian buildings include kārāwānsāras, wells, bridges, hamamānas, bazaars and stables. A masterpiece of Mughal engineering is Mūmīn Kīta's bridge at Dijawnpur [q. v.] (976/1569). From the early 1570s particular emphasis
is given to public works along the highways, such as wells, reservoirs, and kdrwdnsard^is, a programme based on the “spade work” of Sher Shâh Sûrî. The imperial pilgrimage road from Agra to Ajâmir is lined at regular intervals with stations for imperial use (W. Finch, in Early travels in India, 1583-1619, ed. W. Foster, London 1921, 148 f.), wells and small minârs functioning not only as milestones but also as hunting memorials of the emperor since they are studded with horns of his game. They represent a smaller form of the kdrwdn which in Akbar’s time, were set up in imitation of Iranian models, i.e. the “Hiran Minâr” at Fathpur Sikrî, the “Cor Minâr” at Dîhil or the Nim Sarâtî Minâr, Bengal (see A. Rabbâni, “Haran Mumâra” at Sheikhupura (Punjáb) and some problems connected with it, in Armughân-i ûmî; Prof. Md. Shafi”presentation volume, ed. S.M. Abdullâh, Lahore 1955, 181-99). The typical plan of the Mughâl kdrwdnsard (usually termed sarâtî) which emerges at this time (Sarâtî Cháštâ, Sarâtî Châparghât) has not varied much in later periods (pioneering study of I.A. Khan forthcoming in Indian Historical Review). The plan is uniform in principle. It consists of a square or rectangular compound made of wings of unconnected tiny closet-like rooms (budfrâ) with a narrow porch (the Mughâl “iwan”), a scheme which was also used in the nask of mosques functioning as madrasas (Kâhvar al-Manâzîl at Dîhil, Djamî Nithâr Begumâ, etc.). In the compounds which are not pierced by gates is a block of larger rooms for the use of higher-ranked persons. The corners are fortified with towers which may contain larger apartments, hamamîms, or store houses. The hamamîms of the period are best represented by those of Fatâpîr Sikrî (see above); they constitute what is probably the last survival of the fortification of the nask of the time of Iftikhar Khan at Cûnar with massive, tunnel vaulted verandahs. The cube-shaped Dihî type of tomb (which in Akbar’s period was taken up for instance by the tomb of Agra Khânân, 974/1566-7; at Nizamuddîn, Dîhil, see Hasan, 31 f.) continues to be used. Important examples are the mausoleum of “Abîd al-Râhîm Khânî-i Khânân [q.v.] at Dîhil (d. 1036/1627) which incorporates a nine-fold plan, and those in the Khusrâw Bâgh at Allâhâbâd: the tomb of Sultan Nîthâr Bâgum, sister of Khusrâw (1034/1624-5) and that of Khusrâw (d. 1031/1622; Pl. XXVI, 2) (see above). A new form is that of a flat-roofed arched hypostyle hall composed of domed bays demarcated by pillars (piers) arranged in a grid pattern (tomb of Mirzâ ‘Azîz Kûkâ (d. 1033/1623-4 [q.v.] at Nizamuddîn, Dîhil (see Hasan, 34-5).

Mosques. Related tendencies appear also in the mosque architecture of the period. The “Pathtar Mandîgî” at Srînagar (1620s), sponsored according to tradition by Nîr Djiânân, has three aisles (parallel to the kibla wall), each consisting of nine bays demarcated by cruciform piers and coved ceilings or patterned vaults (for a plan, see Soundara Rajan, 8). Such arched halls foreshadow a definite trend of the mosque and palace architecture of Shâh Djiânân. The compact mosque-mosque of the Dihî tradition embellished with Timurîd and Safawid components is best represented by another mosque of female patronage, that of Maryam al-Zamânî at Lâhâw (1020-3/1611-2) (see above). This masterpiece (tomb of Bâha-ü’d-Din) at Srînagar (1620s), sponsored according to tradition by Nîr Djiânân, has three aisles (parallel to the kibla wall), each consisting of nine bays demarcated by cruciform piers and coved ceilings or patterned vaults (for a plan, see Soundara Rajan, 8). Such arched halls foreshadow a definite trend of the mosque and palace architecture of Shâh Djiânân. The compact mosque-mosque of the Dihî tradition embellished with Timurîd and Safawid components is best represented by another mosque of female patronage, that of Maryam al-Zamânî at Lâhâw (1020-3/1611-2) [q.v.]. The courtyard master-architect of Djiânân’s period bears thus the stamp of female patronage; the emperor himself did not sponsor any major mosque constructions.

Djiânân’s own projects were in the domain of palace and garden architecture. Most of these were however either altered or altogether removed by his son and successor Shâh Djiânân who considered them as “old-fashioned and bad design” (kabûghî wa... bad tarbi, see Lâhâwî, v/2, 51, et passam). To the latter belong Djiânân’s additions to the palace of Agra. The best picture of Djiânânî palace architec-
turance can be obtained in the fort of Lahawr [q. v., also for a plan] (Pl. XXVII, 2) which Djahangir began to reconstruct after his accession. The final touch which was given to the buildings between 1617 and 1620 by Djahangir's architect 'Abd al-Karim Ma'mur Khân. He had recommended himself for this task by his suc-
cessful adaptation of the palaces of the Mâlûw sultans at Mâdîdî [q. v.] for the stay of the court in 1617 (Tûzuk, i, 368, 375 f.). Beside these additions to the palaces in the Mughal metropolises, Djahângir also constructed several country houses and hunting lodges. These include Shakhshûpûra near Lâhwâr, a classical octagonal water-pavilion of the design of the "Shâh Mâfadîl" in a tank (1015-30/1607-20; Pl. XXVII, 1; see A.N. Khan, The Hiran minar and baradari Shâhiâkhpura: a hunting resort of the Mughal emperors, Lahore 1980), as well as the Châhîma-yi Nûr near Aḏâmîr, completed in 1024/1615 (Sârda, 104-7).

Gardens. The emperor's main interest was here directed to the development of Kâshmîr as a summer residence of the court. One of his first projects after his accession was the foundation of a garden around the springing of the Bhat (Qâhîla) at Vêrnâg. His visit in 1620 brought about a whole wave of garden constructions, among them the Nûr Aţfâ in the Fort of Harî Parbat, Aâfal (altered by Djâhângîrâh before his death in 1627), and the lower garden, the Fârâh Bâkhsh of the famous Shâhîmâr. The construction of the latter was put in the hands of Prince Khûr-râm, the later Shâh Djâhân (Tûzuk, ii, 142, 150-1, 173-4). The central feature of the Mughal garden at Kâshmîr is a spring collected in a canal which forms the main axis of the garden. The layout takes advantage of the sloping hillside site for terraces, ponds, branch canals, and pavilions, sited along the water-way [see also âsrûn, ii].

The development of Agra as a city of river-side gardens seems to have been given special attention in this period. Of some 33 gardens which Pelsaert lists with their names in 1620 (Jahângîr's India, tr. W.H. Moreland and P. Geyl, 1925, repr. Delhi 1972, 2 ff.), about one-third was newly founded or rebuilt during Djâhângîrâh's time. This concern particularly the river-bank garden of the Bâtîmâd al-Dawla's tomb which includes the best preserved garden, not only of Agra but of Djâhângîrâh's period altogether. It is the "Râm Bâgh", recently re-identified as Nûr Dijâhân's Bâgh-i Nûr Aţfâhân, completed in 1621 (Pl. XXIX, 1; see Koch, 1986a).

The public works of Djâhângîrâh's period include the planting of trees along the highways from Agra to Atâk and from Agra to Bengâl, and the setting of kis [see mîrân] there as wells and wells along the road from Agra to Lâhwâr (Tûzuk, ii, 100). In 1620 Djâhângîr ordered the construction of small stations (lâdhis) along the route over the Pir Pândjâl pass into Kâshmîr (Tûzuk, ii, 178). A number of kâvânsârâs were built during his reign. Nûr Dijâhân's sarâ'i, Nûr Mahâl in the Pândjâb (1620), has an entrance gate faced with sandstone, carved—true to the fashion of the period—with animal and human figures similar to those appearing in tile work on the outer wall of the Lâhwâr Fort (Pl. XXVIII, 2). The architectural patronage of 'Abd al-Râhîm Khân-i Khânân includes a still-existing kânâî [q. v.] system at Burhânpûp to bring water from the foothills of the Satpura Range to its now lost garden Lâfî Bâgh (Naik, 216-19).

Shâh Dijâhân (1037-68/1628-58)

Gardens. Under Shâh Dijâhân, Mughal architecture reaches a new aesthetic and its classical phase. The architectural ideals of the period were symmetry as well as uniformity of shapes gov-
erned by hierarchical accents. The symmetrical plan-
ing of individual buildings and architectural com-
plexes became even more binding than in previous
periods. Bilateral symmetry was now given preference over centralised schemes, and uniformity was
achieved by the reduction of the architectural
vocabulary to a few forms (Pl. XXIX, 2). White mar-
ble or lâbûn (fine, highly-polished stucco) now replaced red sandstone as the preferred facing for buildings.

The planning of architectural projects was done by the collective effort of a court bureau of architects who worked under close supervision of the emperor, who already as Prince Khûr-râm had shown himself "excessively fond of founding buildings and laying out gardens" (Kânôbî, i, 108).

Tombs. Following the usual custom, Shâh Dijâhân, after his accession, built the tomb of his father at Lâhwâr [q. v.] in one of the gardens on the opposite side of the Râwî (1628-38; Pl. XXX, 2). The classical târ bâgh layout was combined with a cawk-i dijâhu-šâhâna (forecourt) containing also a mosque. The peculiar form of the mausoleum was dictated by Djâhângîrâh's wish to be buried under the open sky like his ancestor Bâbûr; consequently, his tombstone (markand) was set on a platform (tabāna) which in turn was placed on a monumental podium (tâlâbûn) with corner minarets (Kânôbî, i, 314-15). The architecture of Shâh Dijâhân and, indeed, of the Mughals, culminates in the famous mausoleum of Shâh Dijâhân's favourite wife Ardujamand Bânû Bêgâm at Agra [q. v.] (1041-52/1631-43; Pl. XXX, 1). The tomb derived its name from her title Mumtâz Mahâl [q. v.] distrupted by popular etymology to Tâdji Mahâl. Comparable to some extent to Ottoman schemes, the tomb garden makes part of a larger com-
pound; it is preceded on its southern side by a dijâhu-
šâhâna framed on both sides by courtyards for the attendants of the tomb (khâwâjs-pîrs) and subsidiary tomb enclosures. Further south there followed a (not now preserved) complex divided by two bazaar streets crossing each other (târ su bâzâr) into four square (kâr-
van) sârâs (Romance of the Taj Mahâl, fig. 41); further south was a courtyard (dâr) with an of large complex; it is preceded on its southern side by a dijâhu-
šâhâna framed on both sides by courtyards for the attendants of the tomb (khâwâjs-pîrs) and subsidiary tomb enclosures. Further south there followed a (not now preserved) complex divided by two bazaar streets crossing each other (târ su bâzâr) into four square (kâr-
van) sârâs (Romance of the Taj Mahâl, fig. 41); further south was a courtyard (dâr) with an of large complex; it is preceded on its southern side by a dijâhu-

Palaces. Another point of effort of Shâh Dijâhân's architectural patronage was palace and garden architecture. He reconstructed the palace in the fort of Agra, made changes to the fort of Lâhwâr [q. v.] (1628-34, and 1645) and built a new fortress-palace in his newly-founded city Shâhjâhânâbâd at Dîhî. He constructed several pleasure houses such as the pavilions of white marble on the bank of the Anâ Sâgar lake at Aḏâmîr which vary the theme of the hypostyle hall (begun already under Djâhângîr, completed in 1046/1636) for illus., see MAHÂL]. Shâh Dijâhân's building programme included also several hunting palaces (e.g. Bärî, 1637; E. Koch, The hunting palaces of Shâh Dijâhân, forthcoming).

Fortress-palaces. The Ağra Fort presents us with the first official palace architecture of Shâh Dijâhân (1628-37; Pl. XXVIII, 1). The nucleus of his reconstruction consists of a complex of three courts; the great courtyard of the dîwân-i khašîā-a-âmm, its eastern wing forming the western portion of two smaller courts or one large courtyard facing the river Yamûnâ; the "Angûrî Bâgh" (residential quarters) [for illus., see MAHÂL] and the "Maţhî Bhawân" (treasury and
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offices, PL XXIX, 2). All three courtyards are organised in a similar way and follow the scheme of the river-side garden of Agra (for the individual buildings see MAHAL, for a plan, see Petruccioli, 1988, fig. 144/2).

The ideas of Agra were brought into a rigid formal scheme in the palace of Shahjahanabad, 1048-58/1639-49 [see MAHAL, ii, for the individual buildings, see MAHAL] (for a pre-Multuny plan, see Petruccioli, 1983; for a pre-Multuny panorama, see Romance of the Taj Mahal, fig. 252). Since it was a new foundation, the Shahjahanii ideal of bilateral symmetry could be realised almost unimpeded by earlier structures. The plan has the form of an oblong muhazzama baghddi extended by a wedge in the north to integrate the already existing small fort Salimgarh into the lines of defence. The family members and nobles of Shah Djahan were encouraged (also by financial help) to build their havelis (courtyard houses) in the new city. Outstanding was here the complex of Djahanar in the Candni Cawk, consisting of a sarat, a hamam and her garden Sahibabib (Kanbo, iii, 37 ff.; cf. Blake, 158-9; for a sketch map, see MAHAL, ii, Fig. 3).

Gardens. Shah Djahan's garden constructions include an addition to the Shalmiran garden of Kashmir in the form of another dar baik garden named Fawd-i Bakhsh (1078/1667-), a repeat of the scheme of the earlier Farah Bakhsh. Its central feature was a pavilion in the local black stone. Shah Djahan's main garden foundation was the Bisch-i Fawd Bakhsh or Shalimar garden at Lahawr (1051-2/1641-2), inspired by its namesake at DihlT (for the individual buildings, see MAHAL). The earlier scheme of Kashmirs two dar baiks enthreaded along a central waterway is enriched at Lahawr by a rectangular terrace which is inserted between them. The water supply was provided by a canal constructed by the Persian noble 'Ali Mardan Khan who had defected to the Mughal court in 1638. His knowledge about architecture and engineering made him a welcome addition to the architectural counsel of Shah Djahan.

Mosques. Shah Djahan's enormous building programme included also a considerable number of mosques [see also section H. II, Blh-]. In fact the Golden Age of Mughal mosque construction. Shah Djahan, who liked to appear as a renewer of Mughal architecture.

Mosques. Shah Djahan's enormous building programme included also a considerable number of mosques [see also section H. II, Blh-]. In fact the Golden Age of Mughal mosque construction. Shah Djahan, who liked to appear as a renewer of Mughal architecture.

The series of great city mosques is initiated by that of Wazir Khan at Lahawr (1044/1634-5) and by Shah Djahan's brick and tile Djami Masjid in Thatta (1054-6/1644-57; A.H. Dani, Thatta, Islamab 1982, 190-7). The Djami Masjid of Agra (completed 1058/1648), sponsored by the emperor's daughter Djahananar (Pl. XXXI, 2; plan in A. C. Chaghatai, Bahadurhj Masjid, fig. 26b) enlarges the plan of Wazir Khan Mosque by a new foundation, the wings of the prayer hall. The scheme is slightly altered in the Djamis Masjid of Shahjahanabad [see MAHAL, ii] (1060-5/1650-6; Pl. XXXI, 1) intended as Shah Djahan's counterpart to Akbar's Djamis Masjids in Fateh pur Sikri (Koch, Arch. forms, 122), though in fact derived from the city mosque of Agra.

Public buildings. Only scant remains survive of the great metropolitan bazaars, hamamds and sarats of Agra and Shahjahanabad described by the historians of Shah Djahan (Inayat Khan, Eng. tr. 205-6, 531 and passim). The sarat of Amanat Khan (the calligrapher of the Tadj Mahal), 1050/1640-1, south of Amirras, has two gates with remains of good tile mosaic (Besley, 1974, 173 ff.). The 'palace' of A'zam Khan at Ahmadabad (1047/1637-8; J. Burgess, The Muhammadan architecture of Ahmadabad, ii, London 1958, 50-60, pl. 58) was, according to its inscription, not only a sarat but also a market (kayariya); the gate served apparently residential purposes for its founder.

Awrangzib (1058-1118/1658-1707) and later Mughal architecture.

General considerations. The success of the architecture created under Shah Djahan may be recognised from the fact that it affected not only the buildings of his immediate successor Awrangzib but, in the long run, the whole of Indian architecture. Measured against the architectural patronage of his father, that of Awrangzib has been somewhat underrated and, consequently, has been studied very little. He embarked on considerably more architectural projects; true to his Weltanschauung, his main interest was directed towards religious architecture and charitable institutions.

Palaces and gardens. Neither Awrangzib nor any other of the later Mughals sponsored any major urban palace construction—Shah Djahan's solutions proved to be binding ones. Awrangzib did, however, add an exterior enclosure—a dar baik—around the Agra Fort in 1659-62 (Pl. XXIV, 2). Awrangzib's foster-brother Muzaffar Husayn, entitled Fidat Khan Koka, constructed the gardens at Pingjaw near Candigafh in the Mughal tradition of Kashmir (Crome et alii, 185-7).

Tomb. The mausoleum of Awrangzib's wife Rabia Daurani at Awrangabad (1072/1660-1; Pl. XXXIV, 1) is a smaller, free copy of the Tadj Mahal. Awrangzib's sister Kishangah (d. 1068/1657) is entombed at DihlT in a flat-roofed hasht bihisht pavilion in the later Mughal idiom (verandahs with baluster columns and cusped arches). Otherwise, the Mughal imperial family reverted with their burials to the example set by the founder of the dynasty, Babur. Neither Djahanar nor Awrangzib himself allowed any construction over their respective resting places in Nizamuddin, DihlT (1092/1681, see Hasan, 16-18) and Kuldudab (q.v.) near Awrangabad. The later Mughals were buried either in the dargah of Kutb Sahib at Mihrawli, or in Humayun's tomb, or in the dargah or Nizamuddin.

Mosques. The most impressive building of Awrangzib's reign is the Badshahi Masjid at Lahawr (1084/1673-4; Pl. XXXII), the last of the series of the great djamis5 mosques in red sandstone. Deviating from the customary local facing with tile work, it echoes particularly the Djamis Masjids of Shahjahanabad, but succeeds in conveying a more serene impression by its vast proportions and the quiet juxtaposition of red sandstone with white marble (domes, subtle intarsia decoration). The exquisite "Motl Masjid"—Awrangzib's afterthought to the DihlT palace (1074/1664; Pl. XXXII, 2)—copies Shah Djahan's brick and tile masjid5 in the Agra Fort almost literally. New is the exuberant floral décor in marble relief work which leads from the beginning of this trend under Shah Djahan towards the florid style of...
The later Mughal architecture. The sensuous treatment of the mosque stands in strange contradiction to the urbanity professed by the patron—an indication that stylistic developments had begun to become independent of the patronage of the Mughal emperor. Other important foundations of Awrangzib are the qismā masjids of Mathurā (1071/1660-1) and Benāres (1087/1676-7). The madrasa and mosque of Ghasi al-Din Khān at Dhihi transposes the scheme of the Khayr al-Manāzil into the idiom of the period (Pl. XXXXIII, 1). Remarkable is the tomb of the founder with its floral décor and djalis carved out of sandstone.

Public works. In the first years of his reign, Awrangzib enlarged the Mughal net of roadside accommodation by constructing sara’s equipped with bazaars, mosques, wells and hammanās along the roads from Awrangzab to Agra and from Lāhawr to Kābul. He also ordered the repair of older sara’s and bridges as well as the renovation of mosques throughout the empire; the latter works were financed from his own establishment (Muh. Kāzīm, ‘Alamgir-nāma, ed. Kh. Husayn and ‘Abd al-Hayy, Calcutta 1868, 1084 f.).

The later Mughal style.

From the late 17th century onwards, there develops in India an architectural style which, although derived from Mughal architecture, became more and more independent of the Mughal court. The new influential patrons were provincial rulers who proclaimed their defiance of the Mughals by copying their lifestyle and architecture. Typical of this style is a florid ornamental mode with a preference for bulbous shapes, as well as the increasing use of stucco. With regard to building types, Shāh Djiān’s rooms decorated with mirror mosaic (qinā kān) produced numerous off-spring: as ‘dījj madāllās’ they had to give Mughal splendour to the palace of every petty ruler. By-and-by, the Mughalising fashion conquered the whole of India. It bloomed particularly under the patronage of the nāwawāb of Awadh at Faydjabād and Lakhirāw [q.v.]. Characteristically, the most outstanding and best preserved example of the late Mughal style at Dhihi is the mausoleum of Sādjar Dīang (1167/1753-4; Pl. XXXIX b, XV, 2), the second nāwawāb of Awadh. It is the last great mausoleum in the classical Mughal tradition of a nine-fold plan set on a podium in a four-parterre ār bāgh. In the 18th and the 19th centuries, the influence of the Mughal style stretches from the wooden architecture of the Himalayan valleys (Kathmandu, Kulu) to Maysur (q.v.) and Bangalore in Karnatakā, and from the Sīkẖ architecture in the Pandjāb to Mughaljābd [q.v.] and Dihākā [q.v.]. Under British patronage, the Mughal fashion became a constituent element of the so-called Indo-Saracenic style. As a typical Indian style it found its way to England in the Indian revival (e.g. the country house Sezincote in Gloucestershire, ca. 1806; the Royal Pavilion and the Royal Stables at Brighton, 1803-32, Pl. XXXV).

Bibliography (including references given above):
(1) Mughal sources: The important position which architecture held in Mughal culture and society is reflected only to some extent in contemporary writing. No special works dedicated to architecture have come to light so far except the late 17th-century manual Bādshah-i Qhīṛṭbī, I. O. Pers. ms. Ethē 2784, which has a section on buildings and gardens. Information has to be distilled from epigraphical inscriptions (architectural descriptions) and from poetry (versified descriptions, eulogies on buildings, and chronograms).


It was only in Shāh Djiān’s period that literature was expected to reflect faithfully the building activities of the emperor and to some extent it did. The most influential texts are those of the court chronicler ‘Amīn-ī Sālīh or Shāh Djiān-nāma, rev. Pers. text ed. W. Kurayshī, 3 vols., 2nd ed. Lāhawr 1967-72; Dīalāl al-Dīn Tabatābāi, Pādshāh-nāma, Pers. ms. B.L., Or. 176; ‘Abū Tālīb Kālim, Dīvān, Pers. text ed. H.P. Bayda°I, Tehran 1336 š/k 1957; idem, Bāḍshāh-nāma, Pers. ms. L. Ethē 170, unpubl. but described in typescript by Jaffery. ‘Inayat Khān’s abridged Shāh Djiān-nāma, the only history of him which has been translated into English (by A.R. Fuller, rev. and ed. W.E. Begley and Z.A. Desai, New Delhi 1990), contains only a few comments on architecture. From Awrangzib’s period onwards, information about architecture becomes again more sparse. The Dīvān of Lūf Allāh Muhandīs contains information about a family of architects who worked under Shāh Djiān and Awrangzib (partly tr. M.A. Chaghtai, A family of great Mughal architects, in IC, xi (1937), 200-9).

(2) Secondary literature: In addition to the Bibl. to Būštān. ii, HIND, vii, MAHAL, MARBAKA, 5, and MAŚJĪD. H. II, see for general works, A. Vawālusen, Islamisches Indien, Munich 1969 (good photographs and drawings); P.A. Andrews, The architecture and gardens of Islamic India, in The arts of India, ed. B. Gray, Oxford 1981, 95-124; K.V. Soundara Rajan, Islam builds in India, Delhi 1983 (with some useful so far unpUBL. drawings); R. Nath, History of Mughal architecture, i (Bābur, Humāyūn), New Delhi 1982, ii (Akbar), New Delhi 1982; idem, Some aspects of Mughal architecture, New Delhi 1976a; A.J. Qaisar, Building construction in Mughal India: the evidence from painting, Delhi 1988; E. Koch, Mughal architecture, an outline (forthcoming). For particular areas treated in the article:
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8. Carpets and Textiles.

(a) Carpets.

The traditional floor-covering in India was the woven cotton dori, or the lightweight and easily-transportable floorspread of cotton, painted and dyed (see b), below). The first pile-carpets to be imported into India, mainly from Persia, would have been sādūzādī [see sāpīyānā], for the daily ritual of salāt [q.v.]. Emulating the life-style of Persian nobility, pile-carpets gradually came into secular use. Abu l-Fadl (Aʿīn-i Akbari, ii, 55) confirms that the craft of pile-carpet weaving was introduced into India during Akbar's reign: "His Majesty has caused carpets to be made of wonderful varieties and charming textures; he has appointed experienced workmen who have produced many masterpieces. The carpets of Iran and Turān are no more thought of, although merchants still import carpets... All kinds of carpet weavers have settled here, and drive a flourishing trade. They are found in every town, especially in Agra, Fathpur and Lahor..."

Early Mughal carpets were close in style to those of Eastern Persia, but the warp was usually of cotton. Scholastic study of Indian carpets was born from the great exhibition of oriental carpets (mainly Persian and Turkish) in Vienna in 1891 (A. von Scala, 1891; C. Purdon Clarke (ed.), 1892-6). Our most complete information on Mughal carpets woven in Lahore in the early 11th/17th century is from the collections of Amber palace, as recorded by Hendley (1906), compiled from notes, photographs and drawings which he had assembled in 1892-3, while working at Jaipur; many bear inventory notes confirming that they had been at Amber since the period of Shāh Djahān. Most of the designs are of flowering plants, in colours on a red ground, the borders being of floral ornament on an indigo ground. Some show fauna and legendary beasts among the flowers. Hendley (p. 8) describes the layout of carpets for a darbār: "...The whole surface thus looks like a meadow covered with beautiful flowers, or a park or paradise in which beasts wander or birds fly amidst trees of every kind..."

Two large carpets commissioned in India in the early 17th century provide valuable dated evidence. The finest, the 'Girdlers' carpet', was commissioned in 1631 by Robert Bell, a director of the East India Company, and also a member of the Worshipful Company of Girdlers of London, to whom he presented it in 1633. The field is filled with flowering plants in the mature Mughal style; at the centre is the great coat-of-arms of the Girdlers Company, and to either side, the coats-of-arms of Bell himself. It was probably designed as a table-carpet for the original Court Room table (see illustr. in mśr art in Suppl., Pl. XVI, no. 18). The 'Fremlin carpet', now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, was commissioned by William Fremlin, who served in the East India Company between 1626 and 1644. The field is filled with

flowering plants, beasts of prey and other fauna; the Fremlin coat-of-arms (invented by Fremlin himself) is emblazoned five times in the field, and repeated in the border.

Under an increasing volume of commissioned work, styles became more rigid, and by the 19th century, Indian carpet-weaving had become a competent commercial industry. In recent years, identifications and assessments are emerging through the cataloguing of museum and private collections, and of special exhibitions; but the gracious design, and imaginative conception of 'a meadow covered with beautiful flowers, or a park or paradise ...' are unique to the early Mughal period.

(b) Textiles.

If the weaving of pile carpets in India was a 16th-century innovation, the history of Indian textiles is of far greater antiquity. India's particular renown lay in fine muslins; in richly-coloured cloths, painted and dyed (kalāmkār); and in fabrics ornamented with gold. Extensive documentary evidence exists in early and mediaeval Indian literature, and in the accounts of the early Arab geographers (Moti Chandra, 1960). Records of the first European travellers and traders confirm a flourishing trade in textiles from India to Persia and the Levant. The indigenous Indian techniques had evolved within the ancient social structure, each sector—rural, and the weaving reserved within its own communities, thus transmitting inherited experience from generation to generation. Tools were very simple; the craftsman relied upon his intimate understanding of natural materials, and above all, upon the dexterity of his hands.

Abu l-Fadl's account (ʻAīn-i Akbari, 87-8) is of great significance: "His Majesty pays much attention to various stuffs; hence Irānī, European and Mongolian articles of wear are in abundance. Skillful masters and workmen have settled in this country, to teach people an improved system of manufacture and on account of the care bestowed upon them, the intelligent workmen of this country soon improved... and the imperial workshops furnish all those stuffs which are made in other countries..." It is further recorded (ʻĀin-i Akbari, p. 92): "In former times, shawls were often brought from Kāshmīr... His Majesty encourages in every possible way, the manufacture of shawls in Kāshmīr..."

The most dramatic developments in India were in woven brocades and brocaded velvets (ibid., 92). The weaving of kimkāb (brocade of silk and gold), and of velvet, required a more sophisticated type of loom than was previously known in India. The main advances within the Mughal imperial workshops were thus in equipment and in more orderly administration.

No textiles from Akbar's period survive, but the rich furnishing of the palaces, and the royal encampments (ʻAīn 21, pp. 53 ff.), are vividly portrayed in Mughal paintings. During the reign of Djāhnār, the somewhat formal style of early Mughal floral ornament evolved a more graceful naturalism. Hangings of the Shāh Djahān period show exquisitely-designed flowering plants, perfectly placed within a foliated architectural framework. The delicate beauty of Mughal dress fabrics is particularly striking in portraits of the Shāh Djahān period.

By the 18th and 19th centuries, the exotic yet dignified 'Mughal style' had become the main visual image of Indian textiles (other than the ritual textiles of Hindu ceremony), and the designs made in European designs for the East India Companies of Europe). The Mughal court custom of bestowing a
fine textile as a khiPa [q. v.] accounts for the survival of rare pieces of exceptional quality.


(b) Textiles. Abu '1-Fadl 'Allāmī, A.ʿīn-i Akbārī, Aʿīn 31, in ii, 88 ff., Aʿīn 32, 91 ff. and also Aʿīn 21, 53 ff.; J. Irwin, Golconda cotton paintings of the early seventeenth century, in Lālit Kālā, v, 11-48 and plates 1-XX, New Delhi 1959 (all surviving examples discussed and illustrated); Moti Chandra, Indian costumes and textiles from the eighth to the twelfth century, in Journal of Indian textile history, v. (Ahmadābād 1960), 1-32; R. A. and V. Krishna, Banaras brocades, New Delhi (Crafts Museum) 1966 (history, technique, design; excellent plates); J. Irwin and M. Hall, Indian painted and printed fabrics, Ahmadābād 1971, 14-15 (early 17th century hangings and floor-spreads), 32-5 (Mughal tent hangings, etc., 17th-18th centuries), 43-65 (19th-century textiles under Mughal influence) (many plates; bibl.); idem, Indian embroideries, Ahmadābād 1973, 5-28 (court embroideries; many plates; bibl.); R. W. Skelton, The Indian heritage, 77-102 (textiles; many illustrated). (MARGARET HALL)

9. Painting and the applied arts. i. The period of Akbar period

The number of illustrated manuscripts identified as products of pre-Mughal India is small but increasing. Questions of date and origin are often matters of debate. The earliest evidence is indirect: literary reference to drawing is found in poems of Amir Khusrū found in 1301 and 1515; a dispersed

Questions of date and origin are often matters of debate. The earliest evidence is indirect: literary reference to drawing is found in poems of Amir Khusrū found in 1301 and 1515; a dispersed
(15th and 16th century manuscript style), with occasional contributions from Bukharan, Sultanate and Dakhání (Deccani) styles. The evolving technique has passages of more painterly brushwork, and there are effects of volume and space. Scenes are filled with vibrant energy which must reflect the enthusiasm of the dynamic young patron. The royal studio is under the direction of Mir Sayyyid 'Ali until his departure to Mecca (probably 979/1571-2) and then under 'Abd al-Šamad, but from now on the painters are predominantly Hindu; the names of Dawsan and Basawar are encountered. The major project of the period is a Hamza-náma (Dáštání Amir Hamza), in large format on separate sheets of cloth mounted on cardboard, which eventually comprised some 1,400 pictures. Probably produced from 1562-77, this is notable for the orchestration of turbulent compositions and for the dramatic portrayal of giant figures (Pl. XXXVII). Colour is strong but sometimes murky. The Dáštání-náma, a romance, contains some pictures much influenced by European technique.

Principal works:

ca. 1557 Khamsa of Nizámí (private collection)
ca. 1558-60 Túrū-náma (Cleveland, CMA)
ca. 1563 start of Hamza-náma (dispersed)
975/1567-8 Gulštán (London, BL)
976/1568-9 Dausöli Rúmi u Khód Khán ('Ashika)
1576-70/1581-2 Anwár-i Suhaylí (London, SOAS)
1572 Tílísím-náma (Rampur, Raza)
1577 completion of Hamzá-náma
1579 Túrū-náma (Dublin, CB)
1579 Dáštání-náma (London, BL)
iv. Middle Akbar period (1580-98)

The middle period of Akbari painting is complex: a great many works were produced and dating is incomplete. Subject matter is more serious in character. Akbar’s religious and historical interests are reflected by translations of the Hindu epics (Razm-náma, Harivámśa, Ramáyána) and an Islamic history (Túrū-i ‘alí). Another major theme is the study of the place in history of his lineage and of himself (Cíngiz-náma, Túrū-i Khóänd-i Timúriyá, Bábúr-náma, Akbar-náma). The third area of interest is the production of fine copies of the Persian classics; this comes to predominate in the 1590s at Ālahawr. In addition, a dossier of portraits of courtiers was compiled. Miscellaneous pictures for collection in albums [see MURAŠKA] include copies of European originals. A notable accession of European material occurred in 1580 when the first Jesuit mission brought seven of the eight volumes of the Polyglot Bible prepared by Christophe Plantin from 1568-72. Motifs from the engraved title pages were adopted in the painter’s studio. Other pictures were brought by this and later missions.

Relatively free brushwork at the beginning of the period gives way later to a more minutely controlled manner, and colour becomes more harmonious and resonant. From the 1580s there is some use of ním kálm (half colour). By the 1590s works of great luxury are produced. The style is more unified, though individual hands can be discerned. European influence has been well assimilated, especially in the depiction of recession in landscape. The dramatic physical action of earlier Akbari painting is now matched by dramatic psychological action (Pl. XXXVIII). In some margins, traditional golden chinoiserie ornament is invaded by small figures in colour. Important observations on the painting in the period are found in the Æm-i Akbari, i.e., of Abu ‘l-Fadl, tr. H. Blochmann, Calcutta 1873; 102, the scope of painting; 113-15, the current state of the studio, Akbar’s theory of painting, and the most respected painters of the period. Numbers of painters up to some 60 might be employed on a large cycle, and it is not uncommon to find the production of a single picture shared, one painter charged with the composition (tarh), another with the execution/colouring ('amal/rang 'ámizi), and sometimes a third for the finishing of faces (šahr-náma). Simpler work was produced for sub-imperial patrons.

Principal works:

ca. 1580 Khánsá single picture (Keir)
990/1582-3 Gulštán (London, RAS). Picture possibly 1590s
c. 1584-6 Túrū-i Khóänd-i Timúriyá (Patna, Khuda Bakhsh)
c. 1584-6 (pictures dated 993 and 994) Razm-náma with Harivánśa (Jaipur, CPM)
c. 1587 (post-late 1583) Khamsa of Nizámí (Keir)
996/1588 (Dhù ‘l Ka‘da/September) Dúsán-i Anwárí (New York, MAA)
c. 1588 Harivánśa (dispersed)
c. 1589 (presented Ahdšar/November) Slhlá 34 Bábúr-náma (Wáhšá-i Bábúrì) (London, V&A)
979/1587 (29 Dhù ‘l-Hidjád/November) Ramáyána (Jaipur, CPM)
c. 1590 Akbar-náma (New Delhi, NM, V&A)
c. 1591 Bábúr-náma (Istambul, Millet)
c. 1592 Bábúr-náma (London, BL)
c. 1592 Dúsán of Háshí (Rampur, Raza)
c. 1592-4 Túrū-i ‘alí (dispersed)
c. 1593 Akhláq-í Náširi (Aga Khan)
c. 1593 Bábúr-náma (Moscow, SMOCG, and Baltimore, WAG)
c. 1594 ‘Ašur-i dáwúr (Dublin, CB)
Iláhi 39/1595 (23 Bahman/February) Baháristán (Oxford, Bodleian)
Iláhi 40/1004/1595 (24 Ahdšar/December) Khamsa of Nizámí (London, BL, and Baltimore, WAG)
c. 1595 Laylá u Mágán (Oxford, Bodleian)
c. 1599 Gulštán illustrations (Cincinnati, CAM) 1004/1596 (27 Ramádán/25 May) Cíngiz-náma ( Tehran, Gulštán)
1005 or 1006/1596-8 Anwár-i Suhaylí (Banares, BKB)
Iláhi 42/1597-8 Khamsa of Amir Khusraw (Baltimore, WAG)
c. 1598 (picture slhlá 42) Bábúr-náma (New Delhi, NM)
v. Late Akbar period (1599-1605)

For works ca. 1600-5, the patronage of Akbar or of Djağhángír [q.v.] is sometimes a matter of debate. It seems probable that an Akbar-náma and two works of religious content were made for Akbar. Drawing and colour are refined. The religious manuscripts have simpler compositions and a contemplative air.

Principal works:

Iláhi 47/1602 (15 Ahdšar/early December) Džüj Bábáshá (Dublin, CB)
c. 1603 (picture 12 Islandarmígh 47/February) 1603) Akbar-náma (London, BL, and Dublin, CB)
Iláhi 49/1605 Nafáshát al-xans (London, BL)
vi. Djağhángír (1605-27)

Already in the 1590s at Ālahawr, the then prince Salim ordered close copies of the Christian subjects brought by the Jesuits. During his period of revolt at Allahábád (1600-3), Salim maintained a small studio which produced fine work. In the first years of rule there were additions to Akbari manuscripts.
Throughout the reign, colour is exquisite, though later more restrained. Physical action is stilled, and emphasis is placed instead upon states of mind. In subject-matter, ancient themes give way to the depiction of daily events, both ceremonial and the portrayal of animals and birds. The margins of folios, especially those of albums, may be richly decorated. From ca. 1616, and influenced by European Mannerism, allegorical paintings portray the emperor symbolically wielding the divinely derived royal power (PL. XL). Various pictures now preserved in albums would have been intended as illustrations to the \textit{Djahan-gir-nama}, a royal copy of which was presented in 1618.\\n\\n\textit{Djahan-gir} prided himself on his connoisseurship in painting (\textit{Tuzuki-i Djahan-giri}, ii, A. Rogers and H. Beveridge, repr. New Delhi 1978, 20-1). The principal painters of the early years of the reign are A\text{"a} K\text{"a} Rid\text{"a}, Man\text{"o}h\text{"a}r (son of Basaw\text{"a}n, \textquoteright\textquoteleft N\text{"a}dir al-\textquoteleft\textquoteleft as\textquoteleft\textquoteleft\textquoteright\textquoteright).\textquoteright\textquoteright), Dawlat, and Ma\text{"u}\text{"a}f (q.	extquoteright\textquoteright). Others who would continue into the reign of Shah Djahan are Abu \textquoteright\textquoteleft l-Hasan (son of A\text{"a} K\text{"a} Rid\text{"a}, \textquoteleft\textquoteleft N\text{"a}dir al-zam\text{"a}n\textquoteright).\textquoteright\textquoteright, B\text{"a}ld\text{"a}n, B\text{"e}t\text{"i}, B\text{"i}h\text{"a}d\text{"a}, and Go\text{"o}d\text{"a}h\text{"a}.\\n\\nPrincipal works:\\n1011/1602 (Muharram/June-July) \textit{Daw\text{"a}n of Hasan Dihlawi} (Baltimore, WAG).\\n1012/1603-4 \textit{R\text{"a}d}i\text{"a} Kanu\text{"u}r} (Dublin, CB).\\n1012/1603-4 \textit{H\text{"a}l\text{"a}n} (Paris, BN).\\n1014/1605-6 Margins of \textit{Daw\text{"a}n of H\text{"a}fiz} (ex-Bute, London, BL).\\n1014/1605-6 \textit{B\text{"a}st\text{"a}n} (ex-Rothschild, private).\\n1015/1606-10 \textit{K"uliyat} of Sa\text{"u}d (Ag\text{"u} Khan).\\n1015/1606-10 \textit{Gaw\text{"o}d\text{"a}n} (Baltimore, WAG, and dispersed).\\n1016/1608-10 \textit{Daw\text{"a}n of H\text{"a}fiz} (London, BL).\\n1019/1610-11 (early pictures 1013/1604) Anwar-i \textit{Subay\text{"a}i} (London, BL).\\nBy 13/1027/1618 (presented 8 Shahshwar/August) \textit{Djahan-gir-nama} (dispersed).\\nAlbums: \textit{Djahan-gir} (Berlin, SPK); Mur\text{"a}k\text{"a}t-i Gul\text{"a}h\text{"a}n (Tehran, Gul\text{"a}h\text{"a}n).\\n\textit{Djahan-gir} (1628-58).\\n
Though a \textit{Gaw\text{"o}d\text{"a}n} and a \textit{B\text{"a}st\text{"a}n} were prepared at the outset of the reign—possibly as a gift to Shah \textit{Djahan}’s son D\text{"a}r\text{"a} Sh\text{"i}kh\text{"o}h (q. v.—the main output of painting takes the form of album pictures. Some albums have suffered dismemberment, and some are of later formation, thus dating of pictures must often be tentative. In the margins of album folios there is increasing use of flowers of semi-naturalistic \textquoteleft specimen\textquoteright character which may derive from European herbs. Portrature continues. Shah \textit{Djahan}, already painted in the reign of \textit{Djahan-gir}, is shown as a single figure, in courtly settings, and in allegories which celebrate the Tim\text{"u}r\text{"u}d dynasty. The princes are shown in more informal circumstances sitting in rapt contemplation of their women, or of the words of sages. Groups of non-royal figures, often holy men, are shown sitting, still and concentrated. Occasionally these pictures have a night background with European-derived chiaroscuro effects—a speciality of works by Pay\text{"a}y. The final major work of Mughal patronage is a \textit{Fad\text{"a}d\text{"o}h-nama} of L\text{"a}h\text{"a}wri of 1067/1656-7, whose illustrations may be in part earlier and later, and in which a resplendent formal manner is sometimes achieved (PL. XLI). The colour and finish of painting in the period is magnificent.\\nPrincipal works: 1038/1628-29 (Qum\text{"a}d\text{"a} i/December-January) \textit{Gaw\text{"o}d\text{"a}n} (Dublin, CB). 1039/1629 (Rabi’ i/October-November) \textit{B\text{"a}st\text{"a}n} (London, BL). 1040/1629-30 \textit{Gaw\text{"o}d\text{"a}n} (dispersed). 1067/1656-7 \textit{Fad\text{"a}d\text{"o}h-nama} (Windsor, Royal Library) Primary albums: British Museum (London, ex-Add. 18801); D\text{"a}ra Sh\text{"i}kh\text{"o}h (London, IOL); Ke\text{"o}rk\text{"a}n (New York, MMA/Washington, FGA); Late \textit{Shah Djahan} (dispersed); Leona\text{"o}nd (Leningrad, AS); M\text{"o}ndo (London, CB/London, VA); N\text{"a}\text{"u}r\text{"a}n al-D\text{"u}n (Tehran, Gul\text{"a}h\text{"a}n); S\text{"u}l\text{"u}d\text{"a}n Kh\text{"u}rr\text{"a}m (dispersed).\\nvi. \textit{Later Mughal painting}\\nA\text{"u}rwanz\text{"u}b (1658-1707 [q. v.]) initially maintained some patronage and a few finely painted pictures show him in darb\text{"a}r or hunting. Later, he ceased to commission work, whether from the pressure of other concerns or from religious scruple. Painters sought other patronage from nobles or at other Muslim or Hindu courts. Work of the late 17th century presents a careful surface and, if the rendering of character is less profound than before, it is not lacking in dignity (PL. XLII). Farr\text{"u}kh S\text{"i}y\text{"a}r (1713-19) and M\text{"u}hammad S\text{"a}h\text{"a} (1719-48) (q. v.) are painted in a harder mode. High Mughal patronage then lapses until a revival from ca. 1780 onwards which sometimes imitates 17th-century work. From the second half of the 18th century derived styles were practised in Awadh (Oudh) at Fay\text{"a}bd\text{"a}d (Faizabad) and Lakh\text{"a}w (Lucknow), and in Bang\text{"a}l\text{"a} at Mursh\text{"u}d\text{"a}b\text{"a}d and Pat\text{"a}n. Subjects include scenes of princely pleasure, portraits, and some Hindu themes. Emp\text{"a}thatic use may be made of classical perspective. From ca. 1760, painting is occasionally for European patrons, and from ca. 1800 the \textit{\text{"a}mpa\text{"o}ny} style develops for this market in Kalk\text{"a}ta/Kalik\text{"a}r (Calcutta), D\text{"i}h\text{"a}l and Agra. A local style, possibly of pre-Mughal origin, flourished in K\text{"a}sh\text{"u}m\text{"i}r in the 18th and 19th centuries.\\nix. \textit{The Dakhan}\\nPainting for the courts of the Dakhan is found from the second quarter of the 17th century onwards. It is generally comparable to the painting of northern India, but tends to be more marked by Persian influence, and has often a stylized, dreamlike quality.\\nxiv. \textit{Applied arts}\\nThe Mughal achievement in fields of architecture and of textiles (see sections 7-8) is justly celebrated. Other applied arts were also brought to a superb level. The working of jade is particularly characteristic of the 17th and 18th centuries; it was used for cups, bowls, phials, bowls, \textit{b\text{"a}k\text{"u}s} (hookah) bowls, \textit{p\text{"a}n\text{"a}d\text{"a}s} and spittoons. Rock crystal was also used, but to a lesser extent. Designs share themes with the architectural ornament of the period, a blending of motifs of lotus, acanthus and poppy. Most renowned is the white jade cup of Shah \textit{Djahan} of 1057/1647-8 (PL. XLIII). In the later period, gems are often inlaid with golden settings. The hilts to daggers (\textit{k\text{"u}\text{"u}r\text{"u}g\text{"u}r}) often terminate in animal heads. Weapons in general are highly ornamental and are often treated with inlays or surface \textit{k\text{"u}\text{"u}t\text{"i}g\text{"u}r}. A specialised form is the \textit{kal\text{"u}r}, a dagger with a transverse grip for use in tiger hunts. A particular type of metalwork is \textit{b\text{"i}b\text{"i}r}, associated with, but not exclusive to, Bid\text{"a}r. A body of alloy is inlaid with gold, brass or silver and is then exposed to acid so that the ground of the design turns black and matt. Motifs often include \textquoteleft specimen\textquoteright plants. A similar dark and light contrast is found in the decoration of boxes and chests of wood inlaid with mother-of-pearl or ivory.\\nBibliography: General and mixed topics, by date of publication: F. R. Martin, \textit{The miniature}}


10. Literature.

The Mughal period marks the highest point in the development of Persian literature in India. Notwithstanding the Turkish antecedents of the Mughal rulers, Persian, because of its cultural influence, received attention at the Mughal court from the beginning. Its importance began to grow during the reign of Humayun (1530-56), particularly after the return of the emperor from his forced exile in Persia. Humayun's love for poetry in that country, and the help he received from the Persian monarch Shah Tahmasp in regaining the Indian throne from his Afghan foes, strengthened the ties of friendship between the Mughal and Safavid courts, and initiated a process of Persianisation that was to affect all aspects of Indo-Muslim culture under the Mughals. By Akbar's time (1556-1606) the supremacy of Persian was firmly established and in 1582 it was declared the administrative language of the whole empire.

Though the Mughal period represents a wide variety of literary activity, the most significant advances were made in its poetic output. In fact this period may be regarded as the golden age of Indo-Persian poetry, when the latter came to acquire new stylistic patterns and modes of thought. An important factor which contributed to the enrichment of Mughal poetry was the influx of a number of gifted poets from Persia at this time. In contrast to the indifference of Safavid rulers towards literary men, the fame and munificence of the Mughal court held out the promise of rich patronage to men of letters. Thus throughout the 16th and 17th centuries India continued to provide a haven for Persian poets in their quest for recognition. The more fortunate of these poets succeeded in gaining entry to the imperial court, while others were patronised by nobles and provincial rulers.

The real flowering of Mughal poetry dates from Akbar's time, which brought together many talented poets. Among the better known names who graced this period were Ghasalî Mughaldi (b. 933/1528-7, d. 1013/1606) and his son Shah 'Abd al-Hakim (b. 934/1525-6, d. 1013/1606), both of whom were poet laureates. Ghasalî was the first to be appointed to that position. His personal and professional qualities are extolled in contemporary chronicles, and Abu 'l-Fadl, who received attention at the Mughal court from the return of the emperor from his forced exile in Persia. Humayun's long stay in that country, and the help he received from the Persian monarch Shah Tahmasp in regaining the Indian throne from his Afghan foes, strengthened the ties of friendship between the Mughal and Safavid courts, and initiated a process of Persianisation that was to affect all aspects of Indo-Muslim culture under the Mughals. By Akbar's time (1556-1606) the supremacy of Persian was firmly established and in 1582 it was declared the administrative language of the whole empire.

Though the Mughal period represents a wide variety of literary activity, the most significant advances were made in its poetic output. In fact this period may be regarded as the golden age of Indo-Persian poetry, when the latter came to acquire new stylistic patterns and modes of thought. An important factor which contributed to the enrichment of Mughal poetry was the influx of a number of gifted poets from Persia at this time. In contrast to the indifference of Safavid rulers towards literary men, the fame and munificence of the Mughal court held out the promise of rich patronage to men of letters. Thus throughout the 16th and 17th centuries India continued to provide a haven for Persian poets in their quest for recognition. The more fortunate of these poets succeeded in gaining entry to the imperial court, while others were patronised by nobles and provincial rulers.

The real flowering of Mughal poetry dates from Akbar's time, which brought together many talented poets. Among the better known names who graced this period were Ghasalî Mughaldi (b. 933/1528-7, d. 1013/1606) and his son Shah 'Abd al-Hakim (b. 934/1525-6, d. 1013/1606), both of whom were poet laureates. Ghasalî was the first to be appointed to that position. His personal and professional qualities are extolled in contemporary chronicles, and Abu 'l-Fadl praises him for his poetical talent and style. Reports differ regarding the extent of his output. The British Library manuscript of his poems comprises less than 12,000 verses, which show Ghasalî as a poet influenced by ethical and moral concepts and endowed with a felicity of expression. Faydî succeeded Ghasalî in 996/1587-8 as the poet laureate of Akbar. He was born in India, and thus differed from other notable poets, who came from outside. Shahîbû Nu'mânî places him alongside Amir Khusrav (b. 651/1253, d. 725/1325 [q.v.]) as the two individuals whom the critic regards as the most outstanding of the Persian poets born in India. According to contemporary sources, Faydî was the author of a large number of works. His poetical output is represented chiefly by his Dīwān and two long mā押mātīs, Markaz al-adqās ("Centre of circles") and the more
famous Nal Damani. The latter, based upon an episode from the Sanskrit epic Mahabharata, has beenlavishly praised by none other than Badi‘uddin [q.v.], the most hostile critic of Faydi. The poet was a man of varied learning, and his poetry demonstrates his breadth of erudition and mastery of language. Among the verse forms employed by him, he excels in the ghazals, which are characterised by a beauty of expression and philosophical ideas.

The most famous poet of Akbar’s period was ‘Urfi. He was originally a native of Shiraz. On coming to India he enjoyed successfully the patronage of Hakim Abu ‘1-Fath (d. ca. 974/1567), the court physician of Akbar, and ‘Abd al-Rahim Khan-i Khánan (b. 965/1557-8, d. 1036/1626-7).28 The strength of ‘Urfi’s poetry resides chiefly in its boldness and creativity. These qualities are reflected vividly in his kasidas, which constitute the basis for his fame. In these poems ‘Urfi provides a wide range of imagery. He employs non-traditional metaphors, similes and word compounds. His verse shows a penchant for self-praise, a feature reflecting his own natural conceit for which he was notorious in his circle.

The lyrical poetry of Akbar’s time found its brightest exponent in Nazir, who originated from Nishapur. He was attached to the court of ‘Abd al-Fattah, in the last decade of whose reign (ca. 975-1566) he wrote as a poet laureate. In the reign of Akbar, where frequent poetical contests with his more illustrious fellow-poet, ‘Urfi. Though he composed numerous kasidas, his claim to distinction rests chiefly upon his ghazals, which express complex and varied feelings of love, and may be said to rival Faydi’s ghazals in their refinement and eloquence. His compositions possess a rhythmic quality and a fondness for melodic metres. Among the classical poets, he seems to be inspired by Hafiz, whom he imitates in several of his pieces.

Contemporary with the Mughal rule was the ‘Adil Shahi [q.v.] kingdom in the south whose rulers were generous patrons of poetry and literature. Among the poets who flourished in the ‘Adil Shahi court, the best known were Malik Kummi and Zuhuri. Malik Kummi was the poet laureate of Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah II (1580-1627), and enjoyed the respect of his fellow-writers. Zuhuri, with whom he collaborated on many occasions, was not only a poet of standing but also an effective prose writer. His well-known work in that medium is Sih mahiy (“Three essays”). It constitutes the preface of Na‘r, a book of songs attributed to Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah II. In poetry, Zuhuri’s chief contribution are his mathnawis, the most famous of which is the Saki-nama (“Book of the cup-bearer”) in praise of Burhan Nizam Shah (1508-53).

The flow of poets from Persia continued during the reigns of Daghānīr (1605-27) and his successor Shāh Daghān (1627-58). The most eminent among Daghānīr’s poets was Tālib Amuli (d. 1626-7), who served as the emperor’s poet laureate. Tālib displays a spirit of inventiveness not unlike other leading poets of the Indian school who made determined use of new similes and metaphors for the sake of innovation. His ghazals are especially noteworthy for expressing an idealised and aesthetic conception of the beloved’s beauty.

The period of Shah Daghān’s rule boasted a number of fine poets. These included Kalīm (d. 1606/1651), Kūdil (b. ca. 991/1583, d. 1061/1656) and Sā‘ib (b. 1010/1601-2, d. 1088/1676-7). Kalīm was Shāh Daghān’s poet laureate, a position he held from 1037/1628 till his death. His poems are conspicuous for their ingenious conceits and subtle ideas. In his ghazals he employs the illustrative technique (mithalyya) with great effect. Most of his lyrical poetry occasionally contains verses from Hindi, and there are references in his poems to trades and professions associated with the Indian environment. He has also devoted his talent to the writing of descriptive verse on simple, commonplace subjects.

Kūdil, who was a contemporary of Kalīm, has been wrongly quoted as Shāh Daghān’s poet laureate. Some writers on poetry rank him equal to Kalīm, which is certainly an over-estimation of his creative abilities. However, his output is extensive and varied, and reveals a mastery of composition.

Shāhī is generally regarded as the best Persian poet of the 17th century. During his stay in India he received much acclaim at the court of Shāh Daghān. He was a prolific poet whose verses are estimated in tens of thousands. His best work is represented by his ghazals, which are distinguished by their philosophical expression. He carried further the illustrative style and employed it extensively in his ghazals.

During the reign of Awrangzīb (1658-1707), the official patronage accorded to the poets came to an end, and the office of the poet laureate was abolished. However, the lack of patronage by the royal court was offset to some extent by the patronage given by members of the court to such poets as Makhātī, Şib, and others. Thus Awrangzīb’s daughter, Şib al-Nisā Begum, who was herself a poet using Makhātī as her pen-name, was a liberal patron of literary men. Similarly, Prince A‘zm (b. 1063/1653, d. 1119/1707), the third son of the emperor, supported a number of poets who were employed in his service. The best known poet of Awrangzīb’s reign was Bīdīl (b. 1054/1644-5, d. 1133/1720), in whose verse the Indian style of Persian poetry reached its culmination. His poetical output is voluminous and covers almost all forms of verse. He was the author of several mathnawis which are indicative of his spiritual and ethical concerns. But it was in the ghazal that his literary prowess found its true expression. Bīdīl’s ghazals are characterised by a depth of thought and reflect his high ethical standards. His verse is difficult to understand because of his habitual inclination towards abstraction of meaning.

From the 18th century onwards, Urdu steadily gained importance, replacing Persian as the medium of literary expression. Nevertheless, the continued influence of Persian as a part of Indo-Muslim culture was demonstrated in the emergence of many bilingual poets who composed both in Persian and Urdu. Ghalīb (1797-1869 [q.v.]) was the most outstanding of these bilingual poets. His towering stature as an Urdu poet has somewhat overshadowed his contribution to Persian poetry which, according to him, was superior to his Urdu verse. There is no doubt that he was the last great poet of the Mughal period. He was associated with the court of Bahadur Shāh II (1837-58), with whose exiling by the British the history of Mughal India finally came to an end. Ghalīb, in the beginning, was attracted to Bīdīl’s involved style, from which he could not extricate himself completely. However, he also turned towards the works of such poets as ‘Urfi, Nazirī, Tālib Amuli, and Kalīm, assimilating the finest elements of Mughal poetry, and giving them a new life by the magic touch of his extraordinary genius. His best work possesses an intellectual content, and is marked by a polished style.

The Mughal period of Persian poetry brought to perfection a style which has been named sabk-i Hindi or Indian poetical style. The term was coined by the
Persians to describe a particular manner of writing, the evolution of which took place mainly in India. Where and how this style originated is a matter of dispute. It has been suggested that its incipient features may be traced in the poetry of Fīghānī Shāhrazī (d. 923/1517 [q.v.]), from where it found its way into Mughal verse through the efforts of the incoming poets from Persia. The credit for introducing this style into Mughal poetry is given to Ūrfit. It was progressively developed by poets such as Tālib Amuī, Ṣālīb and Kalim until it reached its peak in the poetry of Bīdīl with its complex and involved mode of expression.

The foremost feature of sāhk-i Hindī is the exaggerated attention paid in it to the formalistic aspects of poetry. Basic to it are complexity and subtlety which depend not so much on what is said as how it is said. For its effectiveness it relies on new metaphors and similes, innovative word compounds, extensive use of certain poetical devices, particularly the illustrative technique, and the coined of new terms. Its main vehicle is the ghazal, which probably constitutes the most significant contribution of Mughal poetry. Whereas the traditional material of Persian ghazal lays a prominent emphasis upon the theme of love and its varied emotions, in the hands of the Mughal poets the content of the ghazal becomes more and more philosophically oriented. This philosophical tendency in the ghazal found vocal exponents in Ūrfit, Faydī and Nazirī. As a by-product of the philosophical preoccupation of the poets, ethical and moral ideas also came to be increasingly articulated in the ghazal.

Although sāhk-i Hindī was employed by poets in Persia, it never received very much approval from the native arbiters of poetic taste. On the other hand, it enjoyed a favourable atmosphere in Turkish and Tāждik literatures. In the case of Turkish literature, its impact may be noticed in the development of Ottoman Turkish poetry in which sāhk-i Hindī was employed by poets in the court of Şah 4. The poet, who was in the service of Akbar for many years, has been criticised for his austere and ostentatiousness, incompatible with his austere and ostentatious. However, before the practice was abandoned, they are written in a style which became a preferred model for subsequent Mughal historians.

The most outstanding history of the Mughal period and one of the greatest histories produced in India, is the Akbar-nāma of Abu ’l-Fadl (d. 1011/1602-3) under the title of Ṣahmūn-nāma, in which the author, who was Humayūn’s sister, gives a statistical survey of the administrative, social and cultural conditions of the empire, and includes a section dealing with the religious thought of Akbar. Abu ’l-Fadl’s writings have been criticised for their highly eulogistic description of the author’s patron. Their value, however, lies in the wealth of information they contain regarding Akbar’s period. Moreover, they are written in a style which became a preferred model for subsequent Mughal historians.

The premier dynastic account of Dāhāngīr’s period is the official history of his reign, entitled Ikhlās-i Dāhāngīr. It was composed by Muhammad Sharīr b. Dūst Muhammad, better known by his title Mu’tamad Khaṇ (d. 1049/1639 [q.v.]). It is a detailed description of Akbar’s life and the events of his reign. A complementary work by the same writer, entitled 4īn-i Akbarī, is a statistical study of the administrative, social and cultural conditions of the empire, and includes a section dealing with the religious thought of Akbar. Abu ’l-Fadl’s writings have been criticised for their highly eulogistic description of the author’s patron. Their value, however, lies in the wealth of information they contain regarding Akbar’s period. Moreover, they are written in a style which became a preferred model for subsequent Mughal historians.

Abd al-Kadīr Badā′ūnī’s Mush’takhab al-ta’wārīkh, which begins from the Ghaznavids and comes down to 1004/1595-6 of Akbar’s reign, is notable for its treatment of historical details. Bādā′ūnī’s views are often biased, especially when dealing with religious matters, and he does not agree with his own orthodox beliefs. Thus his book contains a severe indictment of Akbar’s religious non-conformism.

The Gulshan-i Ibrāhīmī, or Ta’riḵ-i Frīḏīhī as it is also called, deals with the Muslim rule in India until the early part of the 17th century. Its authors, Muḥammad Kāsī Ṣāhī Shah, who was Frīḏīhī [q.v.] as his pen-name, was employed in the court of Ibrāhīm 4. His history is particularly useful for the information it provides regarding the Muslim dynasties of Deccan.

A large body of historical literature from the Mughal period consists of specialised accounts. One of the earliest examples of this kind is the Tabābdīr-i Ṣulṭān-i Akbar, by Bāyazīd Bāyāt. This work, which was undertaken in 999/1590-1, deals with the reign of Humayūn and early years of Akbar. Another book, dating approximately from the same time, is Tabābdīr al-wadīkī, which is a narrative of Humayūn’s period of exile in Persia written by his personal attendant, Dāwarzā Ṣāḥbī. The first two rulers of the Mughal dynasty form the subject of Gulbadan Begum’s (b. 929/1522-3, d. 1011/1602-3) Akbar-nāma, in which the author, who was Humayūn’s sister, gives a sensitive picture of her family.

The most outstanding history of the Mughal period, and one of the greatest histories produced in India, is the Akbar-nāma of Abu ’l-Fadl (b. 958/1551-2, d. 1011/1602-3 [q.v.]). It is a detailed description of Akbar’s life and the events of his reign. A complementary work by the same writer, entitled 4īn-i Akbarī, is a statistical study of the administrative, social and cultural conditions of the empire, and includes a section dealing with the religious thought of Akbar. Abu ’l-Fadl’s writings have been criticised for their highly eulogistic description of the author’s patron. Their value, however, lies in the wealth of information they contain regarding Akbar’s period. Moreover, they are written in a style which became a preferred model for subsequent Mughal historians.

The history composed during this period is the Akbarnāma, which was undertaken in 999/1590-1, deals with the reign of Humayūn and early years of Akbar. Another book, dating approximately from the same time, is Tabābdīr al-wadīkī, which is a narrative of Humayūn’s period of exile in Persia written by his personal attendant, Dāwarzā Ṣāḥbī. The first two rulers of the Mughal dynasty form the subject of Gulbadan Begum’s (b. 929/1522-3, d. 1011/1602-3 [q.v.]). It is a detailed description of Akbar’s life and the events of his reign. A complementary work by the same writer, entitled 4īn-i Akbarī, is a statistical study of the administrative, social and cultural conditions of the empire, and includes a section dealing with the religious thought of Akbar. Abu ’l-Fadl’s writings have been criticised for their highly eulogistic description of the author’s patron. Their value, however, lies in the wealth of information they contain regarding Akbar’s period. Moreover, they are written in a style which became a preferred model for subsequent Mughal historians.

The most outstanding history of the Mughal period, and one of the greatest histories produced in India, is the Akbar-nāma of Abu ’l-Fadl (b. 958/1551-2, d. 1011/1602-3 [q.v.]). It is a detailed description of Akbar’s life and the events of his reign. A complementary work by the same writer, entitled 4īn-i Akbarī, is a statistical study of the administrative, social and cultural conditions of the empire, and includes a section dealing with the religious thought of Akbar. Abu ’l-Fadl’s writings have been criticised for their highly eulogistic description of the author’s patron. Their value, however, lies in the wealth of information they contain regarding Akbar’s period. Moreover, they are written in a style which became a preferred model for subsequent Mughal historians.
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The most outstanding history of the Mughal period, and one of the greatest histories produced in India, is the Akbar-nāma of Abu ’l-Fadl (b. 958/1551-2, d. 1011/1602-3 [q.v.]). It is a detailed description of Akbar’s life and the events of his reign. A complementary work by the same writer, entitled 4īn-i Akbarī, is a statistical study of the administrative, social and cultural conditions of the empire, and includes a section dealing with the religious thought of Akbar. Abu ’l-Fadl’s writings have been criticised for their highly eulogistic description of the author’s patron. Their value, however, lies in the wealth of information they contain regarding Akbar’s period. Moreover, they are written in a style which became a preferred model for subsequent Mughal historians.

The most outstanding history of the Mughal period, and one of the greatest histories produced in India, is the Akbar-nāma of Abu ’l-Fadl (b. 958/1551-2, d. 1011/1602-3 [q.v.]). It is a detailed description of Akbar’s life and the events of his reign. A complementary work by the same writer, entitled 4īn-i Akbarī, is a statistical study of the administrative, social and cultural conditions of the empire, and includes a section dealing with the religious thought of Akbar. Abu ’l-Fadl’s writings have been criticised for their highly eulogistic description of the author’s patron. Their value, however, lies in the wealth of information they contain regarding Akbar’s period. Moreover, they are written in a style which became a preferred model for subsequent Mughal historians.
biographical genre, pride of place must be assigned to Djahnaghr's Tuzuk-i Djahnaghi, a work composed after his translation of biographies. Djahnaghir wrote the account by himself till the seventeenth year of his reign, after which it was taken up by Muhammad Khan, who described the next two books. The book presents a lively and fascinating picture of Khan, who described the next two years. The book carries accounts of eminent figures and dignitaries. Especially useful for literary purposes are the biographies of poets who were attached to Khan-i Khanan's court and are described by the author on the basis of his personal knowledge.

One of the most valuable books of biographical literature is the Ma'athir al-umara [q.v.] by Abd al-Razazz Awrangzabadi, better known as Shah Nawaz Khan (d. 1171/1758). It is an encyclopaedic work comprising notices on Mughal nobility from Akbar up to the time of the author. The book covers accounts of figures which gained prominence during the Mughal period was ma'qabat or epistolography. Representing the early specimens in this branch of writing are the letters of Abu 'l-Fadl, which are noted for their easy style, different from the stiff and laboured diction of his historical works. The letters of his brother Faydi may also be cited for their simple and straightforward language. In later times, the Persian and the other languages did not conform because of their growing identification with the secretarial profession. Among them, Candra Bhan Brahman (b. 982/1574-5, d. 1073/1663) and Munshi Harkaran occupy a conspicuous place. Brahman was employed as first secretary in the state chancery during Shah Djahnaghi's reign. In addition to his status as a major Hindu poet of Persian, he is also respected for his prose contribution. His letters constitute one of the factors for his reputation as a prose writer. Harkaran also flourished in the time of Shah Djahnaghi. He has left a collection of letters which was used in the schools for instructional purposes. Awrangzib himself was a leader in this literary form, and his letters, of which there exist several collections, are an excellent testimony to his achievement.

The Mughal period witnessed a growth of translation activity directed towards the rendering of Indian literature into Persian. The translation movement, like other literary developments under the Mughals, started during Akbar's time. According to Abu 'l-Fadl, Akbar promoted the translation of Indian works into Persian because he felt that such undertakings would help in dispelling the ignorance which Hindus and Muslims shared towards each other. The works translated during Akbar's reign included the Sanskrit epic Mahabharata (under the Persian title Razm-nama) and Ramayana, the collection of tales entitled Singhad battisi, translated by Badi'uni under the name Namaziji bhroad-arfa, Vyas's Life of Lord Krishna, Tentu Verkesi Horahvam and Atharva Veda. The second important period of translation after Akbar is associated with the name of Dara Shukoh (d. 1069/1659 [q.v.]). The latter's interest in other religions besides Islam prompted him in his translation of fifty Upam尼亚s, to which he gave the title Sirr-i akbar. He is also credited with the translation of Bhagavata Gita, otherwise ascribed to Abu 'l-Fadl. Apart from the translations made by him, there were several works which were translated at his instance. Among them were Gulsar-bah; a translation by Dara's secretary Banwali Dass Wali of the Sanskrit drama Prabhodha Chandra Vidy; and the Persian rendering of Yoga sashifa by a courtier whose name is not recorded.

The dominant style of Mughal prose brings to mind certain resemblances with the prose trends in post-Mongol literature of Persia as represented by works such as Ta'rikh-i Wajisaf by Abu 'l Allah b. Fadl Allah [see wassaf] and Zafar-nama by Sharaf al-Din 'Ali Yazdi [q.v.]. More particularly, it suggests strong similarities with the florid and ornate prose style in Safavid literature. In Mughal writing it appears in its mature form in the histories of Abu 'l-Fadl, which are marked by pompousness and verbosity, and which set a pattern for most histories composed in succeeding periods. However, not everyone chose to favour this style. Among notable exceptions were writers such as Bada'uni, who made use of standard Persian as the medium of his history; Djahnaghir, who adopted a simple and flowing diction for his autobiography; and Dara Shukoh, who employed a direct and unadorned way of writing for his translations and original works.

Bibliography: J. Rypka, History of Iranian literature, Dordrecht 1968; Muhammad 'Abdu'l Ghani, A history of Persian language and literature at the Mughal court, 3 vols., Allahabad 1929-30; Shibl Nu'mani, Shi's al-'urdu, ii, repr. A'zamaghi 1945, v, repr. A'zamaghi 1942; Browne, LHP, iv; P. Chopra, Life and letters under the Mughals, Delhi 1976; Hadi Hasan, Mughal poetry: its cultural and historical value, Hyderabad 1952; Muzaifar Husayn Shamsin, Shi'i Farsi dar Hind u Pakistan, Tehran 1349/1970-1; Nabi Hadi, Muqaddam Dar al-muqaddam, 3 vols., Allahabad 1929-30; Shibli Mu'inni, Shi's al-'urdu, iii, repr. A'zamaghi 1945; Candra Bhan Brahman (b. 982/1574-5, d. 1073/1663) and the Persian rendering of Yoga sashifa by a courtier whose name is not recorded.

The second important period of translation after Akbar is associated with the name of Dara Shukoh (d. 1069/1659 [q.v.]). The latter's interest in other religions besides Islam prompted him in his translation of fifty Upam尼亚s,
the Mughal currency surely deserves to rank as one of the great coinages of the world. Many of the details in Brown's book are now out of date; but this general pronouncement is valid and valuable today. In Brown's book are now out of date; but this general pronouncement is valid and valuable today.

Coins of Timur do not have known to ever have circulated in India—indeed, Timur was more keen on taking coin away from India than bringing it in. But coins of his son Shâhrukh [q.v.] circulated freely in several countries during his forty-eight years' rule (807-55/1404-51), and are fairly well represented in Indian collections; they came to represent a type, and it has been suggested that this refers to the immediate mintless beyond the expression of the extent of his authority—a further precedent for the Mughal mint designation of _urdu_ "camp".

Even before Humayun's defeat and exile, Shîr Khan had assumed the throne in Bengal in 945/1538 as Shâr Shâh Sûrî [q.v.], and immediately set about remodelling the entire currency; since this was the immediate model of Akbar's currency and that of the later Mughals, we must consider it in some detail. From his homeland he would have been familiar with the systems of Bihâr and Bengal, where gold was scarce, billon not used, and cowries often taking the place of the smaller copper pieces; he therefore adopted silver as the standard for his rupee (rupayya = "silver"), of a weight of the familiar Indian _tola_, 11.6638 gms., and an average diameter of 28 mm. His copper coins, called _paise_, were one-fortieth of the rupee, varying in weight with the distance of the mints from the copper mines, from 19.5 to 21.3 gms.; halves, quarters, eighths and sixteenths are also known. The silvers are well-shaped and well-struck, generally with the kalima on the obverse in a square or a circle, with the names of the four Orthodox Caliphs in the margins; the reverse bears Shîr's name and regnal titles, often with an attempt at "Shîr Shâh Shâhî" in the devanagari script, and especially in the case of the later coins) an indication of the mint; over twenty mint-names in the Mughal currency surely deserves to rank as one of the great coinages of the world. Many of the details in Brown's book are now out of date; but this general pronouncement is valid and valuable today. In Brown's book are now out of date; but this general pronouncement is valid and valuable today.
Of Humayun's second regnal period, 962-3/1555-
6, there exist only a small number of specimens of the
coinage in these are now of the standard introduced by
Shir Shah (Whitehead, PMC, p. xlv, remarks that
Agéra is not represented as a mint, but there is a coin
of Humayun's of 963 with the legend durha Agéra in
the author's collection). Akbar's early coinage follows the
same pattern in silver, slightly less in average weight
than Shir Shah's, the obverse usually bearing the
kalima in circle or square, with the names of the
Companions in the resulting margins; the reverse
bears the royal titles Djaldl al-Din Muhammad Akbar,
with the new expressions bddhsh dhzi, date and mint;
 further expressions, in the earlier coinage, may
appear in the margins, which later are dropped. A
similar arrangement holds for the gold coins, usually
of similar weight but smaller diameter. From about
985/1577, though the superscriptions remain much
the same, the square shape is introduced, possibly
inspired by the characteristically square coinage of
Mâlwâ [see Sîkka], as examples are rare from the time
of the pre-Mughal northern coinage, and from about
the same time the legends of both obverse and reverse
may set on a decorative floral background, usually
the arabesque [q. v.], on both round and square coins;
before 992/1583, however, there had been a few coins
in both gold, of a mîlêrd shape. Fractions, normally
uncommon in the collections: half (darbd), quarter (karan),
even tenth and twentieth, the smaller pieces in particular
having been struck for the nîthâr, the silver (sometimes
also gold) coin scattered at processions [see MAW CSRIN];
half-ruppes are especially common from the Kábul
mint.
After Akbar had promulgated his so-called
"infallibility decree" in 987/1579 the superscription
allâhu akbar first appears. Whitehead's comment
(op. cit., p. xx) that "the inference was that Akbar's
person was divine ..." was a difficulty foreseen in
Akbar's own time, and Akbar's own indignant
repudiation of any intention of ambiguity is reported
not only by Abu '1-Fadl but also by the generally
hostile Bâadûnî. See The coin-legend Allâhu Akbar, in
Hodivala, op. cit., 81-92. In Akbar's 29th regnal year,
992/1584, his new lâhî year was founded, its incep-
tion back-dated to 28 Rabî' II 963, the date of his
accession; this was to be a solar year of 12 solar
months, using the Persian names of the old (Sâsânî)
Yazdârdiri era [see TAWRÎN], without intercalation;
the month began when the sun entered each sign of
the zodiac. Synchronization with Hijri dates is not
obvious, but can be determined from references in the
chronicles; see The lâhî era, in Hodivala, op. cit., 11-
40, in which there are copious examples and useful
tables. Lâhî years appear on Akbar's coinage from
year 30, 993/1585, with an expanded superscription
allâhu akbar, gâlîlâ gâlîlahâhu, which from the 36th
year appears on the square gold and silver coins of the
principal mints. At the same time Persian replaces
Arabic on coin legends and in dates. From the 35th
year the month name is also given. The coinage in
gold becomes increasingly frequent, and besides the
common gold piece (muhr, asghaf), of no fixed value
against the rupee but apparently exchanging at
between ten and sixteen times the rupee-value, there
were also 10, 25, 50 and 100-muhr, and even heavier
pieces, struck rather as commemorative medals for
favoured courtiers, or even as ingots for store in the
treasure in circle or square, with the names of the
Companions in the same pattern, which is some confusion in nomenclature with the old lâhî, the "coin of the realm" in the Dîhîl sultanate [see DÂR AL-DÂR and SIKKA], the bând, a goldsmith's weight of
three-elevenths of a lâhî or the lighter jeweller's weight
of one-third lâhî, and small metal pieces called lânkî
issued only in Akbar's last five years from the north-
western mints; it had been thought that these lânkîs
were simply jeweller's weights cast in metal (with mint
and date), but it has been shown that they were cur-
rent in the north-west (especially Kâbul and Kân-
dâhâr) and were introduced to provide fractional
small coinage (see Tânis, in Hodivala, op. cit., 105-
14) (jeweller's weights were regularly of agate).
Akbar introduced also the practice of adornning
some coins (only from three of his mints) with verse-
 couples in Persian. The diversity of mints increased
enormously in Akbar's time, reflecting the expansion of
his empire; silver is known from at least 45 mints,
copper from 51—almost 86 Akbarf mints altogether.
The smaller and less important mints are rather marks of individual mint-masters or
coiners, and their significance seems to be no more
than decorative. The earlier coins of Akbar, with the
kâlima set between the names of the four Companions,
were a frequent source of fakes which were used,
together with genuine coins, as talismans by devout
Muslims. In Abu 'l-Fadl, Aîn-i Akbarî, p. x, there is
an elaborate (but far from conclusive) account of
some of Akbar's coin-types, well summarised in
Abul Fazl's inventory of Akbar's coins, in Hodivala, op. cit.,
41-52.
Djâhângîr was even more of an innovator than his
father, a "prince of moneymakers" in the 11th/17th
century as Muhammad b. Tughluk had been in the
8th/14th, and in his time the Mughal coins reached
their zenith. The floral or arabesque background to
the legends is universal, and verse-couples—some
commonplace, some of no mean poetical value—
became the rule rather than the exception (sometimes
helped by the coincidence that djâhângîr and allâhu
akbar are numerically equal, each = 299 by asghad);
for some time, from the âgrâ and lâhawr mints,
the couplets might be changed every month. His coins
are dated in regnal years, often with the Hijri year as
well. From years 6 to 13 his Âgrâ rupees were struck
in the square and round forms in alternate months;
from year 13 pictorial representations of the signs of
the zodiac replace the month names, on gold as well
as silver. Some pieces, possibly intended as gifts to
favoured courtiers rather than as current coin, bear a
nimbat portrait of Djâhângîr seated, wine-cup in
hand; and between 1033/1624 and 1037/1627 the
name of his empress Nur Djâhân [q. v.] is associated
with his own in some issues. There are many square
silver pieces, struck as nîthâr [q. v.], for scattering
among the populace at weddings, processions and
other public spectacles [see MAWCSRIN], to which
Djâhângîr himself frequently refers in his Tânis; this
seems to have been a pan-Asiatic custom, known in
pre-Muslim India as well as in Iran and Central Asia
(among the Çaghhatays gold and silver almonds,
frontal nuts or tankis, see GULBADAN Begam, HUMAYUN-NAMA, ed. and tr. A.S.
Beveridge, London 1902, text 27, 34, tr. 12, 112).
Refs. to the chronicles in Nîsârî, in Hodivala, op. cit.,
177-85. For the large commemorative pieces see
Gigantic coins, in op. cit., 53-80. Dāhānger’s coppers are well-struck but less innovative, and rarer (there were presumably ample copper coin of previous reigns still in circulation).

ShahJahān’s coinage is profuse, with many minor variations of design; the names of the companions are restored to the obverse, and the reverse frequently bears ShahJahān’s self-confessed title of yābišt-i kārān-i thānī; but the inscription which marked Dāhānger’s coinage is now lacking. Dating is still by regnal (Ilāhī) years as well as Hidjri, verse-couples are frequent, and the new mint ShahJahānabad reflects his new capital in the “Red Fort” in Dīhil.

Awrangzīb’s issues, while well-struck, tend to be monotonous. The reverse of the golds and silvers bears the invariable inscription sana ... djulus-i māznat-i mānās, with mint and regnal year, which becomes the pattern followed by his successors; the number of southern mints increases, as might be expected, with his long years in the Deccan (see 1. History, above). With his reimplication of the dīzāya [q.v.] he struck also a ‘legal dirham’, dirham shar’ī, of about 2.88 gms. in silver (see Whitehead’s note in PMC, ii, 437), in 1090/1679. The “gigantic coins” disappear, but small coin for the nīthār is common.

The later emperors-fainéant maintained the Awrangzīb pattern of coinage without attaining anything of its spirit. Farrukhsīyar, with his long years in the Deccan (see 1. History, above), however, produce from Lāhawr a dirham shar’ī in 1129/1717. But, with the resources of his treasury running low, he adopted the policy of farming out the mints, which proved to be disastrous; and thenceforth the autonomous and semi-independent rulers of the provinces struck their own coin, presumably with the nominal consent of Dīhil; thus the Rājpūt states, after the mid-12th/18th century, especially in silver, were in frank imitation of the Mughal coinage, and since they bear the Mughal emperor’s name it is often difficult to distinguish them except for their poorer quality. (It has been calculated that in the early 19th century there were at least 994 different gold and silver coins current in the country.) Coins in imitation of those of the Mughal emperors were issued, by the British, for some years from Arkat, the French for some years from Arkat, the English from various mints with an invariable regnal year: thus all Banārās coins bear the year 17. From Murshidābād 19, those of Farrukhābād 45, bearing the Mughal emperor’s name but now becoming more European in style and fabric, with the mints having disappeared, but small coin for the nīthār is common.

For the working of the Mughal mints, see Dar al-Darb above.

**Bibliography:** In addition to references in the text (of which Hodivala is fundamental): Catalogues of the Indian Museum, Calcutta; of the Lahore Museum (= Whitehead, op. cit., reissued in Pakistan); of the British Museum; valuable collections in all these museums, also in the Heberden Coin Room of the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford. For Shīr Shāh’s coins: H. N. Wright, The Saluts of Delhi, metropolis of the Muslim Empire, 1936; L. S. Singhal, Mint-town of the Mughal emperors of India (= Memoir iv, Numismatic Society of India), Bombay 1953; idem, Bibliography of Indian numismatics, ii, Muhammadan and later series, Bombay 1952. See also Bibliothèque Nationale (J. Burton-Page).
fig. 1 Ajmer, dargah of Khwāja Mu'in al-Dīn Čīhān, mosque of Akbar, pūjāśa of the prayer hall, 1570s. (Photo: E. Koch, 1985)

fig. 2 Fathpur Sikri, Dūmā Masjīd, prayer hall, c. 976-81/1568-74. (Photo: E. Koch, 1978)
fig. 1 Dīhlī, “Sabz Burdīj”, 1530s–1540s. (Photo: E. Koch, 1976)

fig. 2 Dīhlī, mosque and tomb “Afsarwālā”, 1560s. (Photo: E. Koch, 1980)
Bayāna, Vidjhayamandirgarh Fort, pavilion of Muhammad, dated 940/1533-4. (Photo: E. Koch, 1984)
fig. 1 Ajmer, fort of Akbar, central pavilion, 978-81/1570-3. (Photo: E. Koch, 1985)

fig. 2 Agra Fort, "Amar Singh" Gate (Akbari Darwaza), probably 974/1566-7. (Photo: E. Koch, 1980)
fig. 1 Āgra, Sikandra, tomb of Akbar, dated 1022/1613. (Photo: E. Koch, 1978)

fig. 2 Allāhābād, Khusraw Bāgh, tombs of Shāh Bēgam (d. 1013/1605), of Sulṭān Nīthār Bēgam (1034/1624-5) and of Sulṭān Khusraw (d. 1031/1622). (Photo: E. Koch, 1978)
fig. 1 Shaykhūpūra near Lāhawr, hunting palace, 1015-30/1607-20 and 1043-4/1634-5. (Photo: E. Koch, 1979)

fig. 2 Lāhawr Fort, northern front. (Photo: E. Koch, 1979)
fig. 1 Āgra Fort, eastern front. (Photo: E. Koch, 1979)

fig. 2 Sarā‘i Nūr Mahall, west gate, dated 1028-30/1618-20. (Photo: E. Koch, 1979)
fig. 1 Agra, “Rām Bāgh” (Bāgh-i Nūr Afshān), riverside terrace, northern pavilion, completed in 1030/1621. (Photo: E. Koch, 1982)

fig. 2 Agra Fort, “Mačhī Bhawan”, completed in 1046/1637. (Photo: E. Koch, 1979)
fig. 1 Ágra, Tādj Mahall, 1041-52/1631-43. (Photo: E. Koch, 1978)

fig. 2 Lahawr, Shāhdara, tomb of Djahangîr, 1037-47/1628-38. (Photo: E. Koch, 1979)
fig. 1 Delhi, Dżāmi‘ Masjd, 1060-6/1650-6. (Photo: E. Koch, 1979)

fig. 2 Āgra, Dżāmi‘ Masjid, completed in 1058/1648. (Photo: E. Koch, 1978)
Lāhawr, Bādshāhī Masjid, dated 1084/1673-4. (Photo: E. Koch, 1980)
fig. 1 Dihli, madrasa, mosque and tomb of Ghazi al-Din Khân, early 18th century. (Photo: E. Koch, 1981)

fig. 2 Dihli Fort, mosque of Awrangzib, prayer hall, 1074/1663. (Photo: E. Koch, 1979)
fig. 1 Awrangābād, tomb of Rābiʿa Dawrānī, 1071/1660-1. (Photo: E. Koch, 1982)

fig. 2 Dihli, tomb of Šādkar Djang, 1167/1753-4. (Photo: E. Koch, 1986)
Khurram (later Shāh Djahān) takes leave of Djiāṅgīr (1613). Bālfand in Pādshāh-nāma of Lāhawrī, 1067/1656-7. HB 149, 43b (86). The Royal Library, Windsor Castle. By gracious permission of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.
science and foreknowledge of all aspects of nature and human activity (cf. H. Ringgren, *Studies in Arabian science and foreknowledge of all aspects of nature and human activity* [XXXI, 34: the hour of the Last Judgment [see AL-SA’A’]; when rain will be sent down; what is in the womb (i.e. the sex and number of children); what a man will gain, of his sustenance, on the morrow; and when a man shall die.*


---

**AL-MUGHIRA B. SA’ID**

**AL-MUGHIRA B. SHU’BA**, Abi ‘Abd Allah al-Thakfi, Companion of the Prophet who exercised various political functions under the Patriarchial Caliphs and the early Umayyads.

He belonged to the Ablaf section of the Thakif, and was a member of the clan of the Banu Mu’tattu, guardians of the sanctuary of the shrine of al-Lat [*q. v.*] in al-Ta’if, and of the sanctuary of al-Lat in Kufa. His slave Abu Lu’lu’a [*q. v.*], who lived in Medina, assassinated the caliph *Umair*. Under ‘Uthman, al-Mughira retired to private life. In the year 40/660, taking advantage of the Al-Hadr conference of Adhruh [al-Turk, who were a continual threat to the sovereignty of the Umayyad dynasty; he was solely concerned with keeping on the right side of the sagacious Mu’awiyah. The sudden rising of the Kharijite leader al-Mustawrid failed to disturb his equanimity. With remarkable cleverness, he was able to let loose against these rebels their born enemies, “the fine flower of the Shi’ah”. Whichever was victorious, it could not fail to lighten his responsibilities. By setting them against one another he rendered harmless the most dangerous elements of disorder in his province. The crushing of the Kharijites enabled him to breathe freely.

Thanks to this combination of mildness and astuteness, and by knowing when to shut his eyes, al-Mughira succeeded in avoiding desperate measures against the people of ‘Irak, who were a continual source of trouble, and succeeded in retaining his position. But his fame was marred and his career temporarily interrupted by the plan of proclaiming Yazid heir-apparent. As the general situation had considerably improved in ‘Irak and order prevailed, on the surface at least, the caliph left him in office till his death, the date of which is uncertain but which must be placed between 48 and 51 (668-71). Al-Mughira died of the plague at the age of about 70.


**AL-MUGHIRIYYA**, extremist Shi’iTec named after its founder Al-Mughira b. Sa’id b. Badjali, a *mawla* of Khâlid al-Kasi, governor of ‘Irak (105-20/724-38). Since Khâlid al-Kasi was a member of Badjali, al-Mughira is also called a *mawla* of this Southern Arab tribe. Descriptions of him as a member of the Banu ‘Idji are probably the result of a confusion with another extremist Shi’iT heresiar, Abu Mansur al-‘Idji [see MANSURIYYA].

Al-Mughira is described as an old and blind man practising magic and jugglery about the time of his revolt in Kufa in 119/737. He was a follower of the
Husaynid Muhammad al-Bakir until the latter's death ca. 1171/735 and is accused of having ascribed extremist doctrine to him. After al-Bakir's death he backed the belief that the Husaynid Muhammad b. 'Abd Allâh (al-Naf's al-Zakiyya) [g.e.] would come forth as the Mahdî. It was evidently at this time that Muhammad's father 'Abd Allâh b. al-Hasan b. al-Hasan began secretly to foster expectations that his son would be the expected Mahdî, his name and father's name matching those of the Prophet, his ancestor. As Muhammad b. 'Abd Allâh went into concealment from the authorities, the Mughîriyya claimed that he was alive hiding in a mountain called al-Tamiyya located east of the route from al-Hâdjîr to Mecca. Until his appearance as the Mahdî, al-Mughîra taught, the imâmât of the 'Alîs lapsed and he, al-Mughîra, was the imâm. As in his extremist doctrine he elevated the rank of the 'Alîd imâmâ into divinity, he claimed prophethood and taught that Muhammad b. 'Abd Allâh had given him from his mouth the holy spirit with which he was able to bring the dead alive and to heal the blind and the leper.

The circumstances of the revolt of al-Mughîra reported in the sources are puzzling, since he is said to have had only six or seven companions, yet Kâlid al-Kâstî is described as greatly frightened by the news. Al-Mughîra's relationship with Bayân b. Salhatat b. Muhammad b. 'Umar al-Alînî is described as having lasted the same time, or just before him, is also obscure. According to most accounts, al-Mughîra was put to death by the governor for his extremist teaching rather than for sedition. His body was exhibited on a cross at the Kantrarât al-'Aghir in Wâsît.

According to the Sunni sources, the Mughîriyya recognized Dâhir al-Djufî [g.e.] as the al-Mughîra's successor, and after his death ca. 1200/745-6, Bakr al-'Awar al-Haḍârî al-Kattât. The Imâmî sources consider Dâhir al-Djufî a loyal follower of the Imâm Dâ'far al-Sâdiq, and Sa'd b. 'Abd Allâh describes Bakr al-Kattât as the immediate successor of al-Mughîra. When the Mughîriyya later discovered that Bakr had been lying to them and was enriching himself at their expense, they deposed him and reconstituted the Sunna of the Mughîriyya. 'Abd Allâh cheated them of their money, is probably mistaken.

After the failure of the revolt of Muhammad b. 'Abd Allâh and his death in 1457/762, some of the Mughîriyya claimed that he had been a devil who had taken the shape of Muhammad and that the real Muhammad would still rise and rule the world. Others accepted his death and did not recognise an imâm after him. The sect seems to have disintegrated soon after his death. The reliability of a report of Sa'd b. 'Abd Allâh about a sect of the Mughîriyya called al-Mahdîyya who recognised Muhammad b. al-Hanâfiyya as the Mahdî is open to doubt.

In the Mughîriyya's gnostic doctrine (which, he claimed, was based on his knowledge of God's Greatest Name, which, it is claimed, is allegorical interpretation of the Qur'ân), God was described in human shape with members in the number and form of the letters of the Arabic alphabet. When God wanted to create the world, He spoke His Greatest Name which fell on His head as His crown. He wrote the acts of obedience and disobedience of mankind on His palm. As He grew angry about the acts of disobedience, His sweat produced two seas, one dark and the other bright and sweet. When He saw the sun from the eye of His shadow and wiped out the salty, and the other bright and sweet. When He saw the sun from the eye of His shadow and wiped out the
established in their principality, and the area was fully incorporated into the Ottoman Empire only under Murad II (824-48, 850-5/1421-44, 1446-51). The oldest Ottoman tax register, the akcesihddriyye, was compiled in 913/1507, and another one covering the province (sandjak) of Menteşe was compiled under Bayezid II (886-94, 906-13/1481-1512). According to this document, the townspeople paid 4370 m嗳 as tax. In the year 923/1517 another tax register covering the province (sandjak) of Menteşe was compiled, which records 591 adult males resident in Mughla. About one-quarter of the town's taxpayers were probably recent immigrants from the countryside or were still engaged in agriculture even though resident in Mughla, for in addition to their names, the register records whether they possessed farm land as nih cift holders, bennak or kara(dj)ab. This practice was normal in villages, but inapplicable to fully fledged towns. Mughla was an administrative centre with a strong agricultural component, and has continued as a semi-agricultural market town down to the present day.

The town's most prominent inhabitant of the 10th/16th century was doubtless the lexicographer and Mawladi dervish Şahidi, who was a follower of Diwane Mehmed Celebi. The latter was a descendant of Mawlana Djalal al-Din Rumi [q. v.] and an active propagator of mysticism. Diwane Mehmed Celebi [q. v.] and his Mughla disciple belonged to the anatolian, enthusiastic tradition within the order, and Diwane Mehmed Celebi travelled widely throughout Anatolia. Şahidi ultimately returned to his native town where he probably wrote the Gulshen-i asrdr, containing both his master's biography as well as his own (915/1509). He died in 957/1550. In the uski sections of various 10th/16th century registers, the şahidi was noted as the owner of a house attached to another of Mughla's mosques, as his adherents had made many donations to this sanctuary. Most of the donors gave a shop or else a small sum of money to be lent out at interest. Most of these donations were probably artizans, but the şahidi, who was a disciple of Şaykh Wefa (d. 896/1490-1) had also gained the support of powerful men, who were impressed by the şahidi's meetings which he organised. Şahidi had his reservations concerning the worldly successes of Şaykh Bedr al-Din, but admits that for a while, he was his disciple.

Even though Mughla was remote from the more important caravan routes of the 10th/16th and 11th/17th centuries, the town benefited from lively regional trade. Thus Mughla's most substantial pious foundation, the mosque, madrasa and school founded by Hâdisi Muslihi al-Din, was financed by 220 shops located in the Menteşe village of Mevesi. Some of these were used as storage places for salt from a nearby salt pan. In the neighbouring town of Ula, Hâdisi Muslihi al-Din's foundation also received revenues from a hundred shops. Even though most of these shops were probably in use only for a limited number of weeks over a year, trade in the province was likely enough to warrant the construction of a fıstak in the market village of Yerkeşi near Mughla.

Probably as a result of this activity, the population of the town increased toward the end of the 10th/16th century. While the taxpaying population of Mughla had been 591 in 923/1517 and 474 in 970/1562-3, in 991/1583-90, the number of tax exempt residents was probably low. 10th/16th century Mughla must have been inhabited by only a few thousand people. Ewliya Celebi, who visited Mughla in 1083/1672, records 2,170 houses corresponding to about 10,000 inhabitants. But it is difficult to explain how this increase should have come about during the troubled conditions of the Djalal [q. v. in Suppl.] rebellions. Ewliya does not mention any craft industries, and the town did not possess a covered market, the "status symbol" of important Ottoman towns. Eleven primary schools and seven madrasas show Mughla to have been more active on the cultural level than warranted by its size and economic importance.

In the 19th and 20th centuries, Mughla experienced but limited growth: in 1903 population amounted to 10,215. The 1927 census, which followed upon a decade of war and the 1923 exchange of Greek and Turkish minorities, again showed a population of slightly over 10,000. Even in 1970, Mughla contained but 18,624 inhabitants (1975, 24,178; 1980, slightly over 27,000). Apart from 1923, the city experienced no drastic population change, and the twenty families who make up the local elite also changed but gradually. Thus the "traditional" fabric of old-style residential areas was preserved, along with the urban innovations which Istanbul-appointed bureaucrats and wealthy minority merchants had introduced during the second half of the 19th century: houses with decorative façades oriented toward streets suitable for wheeled traffic, pre-planned squares and neighbourhoods, barracks, a clock-tower, elaborate school buildings and increased facilities for buying and selling. The entire core area of Mughla was declared an historical monument in 1984, and the touristic potential of Mughla province as a whole has encouraged conservation and restoration in the town. Down into the 1960s and beyond, Mughla craftsmen survived due to poor roads, which allowed locally tanned leather and cotton and silk goods manufactured by small workshops and large factories to become a major export. However, by the early 1970s, tobacco and later cotton cultivation led to an increase in the price of labour. Family farms proved more effective, and most large landowners sold out and invested the proceeds in trade and communications. Many of these ex-landowners moved out of Mughla, and the new local elite was more commercially oriented than its predecessor. This process was speeded up by the infrastructural investment of the 1950s. Grain cultivation receded, as more rapid means of communication encouraged the growing of fruit and vegetables for the large cities of Turkey. Olive cultivation expanded, particularly since Turkish law encourages the transformation of wild olive trees into cultivated ones by transferring trees newly made productive into the private property of the grafter. However, gaps in this law have allowed the alienation of coastal land for "wild" development as hotels and summer camps.

Due to inland location, Mughla has had only a limited share of the new investment opportunities characteristic of the coastal areas, and much urban activity is generated by the town's role as a provincial capital and educational centre; from 1982 onward,
Mugla has housed an extension of the Izmir-based Dokuz Eylül Universitesi. Thus Mugla, in spite of its small size and relative isolation, is very open toward improved educational standards and the political climate resembles the latter more closely than is true of many other towns in this size category.


MUHADDIT [see HADITH].

MUHADDIR (a.), literally, "one who migrates", has been applied to various groups in the course of Islamic history.

1. In earliest Islam. See for this HUĐRA and MUHADDIRUN.

2. In Turkey and the Ottoman lands. The function of the Turkish heartlands of Anatolia and Thrace as the refuge of Islam, İslâm-pendh, became significant as Ottoman power declined and the Muslim populations of outlying territories became exposed to the imposition of unfavourable Christian administrations, notably through Russian expansion and national movements in the Balkans. The term muhaddîj/muhacir continued to be used for refugees and the victims of the population exchanges in the early years of the Republic, but by 1933 was recommended for replacement by the neologism göm, which is free of religious associations and more appropriate to the new state. In effect, however, the association between Islam and Turkishness, and thence with Muslim refugees from Afghanistan accepted in 1982 (the proposed neologism sığınik failed to be accepted). Earlier movements into the provinces of the Ottoman Empire reflect the progressive loss of influence in former vassal states and allied regions. After the Russian invasion of the Crimea in 1165/1771 and the treaty of Küçük Kaynardja [q.v.] in 1188/1774, an exodus of both Crimean Turks and Tatars began despite guarantees of the sultan’s continuing religious authority in the region. This was primarily to Ottoman territory west of the Black Sea, notably the Dobruja [q.v.] at the Danube delta and the valley of the Danube itself, and the Tundja and Maritsa [see MERDİT] valleys further south, the Tatars had helped founded colonies there from 1603 onwards and were thus able to exploit their links in that direction. From an estimated population of 300,000, the Russian governor concluded that half had left between 1772 and 1783 (Fisher, in Bíbh., 75), and according to Pallas, 80,000 left in 1783 alone (Kløy, in Bíbh., 1974, 101). Following the adoption of the Crimea as a Russian province in 1783, many of the leading families and the deposed khan left with 8,000 more in 1783-4, and records at the Bâb-i Âli show a total of 180,000 as having taken refuge by 1790, or 300,000 by 1800 (Kløy, 101, citing Seidahmet, and Gözaydın, in Bíbh., 71). Poemkin had in fact ordered all local “Tatars” from the mountains and steppe to be expelled in 1784 (A. Özeren, Toplumyapisi arastirmalar: Yerkesik, İstanbul 1973; P. Wittek, Descriptive et raisonne de l’Asie Mineure, 4 vols., Paris 1830-7, viii, 5847-5975; Ekrem Uykucu, Tarihi, Istanbul 1983; Suraiya Faroqhi, Muğla, an Anatolian town, Istanbul 1974, famous Hanafi scholar who occupied the chair of the Prophet’s wife[^2]. About 100 works are attributed to him, the most important of which are the Suhaylî’s Tarih ifinde Mugla, an Anatolian town, which contains papers by Necva Akcura, Sevgi Aktiire, Omur Bakirer, Sevim Buluc, Suraiya Faroqhi, Sevin Osmary and other scholars. The term was in turn replaced by the neologism sığınik, which is free of religious associations and more appropriate to the new state.
only in 1860, when a further 100,000 had left. According to official sources, another 141,667 emigrated in 1860-2, and 18,000 to 20,000 in 1891-3 (Gözaydın, 93). Gasparrell İsmail Bey suggests a total exodus of a million or more by the beginning of this century. In 1944 the remaining Muslims were deported to Uzbekistan and elsewhere in Central Asia, and despite their rehabilitation they have not been allowed back. Russian annexation of the Kuban steppes also affected the Noghay q.v., who ranged the pastures there and north of the Crimea. Initially, figures for emigration are combined with those for the Crimea. For the period immediately after the Crimean War they vary: according to Pinson (in Bibli., 109), 210,000 to 230,000 left in 1855-62; according to Planhol (in Bibli., 258), 100,000 in 1859-64; to Bennigsen (in Bibl., 195), 46,000 in 1859-63; and to Gasparrell İsmail Bey, 231,177 in 1860-2 from official sources (in Bibli., 706-13). Both Noghay and Crimean Turks were dislocated from the Dobrudja by the Ottoman-Russian war of 1293-5/1857-8, so that some 10,000 had left northern Dobrudja alone in 1880-90, seeking refuge in inner Rumeli or Anatolia, though two out of three remained (Gözaydın, 97). The Ottoman government settled the refugees either in still poorly populated areas or where their presence might provide a stabilising influence on newly-settled nomads. Groups of Noghay families were allocated to series of tribal settlements in the Ceyhan area in 1272/1855, only 50 to 60 households still remain; the rest either migrated elsewhere, or perished from a combination of bad water, malaria, or an inability to adapt to a hot, moist climate (Soysal, in Bibli., 56, 60; cf. Eberhard, in Bibli., 300). A similar fate awaited 90 families who founded Noghaylar village north of İlahtı, though a group of villages founded between 1275-1322/1858-1904 at sites chosen by the Noghay themselves northwest of the Tuz Gölü still survives. The Crimeans settled mainly in western or central Anatolia, starting from Eskişehir, where 8-10 Tatar villages were founded before 1860 and 14 more ca. 1877. They too had difficulties in adapting to new conditions, though the intelligentsia quickly established a Noghay press, though the group of villages founded between 1275-1322/1858-1904 at sites chosen by the Noghay themselves northwest of the Tuz Gölü still survives. The Crimeans settled mainly in western or central Anatolia, starting from Eskişehir, where 8-10 Tatar villages were founded before 1860 and 14 more ca. 1877. They too had difficulties in adapting to new conditions, though the intelligentsia quickly established a Noghay press.
Kayseri and Erzurum. Groups of Ingush are reported in the towns of Beyşehir and Muş. Refugees from Georgia [see above], who fled the war from the neighbourhood of Batumi and Ingilo from the east, migrated after thecession of Batumi to Russia in 1878, for fear of anti-Muslim reprisals; these were in fact realised after the Turkish raid on Batumi in 1915, when only 13% of the Georgians in the Çoruh valley are said to have survived. 52,000 formerly lived here, whereas the number of Georgian speakers listed in the 1965 census for Arvin province (though probably a marked undercount, like other figures for minority languages in Turkey) was only 7,698. Sizeable Georgian populations are listed by language for Ordu province (4,815), Sakarya (4,535), Bursa (2,938), Kocaeli (2,755), Samsun (2,350), Giresun (2,029), Bolu, Amasya, Balıkesir and Sinop, thus demonstrating a tendency to spread along the Black Sea coast to the western provinces. The Georgian language is still quite widely used, but the Haneef community is so closely integrated with the Turkish majority that Magarella (see Bibl., 1979, 116) has referred to their "partial ethnic identity". As with the Circassians, almost all are bilingual. The full number may be over 80,000. Migrants from Dağlıstan [q.v.] include Avars, Lak, Dargwa and Lezghi, all speaking Caucasian languages, and the Turk-speaking Kumaks, or Karabaks [q.v.] (see above). Lezghi is now spoken by about 85,000 and later (1874, 1892), and is now distributed in the provinces of Balıkesir (1842), Denizli (942), Tokat (904) and Istanbul (753) with smaller numbers elsewhere, to a total of 5,225 in the 39 provinces surveyed by Aydemir (loc. cit.) in 1973. The recognition of the particular ethnoecua is complicated by the use of Lezgi in Turkish to denote all Daghistanis; Moor (in Bibl., xxii) has recently (1985) found that of those listed, only two villages in Balıkesir and one in İzmir were true Lezghi, the others being Avar, Dargwa, Dido and Bakı. As with other minorities, exposure to education in Turkish and the media from the outside world is now threatening the use of these languages among the younger generation, though for many adults they are still the norm for ordinary conversation. A small number, especially in the Agrarian region of Kırıkkale and the southern part of this population has subsequently migrated to the cities. The total immigration from Bulgaria in 1923-80 reached 488,000. After a campaign of enforced assimilation from 1984, the Bulgarian government again resorted to mass expulsion and the restoration of rights to the value of their former property and to the transfer of funds. From 1925-30 about 10,000 arrived from Bulgaria annually. The depression caused the flow to fall to ca. 1,400 a year from 1930-3, but it rose again to 24,968 in 1935, 20,542 in 1938 and 17,777 in 1939. The Second World War led to an abrupt decline to a minimum of 631 in 1945 (Kostanick, in Bibl., 89-109, tab. 9 and fig. 1). From 1946-50 the Communist government was able to promise emigration to foreign countries, but below 2,000 a year, and in 1950 it took advantage of the Muslim's resistance to collectivism of property, especially in the Dobruja, and to assimilation by announcing on 12 August that 250,000 persons of Turkish descent would be expelled within 3 months; the immigrants registered rose to 52,185 with 102,208 in 1951. The Turks closed the border on 8 October because, for the second time, the Bulgarians had sought to expel Gypsies among the Turks. Under the legislation of 1934, Turkish immigrants received a two-roomed house, a stable, one decare of garden and 15-20 decares of farmland, with a year's supply of food, seed and fodder. Those arriving before 1940 were settled in the provinces of İzmir, Manisa, Aydın, Diyarbakır, Niğde and Sivas. The wave of 1950-1, recognised by Turkey as deportative, rather than the agreed voluntary emigration, and enforced without observance of the Conventions, was accommodated under amendments of 1947 and 1953, distributing land according to its quality, though in practice the provisions could not be fulfilled, some families receiving only 2 decares. By March 1953 853,812 decares had been allotted to 16,542 families, and some 25,000 houses built for them; the majority were settled in existing villages, though about 50 new ones were built. Göçmen were given full title to the land on condition that they should not sell it for 25 years. Almost half were allocated to the Marmara region, a quarter to central Anatolia, a sixth to the Aegean and the remainder mostly to the north; a few were sent to Erzincan, Elazığ and Malatya, but none further east lest security be impaired. Some $11 million aid was received from international sources. Much of the rural part of this population has subsequently migrated to the cities. The total immigration from Bulgaria in 1923-80 reached 488,000. After a campaign of enforced assimilation from 1984, the Bulgarian government again resorted to mass expulsion in June 1989, without regard to legal rights; by 20 August, when Turkey halted the flow, the numbers had reached 300,000. The strain placed on Turkish resources, depressed economic conditions in Turkey, and the restoration of rights to Bulgarian Turks on 12 January 1990, led to the return of 100,000 by mid-February.
The population exchange arranged with Greece, already initiated in 1914 on the basis of religion, resulted in about 400,000 Muslims coming to Turkey between 1921-8, of whom 355,635 were transferred compulsorily from Greek Macedonia and Epirus in 1923-4 after the Convention of 30 January 1923 signed at Lausanne. In Turkish statistics, all immigrants from the Balkans were then treated as one, totalling 463,534 in 1921-8; these include elements from Rumania and Yugoslavia besides Bulgaria. The immigrants were settled primarily on property abandoned by Greeks who had fled, that is, in Turkish Thrace (33%), the Marmara and Aegean regions (36%), the Mediterranean region (4%) and the province of Samsun (5%). This pattern of preference remains valid for the period 1923-60 as a whole, when migrants from Greece formed 33.9% of the total, from Bulgaria 31.1%, from Yugoslavia 22.4% and from Rumania 10%. A small flow continued from Western Thrace, exempt from the exchange, amounting to 7,753 in 1949-50 and 11,797 in 1950-8. The new communities often preserved language differences; thus in 1965 the census registered 27,226 speaking Bulgarian (Pomaks) and 51,452 speaking Serbo-Croat (from Bosnia and Serbia) as their mother tongue (almost certainly an undercount); they often remained religiously more conservative than the native population of Turkey. Even today, such Muhacir villages are readily identified and in some cases remain largely independent of their neighbours.

The presence of a Şhi'î Azeri minority in extreme eastern Anatolia is mainly attributable to the population exchanges of 1918-25, when they were expelled from the Armenian Republic: 25,000 arrived in Kars, especially in Igdir sub-province, and others settled in Ağrı, Taşçay sub-province, and Erzurum, Şenkaya, Karapapak [q.v.] now living in Kars, Çıldır and Arpaçay sub-provinces, and in scattered villages elsewhere, came in part after the Treaty of Rızkemey in 1928, in part in 1940 (ca. 100 households) and in part in 1921, after the Treaty of Ġumru. Von Hellwald reported the presence of 29,000 on Ottoman territory already in 1878.

The first group of Türkistanis to seek refuge came, in fact, from Tobolsk in Siberia: the descendants of two Özbek sayyids who had gone there in the 10th/16th century to promulgate Islam, they found that under increasing cultural pressure from Russia they could no longer fulfill this purpose, and about 100 families left their villages for the Ottoman lands in 1907, 30 more families joining them later. These Özbek-Tatars live in the single village of Bögrüdelik (Reşadiye/Özbek) in Konya, where they still speak their adopted Tatar dialect, maintain 90% endogamy, and retain their own traditions of music and verse. About 700 Uygurs now live in Istanbul (Safraköy and Ömerhane), Adana, İzmir and Kayseri (Yeni mahalle); they came from Sinkiang via Pakistan in the 1950s, with a second group via Afghanistan in 1968. Kazaks from the USSR first escaped via Afghanistan in 1952; the settlement allotted them at Ceylan Pınar in Urfa was unsuitable and they dispersed. Of the 15,000 Orta Dzhiz Kazak who resisted the Communist take-over in Sinkiang from 1949, 350 succeeded in traversing the 4,000 km across the Tashkaman Desert and Tibet to Kashmir; there they remained from 1951-4, when they were accepted by Turkey as a group, with a remnant joining them in 1969. Some 600 families of the Kerey tribe, 65 of the Nayan and 15 Üwak now live mainly in Istanbul (420 households), where they have established communities at Küçükçekmece, Zeytinburnu, Güneşteşsi (Kazakkent) and Safraköy, in Manisa (60) and at Altay Köyü in Niğde (65) (figures for 1980). Land granted to them in Kayseri proved infertile, and the groups there moved to Istanbul. Group consciousness remains strong and is recognisable in the communal choice of work in the leather crafts, where they now predominate, and the plastics industry. Lineage and language are still important, and efforts are made to resist acculturation. A third group of 70 households of the Kishi Dzhiz arrived from Afghanistan via Pakistan in 1982 and are now in Kayseri city. Some 20 households of Kırğız were already established in 1980, most of them (12) at Aünköy in Şereflikoçhisar, Ankara. 310 families of the Teýt Kırğız from the Wàghàn Corridor who had fled to Gilgit following the Russian invasion in 1978 were accepted by Turkey in 1982 on their own condition that they should remain together as a group in a highland region (having previously been refused access to Alaska). They were transferred to Karagündüz Köy northeast of Lake Van, and subsequently to a settlement near Erçiş in 1986. Another group of 1,300 people is reported in Malatya. Their identity, derived from a single descent group, the Ickilik, is maintained by the presence of their İkân Rahmân Kul, though it is noteworthy that they broke away from the main group as a result of their having sold other possessions at Gilgit. The majority of the 4,351 Türkic refugees from Afghanistan to be granted asylum by President Evren in 1982 were Özbek. Some 280 families were already settled in Istanbul, and 50 in Adana in 1980; the new arrivals now reported as being in Hatay (172 households), and in rural Urfa (180 persons), with 60 families in industrial Gaziantep. Among the remainder was a relatively small group of Türkmen, mostly Ênars, of whom 75 families are in Tokat city and 120 in a nearby rural settlement (Franz, in Bibl., 67).

Migrants to Turkey are now treated in two categories: serbest gümên or independent immigrants, arriving on their own, and İkân gümên or immigrants to be settled through official assistance, usually brought in by groups. After a long period of only loosely organised official activity, a Ministry of Reconstruction, Exchange and Settlement was established in 1913, to be superseded by a Ministry of Reconstruction, Employment and Settlement to deal with the new conditions in 1923. In 1924 the responsibilities were transferred to the Ministry of the Interior, in a Department of Settlement, subsequently to the Ministry of Health and Hygiene, and then to the Ministry of Agriculture. In 1950 a General Department of Land and Settlement Affairs (Toprak ve İkân İşleri Genel Müdürlüğü) was formed under the Ministry of Works and Settlement (İmar ve İkân Bakanlığı). It was the latter which dealt with the first influx from Bulgaria, at first in cooperation with other ministries and later under the direct supervision of the Prime Minister's office; the processing of migrants was expedited by the Government's allowance of direct aid for a maximum of 27 days. Those settling with Government assistance were bound to settle where directed, whereas others were free. Under the legislation of 1934, non-Turkish immigrants were also bound to settle where directed, and were not allowed to form communities or associations of their own ethos. The planned integration of immigrants has remained a matter primarily for those of Türkic speech and Muslim religion. At present, it is not possible that many of those from even the earliest arrivals retain a discrete identity to this day.
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and had fixed Sunday as the Muslim day of prayer. Since many of the muhadjirun placed implicit faith in the pronouncements of their marajah [q.v.], they were easily convinced of the need to save their religion as well as their souls by undertaking hijra.

At the same time, many of the muhadjirun had little to lose by uprooting themselves. The vast majority of the 30,000 or so who made their way towards the Afghan border were poor cultivators or landless agricultural labourers. Amir Amán Allah of Afghanistan [q.v. in Suppl.], who regarded the hijra as an excellent opportunity to hasten the British (with whom he was on bad terms), promised the muhadjirin free land together with anything else which they might need. Thus, while the migrants were inspired by faith, many were also motivated by hopes of a better life. They sold what property they did possess in order to finance the journey and were helped by funds collected from Muslims who stayed behind.

The hijra, however, ran out of steam. This was due in large part to the bad treatment which many migrants suffered both on their journey and after their arrival in Afghanistan. When the first batch arrived they did not receive the warm welcome which they had been expecting. Rather, they were greeted by harassment from local Afghan marauders who stole their property and kidnapped their women. In addition, it became clear that the Afghan government intended a future for the migrants towards which. Once it learnt that the migrants were made up of the poorest elements of Indian Muslim society, it quickly lost enthusiasm for the enterprise and prevented any more muhadjirin from crossing the border. Those who had already arrived received little help, and, possessing no resources of their own, were forced to return to India. The trek back was very difficult and great hardship was suffered. Within three months, nearly all had left Afghanistan.

The second migration followed the partition of British India in 1947 when millions of Muslims made their way to the new state of Pakistan, afraid of what the future might hold for them in an independent India under Hindu majority rule. For some, migration was the logical outcome of their support for Muslim separatist politics and the demand for Pakistan; for many others, it was motivated by self-preservation and the desire to escape the wave of communal violence which swept through large parts of northern India at the time of Partition.

Approximately seven million Muslims had migrated to Pakistan by the time of the 1951 census, but the process continued at a reduced rate well into the 1960s. The vast majority of migrants were peasants or agricultural workers, mostly from East Panjab, while a significant minority were urban-based industrialists, hailed from Gujrat and the area around Bombay. Thus, taken as a whole, these new arrivals were by no means an homogeneous group.

The bulk of the migrants settled in West Pakistan, attracted by its sparsely populated and expanding irrigation lands and by the presence of the country's capital at Karachi. They became concentrated in irrigated areas of southern Panjab and Sind, such as Sukkur and Canon, and in larger urban centres such as Karachi and Hyderabad where better prospects for ready employment existed. But as the economic impact of the migrants was felt more keenly, locals resented their demands for food, homes, jobs and land. Competition increased, differences in language and culture assumed greater importance and mutual resentment began to replace the Sunder feelings.

In the Punjab, these differences were greatly reduced by the fact that most of the migrants who had settled there were themselves Punjabis; for Urdu-speakers, the group which came to be most popularly identified as muhadjirs, it was a different story. Over a million of them settled in Sind, where differences between their own cultural traditions and those of the local Sindhi population helped to create a rift between the two communities. Whereas Sindhis resented what they saw as the preferential treatment of refugees, muhadjirs regarded it as just compensation for what they had left behind in India. There were, of course, some groups of muhadjirs who did relatively well in their new home: landlords from India used their influence to secure properties often larger than the ones they had owned in India; government officials often improved their rank and seniority; and graduates were able to secure employment relatively easily. But the bulk of migrants remained socially and economically insecure well into the 1950s. So-called settlement programmes proved inadequate, haphazard and badly-managed: as late as 1953, over half a million refugees were without proper shelter in Karachi. Some 600,000 left Pakistan in the 1960s, with the extension of the canal system, the establishment of new colonies and satellite towns, and the growth of industry that refugee labour was gradually absorbed.

Many refugee associations sprang up to safeguard muhadjir interests, such as the All-Pakistan Mohajir Board, the All-Pakistan Muhajir Federation and the Muhajir Council which was organised by the Muslim League. One of their major grievances was the "usurping" of eviction property by influential locals which seemed to be confirmed in a presidential ordinance in November 1956. Bitter protests followed, and in March 1958 a bill was passed by the National Assembly which enabled the central government to acquire eviction property and dispose of it at the prevailing market value, giving refugee claimants preference over other bidders and placing the proceeds in refugee compensation pools. The following September, a second bill gave refugees proprietary rights to evacuate land and provided for the punishment of illegal holders.

During the 1960s, muhadjirs as a group became economically stronger. Pakistan's new industrial elite, for instance, was composed mainly of muhadjir and Panjabi interests. Similarly, ethnic biases crept into civil service recruitment and resulted in the development of a muhadjir-Panjabi bureaucratic élite which caused resentment along ethnic lines especially amongst Bengalis and, to a lesser extent, Sindhis. With the creation of Bangladesh in 1971, Sind became the main arena for clashes between muhadjir and non-muhadjir groups. In July 1972, following the successful passage through the Sind Assembly of a Language Bill which made Sindhi rather than Urdu the official language of the province, latent discontent burst into violence. On the one hand, Sindhis regarded muhadjir demands for the recognition of Urdu as symbolic of their determination to hold on to vested interests which they had acquired in the economic life of the province's urban areas. On the other hand, muhadjirs saw in the rejection of Urdu the negation of their identity and the sacrifices which they had made by migrating to Pakistan in the first place.

Demonstrations and riots took place, and demands
were made for a separate muhadjir-dominated Karachi province. Religio-political parties such as the Djamā'at-i Islāmi, which had gained strong support amongst muhadjirs, played a leading role in the unrest.

Under these circumstances, the government compromised by agreeing to a twelve-year period of grace in which Urdu-speakers could learn Sindhi. But resentment among muhadjir groups continued to be fuelled by the introduction and maintenance of quotas for education and employment which favoured candidates from rural, that is predominantly Sindhi, backgrounds, and disadvantaged those mainly Urdu-speaking towns and cities of the province.

The 1980s have seen the resurgence of provincial nationalism and the emergence of new political organisations representing particular ethnic interests. Muhadjirs have also begun to transfer their support from parties which have traditionally backed the concept of a common Pakistani identity to others such as the Muhadjir Quami Mahaz which place the interests of muhadjirs as a distinct ethnic group highest on their agenda. In the present climate of resentment against the Panjabi domination, muhadjir organisations have gone some way towards patching up their differences with Sindhi and Baluchi ethnic groups and are now concentrating their resentment against those whom all regard as the real "intruders" in Sind.


AL-MUHADJIRUN (A.), the Emigrants, are primarily those Meccan Muslims who made the hidjra or emigration from Mecca to Medina either just before Muhammad himself or in the period up to the conquest of Mecca in 8/630. The word hidjra [q.v.] implies not only change of residence but also the ending of ties of kinship and the replacement of these by new relationships. In the document known as the Constitution of Medina (Ibn Hisham, 341-4), which was in force for a time. The number of Emigrants in Medina continued to be added to. Especially after the failure of the siege of Medina in 5/627, men and women from Mecca went to settle in Medina. Some had been believers for a number of years, but had remained in Mecca when Muhammad made his hidjra. Others, like Khālid b. al-Walid and 'Amr b. al-'As, decided to throw in their lot with Muhammad when they saw his increasing prosperity and the declining prospects for Mecca. When men from nomadic tribes became Muslims, they were given a choice between the nomadic pledge (bay'a zubayya) and the pledge of emigration (bay'a hidjra); in the former case they remained with their tribe, while in the latter they settled in Medina and became muhadjirun. Muhammad encouraged these last because they increased the strength and importance of his "clan" of Emigrants and also provided additional participants for the raiding expeditions which were a prominent part of his policy.

In course of time, to be a muhadjir conferred a certain dignity of status. When the Muslims who had taken refuge in Abyssinia around 615 to escape from persecution eventually came to Medina in 7/628, they were regarded as having made a hidjra to Abyssinia, and so as muhadjirun. After this, those who had gone to Abyssinia and then returned to Mecca in time to join the original hidjra claimed that they had two hidjras to their credit (Ibn Sa'd, ii/1, 79, i; viii, 208, 209 foot). The status of muhadjirun was conferred by treaty on the nomadic tribes of Muzayna, Aslam, Khuzā'ah and perhaps others, although they continued a nomadic life in their tribal grounds (Ibn Sa'd, iv/1, 79, 8; viii, 208, 209 foot). Not surprisingly, there was sometimes friction between the Emigrants and the Anṣār. One occasion was on the expedition to al-Murawayh in 5/627, when 'Abd Allāh b. Ubayy [q.v.], the leader of the Hypocrites, seems to have made remarks about the stronger driving out the weaker when they returned to Medina—remarks reported in the Kur'ān (LXIII, 8).

Back in Medina, Ibn Ubayy joined in the "affair of the lie (iḥyā')" against 'Ā'isha, but in a confrontation with him Muhammad gained the support of most of the Anṣār. On Muhammad's death, the Anṣār wanted one of themselves, Sa'd b. 'Uba'da, to become head of the Muslims, but firm action by the Umar led to the general acceptance of Abū Bakr as khalīfa.

For the first sixteen months after Muhammad's arrival in Medina, the Emigrants were almost entirely dependent on the hospitality of the Anṣār, except that one or two of them did some trading in the Jewish market. Groups of them went out on raiding expeditions against Meccan caravans, but achieved nothing until the expedition of Nakhtah in 2/624 when they captured a small caravan. It was probably because of the difficulties of the Emigrants in this first period that there are several verses assuring them of God's favour: "those who have believed and emigrated and striven in God's cause have hope of His mercy" (II, 218); "those who have emigrated for God's sake will be lodged well in this world and also have the reward of the Hereafter (XVI, 41). Similar promises were made later after some had died or been killed (III, 195, XXII, 58). After the conquest of Mecca it was insisted that those who had believed and emigrated and fought in God's cause were in a superior position to those Meccans who had not accepted Islam until after the conquest (IX, 19-22).

Once the expeditions had begun to bring in plunder, much of this went to the Emigrants, though the Anṣār were not denied a share (e.g. LIX, 8, 9, referring to the spoils from expelled Jewish clans).
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AL-MUHALAB B. ABI SUFRA, Abu Sa'id Al-Azd'i Al-'Ataki, Arab general of the 1st/7th century and founder of an influential family [see MUHALABIDS].

According to Abu 'Ubayda, al-Muhallab's father was a Persian warrior from Khisar who migrated via 'Umân to Basra, where he gained acceptance as an Azdi thanks to his military value (Yâkit, ii, 387; Ibn Rusta, 205 f.; cf. also Agâhân, xx, 75; M. Hinds (tr.), The History of al-'Tabari, xxiii, 187 n.). Most sources accept him as a genuine Azdi, and some even present him as a shari' (e.g. al-Baladhurî, Futih, 396). Abu Sufra was among the 'Umânîs who settled at Tawwâd in the mountainous desert before being transferred to Basra, where he arrived with his sons in 36/656 and where 'Ali allegedly invested him with the ri'isâ of Azd (al-'Tabari, i, 2699; al-'Awtabi, Ansa'h, ii, 121-5; cf. M. Hinds, in Iran, xxxi (1984)); but in fact neither Abu Sufra nor al-Muhallab ever held the ri'isâ of Azd in Basra. It was as a soldier rather than a tribal leader that the latter rose (J. G. Wilkinson, in G. H. A. Juynboll (ed.), Studies in the first century of islamic society, 141 f.; P. Crone, Slaves on horses, 39-40).

AL-Muhallab was born in ca. 10/652 and presumably began his military career with his father at Tawwâd. He is credited with operations in the Ahwâz area under 'Umar and 'Ali (Ibn Abi Shayba, Musannaf, ed. al-Nadwi, xiii, nos. 15672, 15677; al-'Awtabi, Ansa'h, ii, 126), and is said twice to have campaigned in Sistan, first in 35/655-6 and next in 42/662-5, when he reached Sind and adopted the Indian custom of cropping the tails of horses (al-Baladhiirî, Futih, 396, 432). Thereafter he campaigned in Khurâsân. He first went there under al-Hakam b. 'Amr al-Qifthâ in 50/670, returned under Sa'id b. 'Ujlman b. 'Affân in 56/676, and yet again under 'Abd al-Wâhid b. Ziyâd in 61-6/676-8 (al-'Tabari, ii, 109, 179, 393-4; al-Baladhiirî, Futih, 411; Nargârâbî, T. Bukhêhâr, tr. Frye, 41-3). 'Abd al-Wâhid b. Ziyâd appointed him deputy governor there on his departure, though in the event 'Abd Allah b. Khâsim al-Sulâmî took over; and when al-Muhallab left in his turn, he was appointed governor of Khurâsân by Ibn al-Zubayr, but was prevented from going there by the Basrans, who made him take charge of the war against the Azârika instead (al-'Tabari, ii, 489, 583 ff.; Ibn 'Abd al-Malik, Futih, v, 311, vi, 10 ff.). This task was to occupy him, on and off, for the next thirteen years [see AZARIKA]. He had cleared the environs of Başra and al-Ahwâz by 67/686-7, when Mus'ab b. al-Zubayr [q.v.] required that his participation in the campaign against al-Mukhtar [q.v.] at Kûfâ. The conquest of Kûfâ accomplished, Mus'ab appointed him governor of Mawisil, the Jâfrâzâ, Armenia and Aqhdhârâyûn, with the task of protecting 'Irâk against the Umayyads and clearing it of the remaining Khashhâhiyûa [q.v.] who held out at Nisîbis (Agâhân, v, 50). Mus'ab's successor, Hamza, reappointed him to the war against the Azârika; but Khâlid b. 'Abd Allah, 'Abd al-Malik's first governor of 'Irâk, dismissed him from the command and appointed him to the khurâf of al-Ahwâz instead. In 74/693-4 he was reappointed by 'Abd al-Malik himself, but the death of 'Abd al-Mawân [q.v.] two years later largely entrenches himself and his cause among most of the Kûfans and Basran troops to desert, so that it was not until 75/694, when al-Hâdhâjîd [q.v.] arrived, that al-Muhallab could resume the war in earnest. The Azârika were once more forced to withdraw from Khûzistân to Fârs and from there to Kirmân and Buzhân, where they entrenched themselves once more [q.v.] and eventually split into two, Khârî b. al-Fudjâ'î [q.v.] leading his followers to Tabaristân while 'Abd Rabih stayed with the rest at Dîjrût, to be defeated by al-Muhallab in 77/696. It was in the course of these campaigns that al-Muhallab introduced iron stirrups in replacement of the traditional wooden ones, which could not bear a man's weight (al-Muhallab, Kamîl, 675; al-Baladhiirî, Ansa'h, ms. Süleymaniye, Reisûktupat, no. 596, ii, 69; cf. al-Dâjîzî, Boyân, ed. Hûrin, iii, 23).

In 78/697-8 al-Muhallab was rewarded with the governorship of Khurâsân. He campaigned in Khûzistân, remaining loyal to al-Hâdhâjîd during the revolt of Ibn al-Ash'âth [q.v.], and died in 82/702 (e.g. al-'Tabari, ii, 1082-3) or 83/703 (e.g. Ibn Kutayba, Ma'tarî, ed. 'Ukâsha, 400). His son 'Ayyân succeeded him in office.

Bibliography: According to al-'Awtabi, no book of any kind was written after al-Muhallab's death without saying something about him (Ansa'h, ii, 141). This is only a slight exaggeration. For al-'Awtabi's own account, see M. Hinds (tr.), An early Islamic family from Oman: al-'Awtabî's account of the Muhallabies, Manchester 1995. For other information, see the indices to standard chronicles such as (in addition to those already cited) Khalîfah, Tarîkh; Ya'kûbî, Tarîkh; Dinawarî, Aghârî; Baladhiirî, Ansa'h, v; Mas'ûdî, Murûq; Ibn 'Abd Rabih, Yihâd. See also Ibn Sa'd, vii, 72, 94; Ibn 'Abî 'l-Hadîd, Sharî'ât al-baladîq, ed. 'Ibrîhîm, iv, 144-225; Tarîkh-i Sistan, tr. M. God, Rome 1976-7, 67-72; Ibn Hajar, Isâbî, Cairo 1392, xvii, 242 f.; 'Ahsîîbû, "Aba Sufra"; "Al-Hakam b. Abî 'l-As'ath al-Tabakî"; al-Muhallab b. Abu Sufra"; Ibn Khâllikân, Wuftûdî, ed. Aâbâs, v, no. 754. For some of the coins struck by al-Muhallab, see J. Walker, Arab-Sasanian coins, Lon- don 1941, 113-15; H. Gaube, Arabosasanische Numismatik, Brunswick 1937, index. For modern studies, see J. Wellhausen, Das arabische Reich und seine Geschichte, Berlin 1902, Eng. tr. Calculata 1927; idem, Die persisch-politischen Oppositionsparteien in Abh. G.W. Götts. N. S. v. 2, (1901), 32 ff., Eng. tr. Amsterdam 1975, 55 ff.; C. E. Bosworth, Sistan unter den Arabîn, Rome 1968, index; S. M. Yusuf, Al-Muhallab-in-Abi-Sufra: his strategy and qualities of generalship, in IC, xxvii (1943); idem, Al-Muhallab b. Abu Sufra, in IC, xix (1944); idem, Al-Muhallab and the poets, in ISL, xxiv (1950); M. A. Shaban, The 'Abbasid Revolution, Cambridge 1970. See also the Bibl. to MUHALABIDS. (P. CRONE)

AL-MUHALABIB, Abu 'l-Husayn al-Hasan b. Ahmad, Arab geographer, about whom it is only known that he died in 380/990 after having dedicated to the Fâjdîmid caliph al-'Azîz bi'llâh (356/867-975/96) [q.v.] a work which came within the category of those called al-Maslûk wa l-manâlik [q.v.] and which actually bore this title but which is generally cited under that of al-`Azîzī.

Although this work has not yet been rediscovered, it was already possible to get an idea of its contents thanks to several later authors who utilised it and took it as items of information, usually very brief ones (see in particular Yâkit, Mu'jam [57 citations], Abu 'l-Fida', Takwîm al-`ulûmî [135 citations] and al-Kalkhânî, Suhh al-`asî [69 citations]). However, one can get an idea of the method since Salâh al-Din al-Muhammedî discovered in 1957 in a
Yemeni ms. of the Ambrosiana Library, Milan, 14 folios of this K. al-Masdlk wa l-mamdlk, mainly on Jerusalem and Damascus; he has made this available, enhanced, compiled and accompanied by a list of the terms of civilisation and an index of the proper nouns contained in it, in RIMA, iv/1 (1958), 43-72. The passage on Damascus was reprinted by this same author in his book Mada'n Dimashq 'ind al-dgbrfisyyin wa l-rdhblin al-muslimin, Beirut 1967, 80-6.

Like other treatises in this category, al-MuhallabI's work contained information about itineraries and distances, as well as on the coordinates, history, population, economy and the physical aspect of towns described in a more or less summary fashion. A. Mez, Renaissance of Islam, Eng. tr. 278, justly noted that it was Yäkût's main source for information on the land and the blacks, and it may not be without interest to note that Yäkût, i, 242-3, borrows from al-MuhallabI a description of the collected and annexed by the same historian states that it was not until 345/956 that he held the official title of vizier. In order to facilitate satisfaction of his Buyid master's growing need for money, various fiscal reforms of his arc mentioned (see Busse, ChaW und Grosskönig, 362, 367). He also had the task of enforcing in Baghdad the Sh'ii religious measures of Mu'izz al-Dawla, including the cursing of Mu'mina and the public celebration of the 10 Muharram or 'Ashur mourning ceremonies; hostile measures of his against Sufis are likewise mentioned (Busse, op. cit., 322-3).

But al-MuhallabI acquired great contemporary fame not merely for his vigorous effective career as both administrator and military leader, but also for his role as one of the several literary luminaries and maecenases in the employment of the Buyids [see e.g. Ibn ABBâd, al-Sâhib; Ibn al-'Amîd; and Ibn Sâdîn in Suppl.]. His literary circle in Baghdad was frequented by the kâdî and poet Abu 'l-Kâsim 'Ali b. Mu'mammad al-Tanûkhî, father of the author of the Nisba al-mu'hädâda, Abu 'l-'Alî al-Mu'ma'sân al-Tanûkhî [q. v.]; by Abu 'l-Faraqâl al-Ifshâhîn [q. v.]; by the Banu 'l-Munaqiqîm [q. v.]; by Ibrahim b. Hîdâl al-Sâbih [see al-Sâbih, q. v.]; in kânâ l-maw'âzîr, Thâ'âlîbî, who devotes a section of his Yatimât al-dahr (ed. Damascus, ii, 8-23, ed. Cairo 1735-7/1956-8, ii, 224-41) to al-MuhallabI, including his own poetry and compositions, compares his magââsî with those of the Barmakîs. So like many others of the Buyids' viziers and secretaries, he achieved especial fame as a literary stylist and the Fihrist (ed. Flulgel, i, 134, tr. Dodge, i, 296) note that his works a collection of ra'àl, epistles, and tanâfîî, official decrees.


MUHALLABIDS (in Arabic, al-Muhallabîa, kinsmen and clients of MuhallabI b. Abl Suîra [q. v.], famed for their numbers and their remarkable role in early Islamic history. They rose to power in the service of the Umayyads even though al-MuhallabI himself was once an adherent of Ibn al-Zubayr [q. v.]) and though the family as such, especially the women, had strong Ibâdî connections (Cook, Early Muslim dogma, 63). They were crushed in 102/720, but staged a spectacular come-back under the 'Abbâsîds, having apparently exchanged their Ibâdî for Hâshîmite leanings in the meantime, and remained politically prominent until the reign of al-Ma'mûn [q. v.], even though a fair number of them supported the revolt of Muhammad al-Naf al-Zakîyâ and Ibrâhîm b. Abd Allâh [q. v.]. They also produced a large number of men of culture (see Ibn Abl 'Uyayna, al-Karâbîs, Nifâjat, al-Sukkâri; Aghâmî, q. v. ii, 270 ff.; Ibn al-Nadîm, Fihrist, ed. Taqâjîrî, iii, 193, 278; al-Sâbînî, Amîdî, ii, 501 ff., etc.), plus a rebel leader of the Zanj (Pepys, History of the Baghdad, Iraq, 77), and a famous vizier of the Buyid period [see al-MuhallabI, Abu Muhammad al-Mu'mammad al-Hasan].
(i) Yazid b. al-Muhallab, began his career under the auspices of his father, participating in his campaigns against the Azārīqā [q.v.] (al-Mubarrad, Kāmil, p. 223), and also in the latter and al-Mansūr. In 142/759–60 he became the first of several Muhallabids to govern India, where he stayed till 147/763, when the latter also joined the embryonic Yemeni faction with its first martyrs: al-Abd Allah and 'Abd al-Malik al-Baladhuri, the leader of the Khurasanī Azd at the time of the 'Abbāsid revolution, used vengeance for the Muhallabids as one of his shibboleths (al-Tabarl, iii, p. 373). Yazid was defeated by Maslama b. Abd al-Malik b. al-Ahwaz in the Third Civil War, and subsequently joined 'Abd Allāh b. Mu'awiyā (q.v.) in 127–9/744–7 and passed on to the 'Abbāsids thereafter, being killed in Mawsil in 133 (al-Tabarl, ii, 1978 f.; cf. Gabrieli, 208 n., for the cousins who stayed out of it).

(ii) The fortunes of the Muhallabids at large in the Umayyad period followed those of al-Muhallab and Yazid. In the Second Civil War, al-Mughīra b. Abī Ṣufra, his son Ma'n, broke ranks with the factions of the 'Abbāsid revolution, used vengeance for the Muhallabids and the Umayyads; he was killed in 147/763, and his son Ma'n, trod the same path, but was put to death in 127–9/744–7. Nonetheless surrendered Basra to Ibrahim b. Abī 'l-Kābir and one of his nephews (Ibn Hazm, Qamhāra, 370).

(23x622) Under the auspices of his father, participating in his campaigns against the Azārīqā [q.v.] (al-Mubarrad, Kāmil, p. 223), and also in the latter and al-Mansūr. In 142/759–60 he became the first of several Muhallabids to govern India, where he stayed till 147/763, when the latter also joined the embryonic Yemeni faction with its first martyrs: al-Abd Allah and 'Abd al-Malik al-Baladhuri, the leader of the Khurasanī Azd at the time of the 'Abbāsid revolution, used vengeance for the Muhallabids as one of his shibboleths (al-Tabarl, iii, p. 373). Yazid was defeated by Maslama b. Abd al-Malik b. al-Ahwaz in the Third Civil War, and subsequently joined 'Abd Allāh b. Mu'awiyā (q.v.) in 127–9/744–7 and passed on to the 'Abbāsids thereafter, being killed in Mawsil in 133 (al-Tabarl, ii, 1978 f.; cf. Gabrieli, 208 n., for the cousins who stayed out of it).
151/768 (though cf. al-Tabari, iii, 360 ff.). In 151/768 he was nonetheless appointed to North Africa, where he fell in action against Ibadis in 153/770 and was followed by a string of Muhallabid governors. A daughter of his married an 'Abbásid prince (al-Baladhuri, Ansāh, iii, index; Ṭabari, Ta'āh, ii, 448; Crone, Slaves on horses, 134).

Yazid b. Hātim b. Kabīsa b. al-Muḥallab joined the Hāshimīya in Basra in response to overtures made by Kahtaba (q. v.) to him and Sufyān b. Ummār (Tabarl, i, 370). Another son, Dawūd, was admitted to Sind in 184/800 when his father left to join the Hashimiyya in Iraq (Baladhuri, iii, 247, 249; Crone, Slaves on horses, 135; he is credited with a governorship of Sind in Ibn Hazm, Djamhara, 370).

His son Dāwūd b. Yazīd b. Ḥātim b. Kābīsa b. al-Muḥallab succeeded him as governor of Irīykiya, but lost control and was replaced by Rawḥ b. Ḥātim (below; al-Ya'qūbī, ii, 496). Dāwūd governed Egypt in 174/790-1 (al-Kindi, Wulūt, 111 ff.; al-Ya'qūbī, ii, 446, 465, 496; al-Azdī, 217-18 [wrong order]; al-Baladhuri, Ansāh, iii, 247, 249; Crone, Slaves on horses, 135; he is credited with a governorship of Sind in Ibn Hazm, Djamhara, 370). These two views of Muhammad— one as the Messenger of God (Muhammadun rasūlu 'llāh) is second only to belief in the Oneness of God (āt tā hā bi 'llāh) according to the Shābābīyya (q. v.); the quintessential Islamic creed. Muhammad has a highly exalted role at the heart of Muslim faith. At the same time the Kūrān and Islamic orthodoxy insist that he was fully human with no supernatural powers. That Muhammad was one of the greatest persons in world history in terms of the global impact of the movement he founded cannot be seriously questioned. How did his extraordinary success occur? One answer is theological: God chose Muhammad as His Prophet and was directly responsible for his triumph over polytheism and evil. Another is based on historical and other empirical evidence: Muhammad had remarkable leadership skills and a charismatic personality that enabled him to attract other strong leaders who were firmly committed to him, and toes they were responsible for the early success of the Muslim community. These two views of Muhammad—one as the ideal person, the exemplar for Islamic orthodoxy and orthopraxis, and the other as the historical person, who first appears as a somewhat shadowy figure whose early life is little known, but who then gradually emerges into the light of history—are not necessarily incompatible, but they involve two separate inquiries, each pursuing its own path of investigation, each following its own methods of analysis. While the theologian and other believers seek to understand the role of God acting through the Prophet, the historian seeks the measure of the man himself. The theological answer is obvious and indisputable for the believer, but, if taken alone as the explanation of the Prophet's success, it runs the risk of diminishing Muhammad's greatness as a man by making him a mere agent of divine action. The purpose of the first section of this article is to seek the historical Muhammad.

I. The historical Muhammad

A. The Sources

The sources for the life of Muhammad fall into overlapping categories that call for a variety of methods of analysis. By far the most trustworthy source, but at the same time the most difficult to utilise as a historical source, is the Kūrān (q. v.), most if not all of which is contemporary with the life of Muhammad. A characteristic feature of this unique
work is that it responds constantly and often candidly to Muhammad's changing historical circumstances and contains a wealth of hidden data that are relevant to the task of the quest for the historical Muhammad, although any use of the Kurgan as a historical source functions in Muslim life. Historians and biographers of Muhammad past and present have only begun to tap this rich source, which requires specialised knowledge and a variety of historical and literary critical methods in order to reach sound conclusions and plausible hypotheses.

The earliest attempts to report events of Muhammad's life could hardly be called biographies in the modern sense. They include what are called maghāzī [q.v.] works that treat Muhammad's military expeditions and campaigns, which from an early date were merged with sīra [q.v.] works that sought to preserve stories about the Prophet, taṣfūr [q.v.] writings that sought to preserve traditional interpretations of verses of the Korān, and eventually hadīth [q.v.] accounts that sought to preserve sayings of and about Muhammad. Early works in all of these categories contain what can be classified as mutawādūtis (handed down successively) or magḥūrur (well-known or widely known) material that was transmitted by oral tradition for generations before it was put into written form. In its early forms, including the maghāzī and sīra works, hadīth had its purpose the recording of the life of Muhammad. Each report or story must thus be evaluated in terms of its purpose, and as many versions of the same story and similar stories as possible need to be consulted, since most of the accounts occur in numerous, often widely differing forms.

The most widely used sources for the life of Muhammad, in addition to the Qurān, date from the 3rd and 4th centuries of the Islamic era. Among these the most highly respected is the Maghāzī or Sīra of Ibn Iṣāk (d. 151/768), which is not extant in its original form, but has been preserved in at least two recensions, one by Ibn Ḥāǧmān (d. 218/833) that is widely used, and another by Yūnūs b. Būkayar (d. 199/814-15) that exists only in manuscript form (for a description and summary of the contents of Yūnūs's recension, see Alfred Guillaume. New light on the life of Muhammad, Manchester n.d.). We also have extensive quotations from Ibn Iṣāk's work, including sections that Ibn Ḥāǧmān and Yūnūs b. Būkayar omitted, in historical works that cover much more than just the life of the Prophet. Among these the most valuable is the Taʾrīkh al-rusul waʾl-mulūk by al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/922-3), which contains other material on the life of Muhammad, notably reports on Ṣaḥīḥ by al-Bukhārī (d. 256/870), the Ṣaḥīḥ by Muslim (d. 261/875), and the Musnad by Ahmad b. Ḥanbal (d. 241/855).

B. Muhammad in Mecca

1. His early life

The very first question a biographer has to ask, namely when the person was born, cannot be answered precisely for Muhammad. We have no certain chronological data for the Meccan period of his life. His activity in Medina covered approximately ten years, from the Hijra [q.v.] in 622 A.D. until his death in 632. Most of the sources say his activity as a prophet in Mecca also lasted ten years, but there is considerable difference of opinion on this question. A statement in a poem ascribed sometimes to Abū Kāyib b. Abī Anas and sometimes to Ḥassān b. Ṭabāḥī (ed. Eichfeld, no. 19) says that his prophetic activity in Mecca lasted "ten and some years". Muhammad's biographers usually make him 40 or sometimes 43 years old at the time of his call to be a prophet, which, taken with the statements on the length of the Meccan and Medinan periods of his prophetic activity and his age at death, is consistent with his claim to have had his name and his birth at about 570 A.D. When, however, tradition says that he was born in the "Year of the Elephant" (alluded to in sūra CV) this cannot be accepted, since Abrahā's attack on Mecca must have taken place considerably before 570. There is better reason to believe that he may have been born later in the 570s. Since the traditional accounts differ widely and also contain elements that are clearly based on later legend, it is best to leave open the question of the year of Muhammad's birth. For the period of his life before he came forth as a religious reformer the Kurān has only the indefinite expression "umr, in sūra X, 16: "I lived among you an umr before it", where the term is usually interpreted "a lifetime" and could just as well mean 35 as 40 or 45 years.

The name "Muhammad" is reported to have occurred previously among the Arabs (e.g. Ibn Durayd, ed. Wustenfeld, 6 f.; Ibn Saʿd, i/1, 111 f.) and therefore need not be regarded as an epithet adopted later in life by the Prophet. It should be noted, however, that the brief section on such persons given by Ibn Saʿd has the heading, "Account of those who were named Muhammad in the days of the ḍāghilīya [q.v.] in the hope of being called to prophethood which had been predicted", which indicates the tendentious nature of some of these accounts. The fact that the sources say frequently that in his youth Muhammad was called Amlīm, a common Arab name meaning "faithful, trustworthy", suggests the possibility that this could have been his given name, a masculine form from the same root as his mother's name, Amina. The name Muḥammad for women occurs several times in the Syrian Book of the Himayaryas.

As to Muhammad's descent several old poems (e.g. Ḥassān b. Ṭabāḥī, ed. Eichfeld, no. 25; Aṣḥā in Ibn Ḥāǧmān, 256; cf. also on Daʾfar: Ḥassān b. Ṭabāḥī, no. 21; Kaʿb b. Malik in Ibn Ḥāǧmān, 800; on Hamza: Ibn Ḥāǧmān, 630; on Abū Lahab: Ḥassān b. Ṭabāḥī, no. 217) support the statement of tradition that he belonged to the Banū Ḥāḏīm [q.v.], apparently counting him as the better class of this tribe (cf. Ibn Ḥāǧmān, 539, 821), which was related to the Banū Mutaṭall (Ibn Ḥāǧmān, 536). On the other hand, the Meccan enemies of the Prophet say in sūra...
XLIII, 31 that they would believe in him more readily if he had been "one of the prominent men of the two cities" (Mecca and Medina). The connection between these two names is as obscure as is the relationship to the Banū Hashim were not prosperous during his early lifetime. His father, who is said to have died before the Prophet's birth, is quite a colourless figure in the sources. His name is probably 'Abd al-Muttalib, which occurs in a variety of forms set in different parts of his lifetime (e.g., Ibn Sa'd, i/1, 94, ii/1, 124) and the often mentioned family of Mut·talib (Hassān b. Thābit, no. 104; Ibn Hishām, 230, 536). On his mother's side he had connections, which are not entirely clear, with Medina. We know little more that is definite about his ancestry, since most of his uncles is heavily influenced by later legend. The first tangible historical figures among his relatives are his parents: Abū Ṭalib [q. v.], whose name was 'Abd Manaf, al-Abbas [q. v.], Hamza [q. v.] and 'Abd al-?Uzza [see Abū Tabār].

Little else about his early life is known. The sources contain many colourful stories with settings from before his birth up to the time of the Hijra. These accounts are important historical sources for understanding early stages in Muslim perceptions of the Prophet, which developed rapidly well beyond his portrayal in the Kur'ān, but they have little value as sources for the historical Muhammad (as distinct from the Muhammad of Muslim faith). As Birkeland has shown, the story of the opening of Muhammad's breast, which occurs in a variety of forms set in different parts of his lifetime (e.g., Ibn Sa'd, i/1, 96 f.), is a later exegetical materialisation of XCV, 1 (The Legend of the opening of Muhammad's breast, Oslo 1953). It would be wise to set aside the Muhammad's alleged trading journeys into Syria, said to have occurred when he was a child under the care of his uncle Abū Ṭalib and later in the service of his future wife, Khadidja [q. v.].

The sources contain several versions of each of these stories, all of which have as their central theme predictions or affirmations regarding Muhammad's future prophethood. Some of the versions of the story of the "first journey" involve a Christian monk named Bājhār [q. v.] (Ibn Ishāk as reported in Ibn Hishām, 115-17 and in al-Tabārī, i, 1123-6; Ibn Sa'd, i/1, 76 f., 99-101), while others say Abū Ṭalib stopped at two convents where the unnamed "master of the convent" affirmed Muhammad's future prophethood and insisted that the boy's father could not be living (Ibn Sa'd, i/1, 98 f.). The main theme of most versions of the story of Muhammad's "second journey to Syria" is the same as in the first, that is, affirmation or announcement by a Syrian Christian monk, in this case named Nastūr, that Muhammad will be a prophet (Ibn Sa'd, i/2, 101 f.). It is curious that most modern biographers of Muhammad depict this story as something of a test of his business skills and as an episode that serves largely as a prelude to an account of his marriage to Khadidja, since this is not a major theme of the story and does not even occur in some versions. In the form in which these stories are given they have distinctly apologetic themes. Equally little confidence is to be placed in the story of the part said to have been played by Muhammad in rebuilding the Ka'ba (Ibn Hishām, 122-6; Ibn Sa'd, i, 1134; with an interesting account varied in Ibn Sa'd, i/1, 93 f.). Verse 8 of Sūrat al-Duḥā may allude to Muhammad's marriage to the wealthy widow, Khadidja: "Did He not find you poor (ṣaḥīḥ) and then enrich [you]?") Muslim and Khadidja are said to have had four daughters, who played various roles in the early history of Islam, and several sons all of whom died in infancy (Ibn Hishām, 121). Except for the names of some of his children the sources tell us virtually nothing about Muhammad's life from the time of his marriage to Khadidja, when he is said to have been 25 years old, until shortly before he began to have visions and hear mysterious voices, when he is said to have been 40 or 43.

2. His emergence as a religious reformer

Because of the nature of the sources and the complexities involved in interpreting them, questions concerning Muhammad's emergence as a religious reformer are among the most difficult to answer. That he originally shared some of the religious conceptions of his milieu is in every way the most natural assumption. The verse in Sūrat al-Duḥā between the two cited above asks Muhammad: "Did He not find you going astray (dālli) and then guide [you]?") (XCIII, 7). It is the plural form of this same crucial word, dālli, that occurs at the end of the well-known Fatiha prayer that serves as the first sura of the Kur'ān: "Guide us on the straight path ... not that of those who go astray (al-dāllīn)." Further support for this assumption is found in other verses of the Kur'ān, such as XLII, 52: "You did not know what the Book or belief was", and in the Sūra reports that Muhammad gave a polytheistic name, 'Abd Manaf, to one of his sons (who, however, was named after Muhammad's uncle and guardian who is better known by his kunya, Abū Ṭalib [q. v.]) and that two of his daughters were married to sons of his uncle 'Abd al-?Uzza (Abū Lahab [q. v.]), who is consistently said to have been an ardent defender of polytheism. One of the clearest examples of traditional Arabian beliefs that Muhammad retained after he began speaking publicly as a prophet of the God of the Christians involves the dānn [q. v.], who are mentioned frequently in Meccan portions of the Kur'ān. He was certainly influenced by the manner of the old Arab, dānn-inspired (madānn [q. v.]) soothsayers and their peculiar form of speech called sādī [q. v.], with its mysterious oaths and rhymed prose (see KĀNIN, KUR'ĀN, at vol. V, 421 f.; also Gsch. des Qur., i, 36 ff.; Blachère, Litt., 222; and M. Zweitler, The Oral tradition of classical Arabic poetry, Columbus, Ohio 1978, 157 f.)

Mecca with its sanctuary must have been a sanctified place in Muhammad's eyes even before it was connected with Abraham and Ishmael, for the Kur'ān asks it as such from an early stage in his public recitations (XXVIII, 91; XXVIII, 57; XXIX, 67; CV, 1 ff.; CVI, 1 ff.). He must have accepted the sacrifices offered there (CVII, 2), and his followers took part in the ancient Meccan pilgrimage rituals before he combined them to form the great Islamic Hajj [q. v.]. A fascinating verse that reveals the uncertain state of the old rituals before Muhammad's Farewell Pilgrimage is II, 158, which seems to answer a question put to the Prophet: "Al-Ṣaḥā and al-Marwa are among the landmarks (dā'ābi) of God, so there is no fault in combining them for those who make a pilgrimage to the House [the Ka'ba] or perform an umra." This verse gives permission for Muhammad's followers to perform the ancient sa'ā
before it acquired an Islamic meaning and was made obligatory for Muslims performing the Hadjdj. (For the... rituals involving al-Safa and al-Marwa in Muhammad's time, see sa'v.)

What one can deduce in this way from the Kur'ān about Muhammad's development is supplemented in an important way by tradition, according to which he was not alone in his search for a monotheistic religion. Various individuals are mentioned who, dissatisfied with the old Arab polytheism, were seeking a more intellectual faith (cf. Ibn Hīghām, 143-9). One in particular, Khadidja's cousin, Waraka b. Nawfal [q.v.], who is mentioned in several interesting stories about Muhammad in the Sīra literature, most likely played a larger role in the rise of Islam than is acknowledged in the sources. In addition there are the Ḥanīfīs [q.v.] of whom the traditions have preserved only a very hazy picture, and Umayya b. Abī l-Salt whose poems often have points of contact with the Kur'ān, which would be of great importance if they could even in part be regarded as genuine [see also Musaylima].

To what extent Muhammad was influenced by the various monotheistic ideas and movements that existed in Arabia in the early 7th century A.D. is difficult to determine. What is certain is that something happened that transformed his whole consciousness and filled him with a spiritual strength that decided the whole course of his life. He felt himself compelled to proclaim the revelations that were communicated to him in a mysterious way. Caetani has argued that Muhammad's emergence as a religious reformer developed gradually and involved extended periods of meditation and reflection, referred to in the Sīra literature as tabahnah" (cf. Watt, Mecca, 44). Islamic tradition, on the other hand, also relates other stories, some involving the archangel Gabriel, that give the impression that Muhammad had a sudden "prophetic call" at some precise moment in his life. Several verses in the Kur'ān, such as XLV, 1-4, LXCVII, 1, and II, 185, have been interpreted in such a way as to support this latter view (cf. Ibn Hīghām, 155), but these verses are ambiguous and in fact contain no clear reference to a first revelation.

The traditional stories that identify either sūra XCVI, 1 ff. or LXXIV, 1 ff. as the first revelation are highly suspect for several reasons. These stories interpret one or the other of these passages as the original command from God to Muhammad to begin reciting the revelation or warning the people. At the same time tradition claims that there was a fāta ("pause") of three years between the time he received these "first revelations" and the time he began his public ministry. Taking these two claims together would mean that Muhammad waited for three years before carrying out the divine command. (For more substantive arguments based on a critical analysis of the history of the text of the Kur'ān, see Gesch. der Que., 78-88; Watt, Mecca, 46-9.) This alleged fāta has not been fully explained and remains somewhat of an enigma. The concept of a fāta of three years in the revelations may have originated in the attempts of Muhammad's biographers to construct an exact chronology of his life out of the conflicting reports of his age at the time of certain key events and of the lengths of his Meccan and Medinan periods of prophetic activity. One must also reckon with the possibility that the very earliest revelations were not written down or memorised by Muhammad's followers and thus have been lost.

The Kur'ān gives only a few hints about the manner of these inspirations. Perhaps the wrapping up (LXXIII, 1; LXXIV, 1) refers to a preparation for the reception of the revelations in the manner of the old Arab kāhins. We are taken further in an indirect way by the often recurring accusation of his enemies that Muhammad was qāmūn-possessed (madīrīn [q.v.]), a soothsayer (kāhin [q.v.]), or a magician (sāḥir), for they show that in his moments of inspiration he made an impression similar to those figures well known in ancient Arabia. The graphic descriptions of his condition in such moments may be regarded as genuine, since they are unlikely to have been invented by later Muslims. These mysterious seizures must have afforded to those around him the most convincing evidence for the superhuman origin of his inspirations. Whether he had such experiences before he began to see himself as a prophet of the God of the Jews and the Christians and, if so, how long he had had these experiences remains uncertain. The Sīra accounts that affirm that at first Muhammad did not recognise these experiences as indications that he was being called to be a prophet may be an example of historical foreshortening or telescoping, i.e. reducing into a short time span what in fact lasted for a much longer period.

3. His public ministry in Mecca

Prophetic activity over a period of several years of a new world of ideas began to fill him to an ever increasing extent, until he was finally compelled with irresistible force to come forth and proclaim them. Parts of the Kur'ān that exemplify Muhammad's early public recitations exhibit a passionately excited inspiration that is rarely matched in later parts of his career. These early recitations are based not on a dogmatic conception of monotheism but on a strong general moral and religious appeal, which, however, was bound in Muhammad's circumstances in Mecca to lead to a breach with the polytheists. Key themes in these early recitations include the idea of the moral responsibility of man who was created by God and the idea of the judgment to take place on the day of resurrection. To these are added vivid descriptions of the tortures of the damned in the hellfire and the pleasures of the believers in Paradise. Another major theme of Muhammad's early preaching, before the onset of strong opposition from the powerful merchant families of Mecca, involves the signs of God in nature that should convince people who will take the time to reflect that there is a power greater than man's, and that the wise will acknowledge this power and cease their greed and suppression of the poor. There is also a stress on the wonders of everyday life, especially the marvellous phenomenon of man (cf. Watt, Mecca, 62-72).

The religious duties that the Kur'ān imposed on Muhammad and his followers during the Meccan years were simple and few in number: one should believe in God, appeal to Him for forgiveness of sins (XXVI, 1-12), offer prayers (XXVII, free text), free oneself from the love of delusive wealth and—what is significant for the commercial life of Mecca— from all forms of cheating (XXVI, 182 f.; cf. LV, 7-9), lead a chaste life, and not expose new-born girls to their greed and suppression of the poor. There is a stress on the wonders of everyday life, especially the marvellous phenomenon of man (cf. Watt, Mecca, 62-72).

The religious duties that the Kur'ān imposed on Muhammad and his followers during the Meccan years were simple and few in number: one should believe in God, appeal to Him for forgiveness of sins (XXVI, 1-12), offer prayers (XXVII), free oneself from the love of delusive wealth and—what is significant for the commercial life of Mecca—from all forms of cheating (XXVI, 182 f.; cf. LV, 7-9), lead a chaste life, and not expose new-born girls to their greed and suppression of the poor. There is also a stress on the wonders of everyday life, especially the marvellous phenomenon of man (cf. Watt, Mecca, 62-72).

The religious duties that the Kur'ān imposed on Muhammad and his followers during the Meccan years were simple and few in number: one should believe in God, appeal to Him for forgiveness of sins (XXVI, 1-12), offer prayers (XXVII), free oneself from the love of delusive wealth and—what is significant for the commercial life of Mecca—from all forms of cheating (XXVI, 182 f.; cf. LV, 7-9), lead a chaste life, and not expose new-born girls to their greed and suppression of the poor. There is also a stress on the wonders of everyday life, especially the marvellous phenomenon of man (cf. Watt, Mecca, 62-72).
At first Muhammad met with no serious opposition and in not a few cases his preaching fell on fruitful soil. In the words addressed to Salih in sura XI, 62 we may find a hint that Muhammad had at first aroused considerable expectations among the Meccans. In addition to Khadija, who is consistently said to have been the first believer, and several men including Abū Bakr, the manumitted slave Zayd b. Hāriša, Zubayr b. al-ʿAwwām, Ṭalhā b. ʿUbayd Allāh, ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿAwf, Saʿd b. Abī Waqṣās, and Muhammad’s cousin ʿAli [q.v.], who are also said to have been among the early followers of Muhammad, the sources mention a number of other converts in Mecca, the majority of whom appear to have been young or of no great social standing, while the well-to-do and influential held back (XIX, 73, XXXIV, 31 ff.; LXXIII, 11; LXXX, 1 ff.; for a detailed analysis of the social standing and the tribal affiliations of the Meccan converts, see Watt, Mecca, 88-96). This became still more the case when the full consequences of Muhammad’s preaching became clear, that is, when he openly attacked the polytheism of his native town. Up until this point most Meccans appear to have had little interest in devotional meetings, and the Kaʿbah thus had been rather indifferent to Muhammad’s activities.

He was only gradually led to attack on principle the gods of Mecca. See Welch, Mecca and Automobiles (734-43). The Meccan sanctuary, he said, belonged to the one true God, “Allāh,” whom the Meccans also recognised as the High God (XXXI, 25; XXXIX, 18; XII, 12 where “Allāh” is the lord of the Kaʿbah) and he will protect and bless his sanctuary, if they submit to him (XXVII, 91; XXVIII, 57; XXIX, 67; XVI, 5 ff.). Meccan merchants then discovered that a religious revolution might be dangerous to their fairs and their trade. That this was the salient feature of their resistance to Muhammad is evident from the fact that the Kurʿān frequently endeavours to calm the fears of the Kuraysh on this point. The merchants of Mecca tended to have conservative attitudes about religious beliefs and practices, and they let their animosity to Muhammad’s new and fantastic ideas be known, particularly regarding belief in a physical resurrection of the dead.

Muhammad’s strength lay in the consciousness that he lived in a higher intellectual world that was closed to the polytheists and that he proclaimed ideas, “the equal of which neither men nor jinn with combined efforts could produce” (XVII, 88). Very pertinently he often points to the lack of logic in his enemies, when they recognise “Allāh” as the real true God but will not draw the logical deductions from this. But even his most crushing arguments rebounced from the impregnable wall of their prejudices that were based on their material interest. This circumstance now began to influence the matter of his preaching in a very remarkable way. When his opponents mocked him because the divine judgment threatened by him did not come (XXXVIII, 16; LXX, 1 ff.) he began to describe in an increasing degree how the contemporaries of earlier prophets had met them with incredulity and had therefore brought on their heads dreadful punishments (Bell-Watt, 127-34). That this threat of terrestrial punishment was not part of the earliest revelations is evident from the fact that Muhammad’s preaching, according to the already mentioned credible tradition, at first gave no offence, and indeed this feature is lacking in the sūras that are associated with his Meccan period, but are unfortunately more or less obscure and may be interpreted in various equally uncertain ways. In addition to the inevitable difficulties to be the case with all historical sources, one other key factor makes it difficult to reconstruct with any confidence the main stages in Muhammad’s life before the introduction of the Book (ahl al-kitāb), an expression that refers to the Jewish and Christian communities. That Muhammad was conscious of this association is clear from the repeated statements in the Kurʿān that emphasise the agreement between its teachings and those of the Jews and the Christians. In a significant passage, sūra X, 94, the Kurʿān even challenges Muhammad’s opponents to consult the People of the Book for irrefutable evidence of the truth of his message: “If you are in doubt about what We have revealed, ask those who read the Book before you.” During the Meccan years it is quite evident that Muhammad had no thought of founding a new religion. His task was only to be a “warner” (nādīḥ[.v.]) (LI, 50; LXIV, 2; LXXIX, 45; LXXX, 11; LXXXVIII, 21 ff.; and Welch, Muhammad’s understanding, 41 ff.), charged with the task of informing the Arabs, to whom no prophet had been sent before (VI, 157; XXVII, 46; XXXII, 3; XXXIV, 44; XXXVI, 6), that the day of judgment was approaching. This warning, which previously was not directly accessible to the Arabs, was now proclaimed as a clear Arabic recitation (kurʿān ‘arāb) so that Muhammad’s people could be saved from the divine wrath. The Jews and Christians must thus also testify to the truth of his preaching (X, 94; XVI, 43; XXI, 7; XXVI, 197; XVIII, 52, etc.), since the same revelation had been sent down to them previously.

It is in this context that the meaning of the often discussed term ummi[.v.] is best understood. As applied to Muhammad in sūra VII, 157, the term appears to mean “one who has not previously been given the Book of God” and is the antithesis of the People of the Book, that is, those who already had versions of the Book of God (kitāb Allāh) in their own languages. Muhammad was the ummi-prophet only during the period before he began to prepare a written scripture for his community (see AL-KUʿRĀN, at 403-4). This interpretation does not affect the question as to whether or not Muhammad was able to read and write, except as the term might have had connotations of his inability to read the Jewish and Christian scriptures (see Wensinck, in AO, i/i, 191). As a merchant he must have had at least some knowledge of reading and writing Arabic. In a key passage on the Meccan period (XXV, 4-6), Muhammad’s opponents are quoted as saying that “he has written down” (ikatasha) “stories of the ancients . . . that are recited to him morning and evening” and the Kurʿān (in verse 6) does not deny this accusation, but simply affirms that what Muhammad was reciting had been inspired by God. It was only in later theological circles that the term ummi acquired the now common meaning, “illiterate”, as scriptural evidence for the doctrine of the miracle of Muhammad’s reception of the revelation from God through Gabriel (cf. AL-KUʿRĀN, at 403; Gesch. des Qur., i, 14; Bell-Watt, 33 ff.; and, for comments on the European literature on the meaning ummi and its plural form ummīyyīn in the Kurʿān, Parec, Komen
tar, 21 ff.).

Traditions record at great length the persecution and ill-treatment that Muhammad and his followers suffered at the hands of the Meccan polytheists (e.g., Ibn Hishām, 205-7). These reports play a significant role in several episodes that are presented in the Sūra literature as major events in the life of Muhammad in his Meccan period, but are unfortunately more or less obscure and may be interpreted in various equally uncertain ways. In addition to the inevitable difficulties to be the case with all historical sources, one other key factor makes it difficult to reconstruct with any confidence the main stages in Muhammad’s life before the introduction of the Book.
the Hijra. While the Kurân refers frequently to major events in the life of Muhammad and the Muslim community that occurred in Medina after the Hijra, often treating these events in some detail, it is virtually silent on the episodes that the Sûra reports as major events in Muhammad’s Meccan years. In light of the fact that the Kurân responds constantly and candidly to Muhammad’s historical situation (see K. Cragg, The event of the Qur’ân, London 1971, and Welch, Muhammad’s understanding, 15-52), its silence on these allegedly major Meccan events is significant. One example involves the various accounts of the emigration of some of Muhammad’s followers from Mecca to Abyssinia. Ibn Sa’îd reports and discusses two separate events: “the first hijdra to Abyssinia” (i/1, 136-8) and “the second hijdra to Abyssinia” (i/1, 138 f.). He says that most of the emigrants in the first group returned to Mecca before the Hijra to Medina, while most of the second group were still in Abyssinia at the time of the Hijra, so that when they left there they went directly to Medina. Ibn Hishâm (205-17) speaks of only one migration of Muslims from Mecca to Abyssinia, as does al-Tabarih (i, 1180-4), who, after discussing the circumstances and giving the names of the first ten to go, concludes his account by saying: “Then Dja’far b. Abî Tâlib emigrated, and after that there was a steady stream of Muslims.”

The sources are somewhat fuller for the major Meccan years before the Hijra than answers.

This curious story, which is also found in Ibn Sa’d (i/1, 137 f.) but not in Ibn Hîshâm and presumably not in Ibn Ishik, is rejected by most modern biographers of Muhammad, on the other hand, accept it as historical on the assumption that it is inconceivable that later Muslims could have invented it (e.g., Watt, Mecca, 103). This reason, however, is in itself insufficient. The story in its present form (as related by al-Tabarih, al-Wâkidî, and Ibn Sa’d) cannot be accepted as historical for a variety of reasons given in AL-KURÂN at 404. This does not rule out the possibility of some historical kernel behind the story. It is possible that this story is another example of historical telescoping, i.e. that a situation that was known by Muhammad’s contemporaries to have lasted for a long period of time later came to be encapsulated in a story that restricts his acceptance of intercession through these goddesses to a brief period of time and places the responsibility for this departure from a strict monotheism on Satan. This interpretation is completely consistent with what is said above regarding Muhammad’s gradual “emergence as a religious reformer” and with evidence from the Kurân that a strict monotheism arose in stages over an extended period of time during Muhammad’s Meccan years (cf. Welch, Allah and other supernatural beings, 736-43).
it as the will of God that his people were not to be saved (cf. X, 99; XLIII, 89). But the consciousness of being a chosen instrument of God had gradually broken through in him that he was no longer able to sink back into an inglorious existence with his objective unachieved. He then made an attempt to establish himself in Taif, but according to the reports this effort failed and indeed brought him into physical danger. After this unsuccessful journey to Taif, the Sira accounts say he obtained protection from a Meccan man named Matrim b. 'Adi, who is said to have taken the discouraged prophet under his wings, thereby providing safety so he could re-enter his native city. (This report is corroborated in a poem by Hassan b. Thabit, no. 88.)

It is at this low point in Muhammad's life that some Sira accounts place the famous Night Journey and Ascension. Ibn Sa'd relates his versions of the mi'raj (q.v.) (i/1, 142 f.) and then the inzâ (i/1, 143-5) as two separate events that occurred after Muhammad's visit to Taif. He even gives exact dates for these two events, saying that Muhammad's Ascension to heaven from near the Ka'ba ("between the Makam Ibrâhîm and Zamzam") occurred "on the night of Saturday, 27 Ramadan, eighteen months before the Hijra", and that his Night Journey from the sanctuary in Mecca to the sanctuary in Jerusalem (isâ al-makharah) occurred on the seventeenth night of the last Rabî' I before the Hijra". As is well known, in later tradition these two stories came to be combined into one. It should also be noted that other Sira accounts place these events at different times in Muhammad's prophetic career. Ibn Hisham reports accounts of the Night Journey first (263-8) and then the Ascension to heaven (268-71), and he places these accounts before the deaths of Khadijih and Abu Talib. Al-Tabari (i, 1157-9) includes only the story of Muhammad's Ascension from the sanctuary in Mecca to "the earthly heaven", where Gabriel led the Prophet through each of the seven heavens, "and then he took him to Paradise", where Gabriel picked up a handful of "its earth" and it had the fragrance of musk. Al-Tabari places this story before the beginning of Muhammad's public ministry, between his account of Hafsa going to Medina (621) and the first caliphate (622), as he believed that his Prophet was the "first male to believe in the Messenger of God" and his account of "the first man to emigrate". Eventually these two events were combined so that the terminus of the Night Journey was the Temple Mount in Jerusalem, where Muhammad led the earlier prophets in a performance of the sa'îf, made his Ascension to heaven from the raised stone protrusion that is now enclosed within the famous Dome of the Rock, and then Gabriel and Muhammad returned to Mecca, completing the Night Journey. It is Muhammad's association with the Temple Mount in this two-part story that makes Jerusalem the third holiest city, after Mecca and Medina, for Muslims [see al-Ruds and al-Masjid al-Asqa].

Despite the harsh reception he received in Taif, but possibly buoyed by the Ascension experience of indeed it occurred at this time, and even if it was a vision or a dream (for we know that personalities such as his can have emotionally powerful vision and dream experiences), Muhammad persevered in his search for a new sphere of activity outside of Mecca. The large number of tribes who came to Mecca for the spring and fall fairs and market days and also to perform the pilgrimage rituals at the Ka'ba provided excellent opportunities for Muhammad to attempt to arrange for a new home for himself and his followers. After several unsuccessful negotiations he found favourable soil for his hopes with some men from Yat'rib (later called Medina). The fact that he had relations there may have made the task of reaching an agreement easier. Fortunately we know something about conditions in Medina just before the rise of Islam, but our knowledge is still meagre and much of importance is still conjectural. We may safely assume that the large number of Jews who lived there had contributed towards making the Arab population somewhat familiar with monotheistic ideas (cf. Ibn Hisham, 178; Wensinck, Jews of Medina, 6-38; and Newby, Jews of Arabia, 49-77).

There is however no question that the Medinans did not so much want to attract an inspired preacher to themselves as to get a political leader, who could re-adjust their political relations, which had been shattered in recent tribal conflicts that culminated in the battle of Bu'ath [q.v.]. The responsibility Muhammad contemplated was awesome, for it would mean his taking responsibility for the safety and welfare of his followers, who would be breaking the links that bound them to their tribes and families. Muhammad would have to assume not only the immense responsibilities of a tribal chief, in relation to his followers who would emigrate with him, but also the challenge of settling disputes among largely unknown tribes who had longstanding grievances among one another. With this in mind he faced the most difficult problems in the biography of Muhammad, the double personality that he presents to us so clearly in the sources. The inspired religious enthusiast, whose ideas mainly centred around the coming last judgment, who had borne all insults and attacks, who only timidly touched on the possibility of active resistance (XVI, 126) and preferred to leave everything to God's intervention, now with his migration to Medina enters upon a secular stage and at one stroke shows himself a brilliant political genius. The decisive point however is that the Medinans would certainly not have thought of seeking in him a saviour from their social and political difficulties if they had not been much impressed by his abilities in this direction.

After Muhammad had entered into relations with some Medinans who had come as pilgrims to Mecca, he released the city of Akabah (621), the last city remaining loyal to the tribe of Quraysh, together with its inhabitants and town along with men whom he had sent there, and thus he was able after a preliminary conference in al-$'Aka$â (q.v.) to conclude at the pilgrimage next year (622) at the same place a formal agreement with a considerable number of Medinans, in which they pledged themselves and their fellow-citizens to take him into their community and to protect him as one of their own citizens, which, as later history shows, was also to hold for his Meccan followers if they moved to Medina. Tradition, and no doubt rightly, mentions here only the promise of the Medinans to take Muhammad under their protection, without any further obligations.

These negotiations, which could not remain unknown to the Meccans, produced great bitterness, and a second fitnah, as 'Uwais says, began for the believers, which would have confirmed them even more in their determination to migrate to Medina. They are reported to have slipped away in large and small groups, so that finally only Muhammad and Abû Bakr, with the latter's servant, were left. (Other accounts, possibly Shi'î, say 'Ali also remained in Mecca until the last moment.) That the Prophet did not go with the others was most likely part of his plan to keep the Hijra as unobtrusive as possible. Just how successful the Meccan leaders could have been if they had wanted to prevent the departure of Muhammad.
The year of the great migration, Hijra [q.v.], of the Prophet and his followers from his native town of Mecca to Yathrib [q.v.], later called Medina (from madīnat al-nabī, "the city of the Prophet"), was with good reason chosen as year 1 of the Islamic calendar, for it marks the beginning of the ten-year period in the life of Muhammad when he led in the establishment of a new religious community that in a remarkably short time developed into one of the great civilisations of world history. According to the usual calculation, he arrived in Kūbā, a suburb of Medina, on 12 Rabi' 1 1/24 September 622. The tasks that awaited him called for extraordinary diplomatic and organising skills, and he demonstrated that he was in every way equal to the challenge.  

1. The initial political situation.  

At first Muhammad would rely with confidence only on those who had emigrated with him from Mecca, the so-called Emigrants (muhādjirūn [q.v.]). These ardent followers, who maintained their support of Muhammad and their belief in his cause during the difficult Meccan years, came to have a special rank among the Muslims. Some Medinans accepted Islam before Muhammad arrived there, but they formed only a small portion of the inhabitants of the Prophet’s adopted city. Slowly at first and then in larger numbers the Medinans adopted Islam. Those who became Muslims during Muhammad’s lifetime, called Helpers (ansār [q.v.]), also came to have a special rank within the community second only to the Emigrants. Among the Arab tribes of Medina, Muhammad encountered direct opposition only from a few families, such as the Aws Allāh. There were others who did not oppose him openly, but accepted the new relations reluctantly. Among these a particularly troublesome group gathered around a man of the Khazraj tribe named ʿAbd Allāh b. Ubayy [q.v.], who managed to let slip away every occasion on which he might have successfully weakened Muhammad’s position. A further danger lay in the fact that an old and bitter feud between the two main Arab tribes of Medina, the Aws and the Khazraj [q.v.], continued and could have broken out into the open at any time. In addition to the Arab tribes of Medina there were a number of Jewish groups, the most prominent being the so-called kāhinān, i.e., the tribes of al- Nadir and Kuryaza (cf. Hassan b. Thābit, no. 216; Ibn Hīghām, 660). Among the other Jewish groups the Kaynuḳī tribe appears to have been the most important. These three Jewish tribes played a significant part in Medina later in their capacity as money lenders and the support they had among the Jewish colonies in Khaybar [q.v.] and other settlements to the north. During his first year in Medina Muhammad devoted considerable attention to the Jewish inhabitants there in the hope that as native speakers of Hebrew they would be God’s one true prophet to the Arabs. His relations with any Christians who may have been in Medina (cf. Hassan b. Thābit, no. 133) can only be surmised from references in the Kūrān. After it became clear that the Jews in Medina were not going to accept Muhammad’s claim to prophethood, the Kūrān gives the impression that his opinion of the Christians also gradually deteriorated (V. 82; LVII, 27).

Muhammad’s task was to form a united community out of these heterogeneous elements. The first problem to be tackled was how to procure the necessary means of subsistence for the Emigrants, who for the most part were without resources of their own. This difficulty was alleviated at least temporarily through an arrangement by which Muhammad ordered a relationship of “brotherhood” to be created between each Emigrant and a man of Medina [see muḥākāt]. Sūra XXXIII, 6, dating from some time after the battle of Badr, is usually interpreted as abolishing this “brotherhood” arrangement, at least in matters of inheritance (cf. Ibn Hīghām, 344-6; Ibn Sa’d, i/2, 1). A more significant factor in the termination of these early arrangements in Medina may have been the formal agreement established between Muhammad and all of the significant tribes and families. Fortunately, Ibn Iṣḥāk preserved a version of this very valuable document, usually called the Constitution of Medina. This version appears not to date from Muhammad’s first year in Medina, as is sometimes claimed, since it reflects the later, strained relationship between the Prophet and the Jewish people of the settlement. It reveals his great diplomatic skills, for it allows the ideal that he cherished of an umma (community) based clearly on a religious outlook to sink temporarily into the background and is shaped essentially by practical considerations. It is true that the highest authority is with God and Muhammad, before whom all matters of importance were to be laid, but the umma as portrayed in the Constitution of Medina included also Jews and polytheists, so that the legal forms of the old Arab tribes were substantially preserved (cf. R. Serjeant, The Sūrah Jāmī’ah, pactis with the Yathrib Jews, and the tahrīm of Yathrib: analysis and translation of the documents comprised in the so-called ‘Constitution of Medina’, in BSOAS, xli [1978], 1-42). The provisions stipulated in this document appear to have had little practical importance. It is nowhere mentioned in the Kūrān, although some commentators interpret sura XVII, 56 as referring to it. In any case, it was soon rendered obsolete by the rapidly and radically changing conditions in Medina.

2. Establishing a theocracy in Medina  

Evidence of Muhammad’s political wisdom and personal determination to establish his position as God’s one true prophet to the Arabic-speaking people is seen in his early endeavours in Medina to attract the Jewish people there to his cause by adopting some features of their worship and customs. For instance, he made the tenth of Muharram a fast day for Muslims, apparently a one-day twenty-four hour fast, like Yom Kippur (the Day of Atonement) that the Jewish community observes on the tenth of Tishri (in the Jewish calendar). That this temporary Islamic practice, which apparently was kept for only one year, was based on the Jewish custom is seen clearly even in its name (muhārām) [q.v.], derived from the Arabic word for a something to be set apart, and used by some Jews in Arabia for Yom Kippur (cf. Watt, Medina, 198 f. for a brief discussion of the major
The Jewish practice of having three daily prayer rituals appears to have been a factor in the introduction in sura II, 238 as “the middle prayer ritual” (al-ṣalāt al-wusta), which was added to the morning and evening salāt kept by Muhammad and at least some of his followers in Mecca before the Hijra. The Islamic weekly community worship service in the early afternoon on Fridays, which may have been instituted before Muhammad’s arrival in Medina, was most likely influenced indirectly by the Jewish “day of preparation” in the Sabbath, which began on Friday evenings at sundown. Friday in Medina during Muhammad’s time was thus the main weekly market day when the largest number of Muslims from the surrounding areas came to town, providing an ideal time for the Islamic weekly congregational worship service (cf. Ibn Sa’d, iii/1, 83, and S.D. Goitein, The origin and nature of the Muslim Friday worship, in MW, xli [1959], 185 = Studies in Islamic history and institutions, Leiden 1966, 113).

Whether the adoption of the Jewish practice of facing north towards Jerusalem when performing the daily prayers, a practice that was discontinued after Muhammad’s first year in Medina, was part of his campaign to win the Medinan Jews to Islam is uncertain, since the statements about the kibla [q.v.] of the Medinan Jews all use the form of the kibla instead of the kā’ba. It is unlikely that Muhammad and his followers faced towards the Ka’ba in Mecca before the Hijra, since it would then be difficult to explain how the varying stories about the Muslim practice there could have arisen. If Muhammad and his followers did use Jerusalem as their kibla before the Hijra, this practice need not necessarily mean a borrowing from the Jews, since this direction of prayer was used also by other groups in the Near East, such as the Ebionites and the Ėlkesiates (cf. H.J. Schoeps, Jewish Christianity [1969], Tor Andrae, Mohammed, 100 ff.). In Mecca the Muslims may have turned to the east like some Christian groups, or they may have had no kibla at all. The Kurʾān is silent on this crucial point in the life of Muhammad and the rise of Islam. The balance of probabilities is that the Hijra changed the Muslim use of the Jerusalem kibla during Muhammad’s first year in Medina was just one among several temporary practices that appear to have been adopted as part of the Prophet’s attempt to win over the medizing Jewish community there.

If some writers have seen in the immediate construction of a place of prayer (Ibn Hishām, 336) an imitation of the Jewish synagogue, Gaetani has with weighty reasons argued that this was not a building definitely assigned to the worship of God, since the alleged masjid was also used for all kinds of secular purposes, because in reality it was simply the courtyard (dār) occupied by Muhammad and his family, while the assemblies for regular worship were held on the musalla [q.v. and Al-Madīna]. On the other hand, the so-called “mosque of opposition” (masjid ḍirār), mentioned in sura IX, 107 (see below), does seem to have been an actual building recalling the Jewish synagogue.

In spite of these overtures to the Jews in Medina, it soon became obvious that Muhammad’s goal of winning them over was not going to be realised. Although they may have cherished lively expectations (Ibn Hishām, 286, 373 f.) they were not willing to recognise the Prophet as the long-awaited Jewish Messiah, who Muhammad had reason to lament that only a few among them believed in him (sura III, 110). In particular, the lack of agreement between what he recited as the Book of God, said to be identical with the Book previously sent down to the prophet Moses, and what the Jews in Medina knew of their scriptures aroused Jewish ridicule and thus brought him into an unfortunate position. His conviction of the divine origin of his mission and his position among the believers would not allow him to believe he was mistaken regarding the identity of the versions of the Book of God sent down to Moses, Jesus, and now to him. At the same time, he had too often appealed to the testimony of those to whom the Book had been sent down previously, the People of the Book, to be able to ignore this criticism. The issue was resolved to the satisfaction of the Muslims by the assertions in the Kurʾān that the Jews had received only a portion of the revelation (IV, 44; cf. III, 119) and that even this included a number of special laws adapted to an earlier age (IV, 160; VI, 146; XVI, 118). Still he challenged them to produce their scriptures (III, 95; cf. III, 181 ff. and IV, 46). Muhammad’s Jewish opponents in Medina were then accused of concealing from him parts of their holy scriptures (II, 42, 146, 159, 174; III, 77, etc.) and even of fabricating verses and then claiming they were in their scriptures (II, 59; IV, 46; V, 13, 47; VII, 162; cf. Ḥassān b. Ṣāḥib, no. 96). He also came to believe that the Christian scriptures did not preserve the actual message and teaching of the Prophet, as stated in it.

Still Muhammad was not thinking any more than before of founding a new religion, but only of restoring the true religion proclaimed by the prophets from the beginning. On this point a distinction needs to be made between religious beliefs and later theological formulations on the one hand, and the conclusions reached by modern historical and sociological research. For instance, in traditional Muslim belief Muhammad is the “last and greatest of the prophets” (ṣeal al-naḥiyam) that is applied to Muhammad in sura XXXIII, 40. Also, he is regarded not as a “founder” but as one who confirmed and restored the true, ancient monotheistic faith that was established by the prophets Abraham, Moses, and Jesus [see TAHRIF]. It should not be surprising that it was at the very time when these concepts were being proclaimed by the Kurʾān, during the early years after the Hijra, that historians see the emergence of a new religious community and tradition founded by Muhammad, a man of extraordinary perception and skills. In particular, the opposition of the Jews of Medina to Muhammad appears to have had a significant impact on the shaping of Islam, for it was precisely at that time and apparently in direct response to the Jews’ rejection of him that the nascent Muslim community took on a pronounced national character through the adoption of various elements from ancient Arabian worship. This decisive change in the course of Islam occurred in the second year of the Hijra (July 623-June 624), and was signaled by the much discussed “change of the kibla” from Jerusalem to the ancient sanctuary of the Ka’ba in Mecca, which is treated at some length in the Kurʾān (II, 142-50). Muhammad’s native town thus became the centre of true religion, the focal point for the daily prayer rituals and the much desired object of the annual pilgrimage, adopted in theory fairly early in the Medinan years, but not performed as an Islamic ritual until the Prophet’s last years. At the same time Muhammad was excommunicated from the ridicule and persecution of the religious community and was regarded as having been founded by his self-proclaimed models, Moses and Jesus.
This nationalisation of Islam gave Muhammad a certain legitimation and broadened his authority as he came forward as the restorer of the religion of Abraham (mīlāt Ibrāhīm) that had been distorted by the Jews and Christians. Abraham, claimed by Jews and Christians alike as the progenitor of their faith, now became the great ħanīf [q.v.] and first ʿulūmī ("a person fully surrendered to the one true God"), in contrast not only to the polytheists but now also to the People of the Book: "Abraham was not a Jew or a Christian, he was an upright person, a Muslim, and he was not one of the polytheists" (ṣūra III, 67; cf. II, 135; III, 95; VI, 101, and XVI, 123, all of which, contrary to some traditional views, appear to date from the early Medinan years; see Bell-Watt, 99, 119). Abraham and his son Ishmael, regarded as the ancestor of the Arabs, were then said to have founded the Meccan sanctuary and the rites celebrated there (II, 125 ff.; XXII, 26 ff.) and it was Muhammad's task to restore the ancient rites to their original monotheistic state, since they had been corrupted by the polytheists. Whether this identification of Abraham as the first monotheist (an idea that met with opposition from the People of the Book according to ṣūra III, 65) originated in the context of Muhammad's dispute with the Jews in Medina or was already in existence among the Jews in Medina that not only the Emigrants but also a number of Helpers offered their services when Muhammad appealed for followers in the month of Radjab, 2 A.H. in his new cause, which he himself was to lead. He had learned that a rich Meccan caravan was on its way south from Syria and he decided to ambush it at Badr [q.v.]. The very cautious Abū Sufyān [q.v.] who was leading the caravan got wind of his plan, however, and sent messengers on a swift journey to Mecca for help. By the time the force of Meccans arrived and camped near Badr, the caravan had reached Mecca safely by following a diversion route along the coast. The angered Meccans, under the leadership of Abū ʿAbdullāh Qāhil [q.v.], one of the most prominent men of Mecca, had an army that is said to have been three times the size of Muhammad's forces, said to have been about 300 men, and he was unwilling to let the opportunity of properly chastising his troublesome enemy escape. Soon after the Meccans arrived near Badr, Muhammad arrived with his men, expecting to meet Abū Sufyān's helpless caravan. When the Muslims and their supporters discovered that the caravan had escaped and that a military confrontation with the Meccans and their allies was imminent, they were filled with fear (VIII, 5 ff.; cf. the continuation of 'Urwa's account in al-Tabarī, i, 1284 f.). The Prophet, however, saw in the encounter a portentous dispensation of God, who wished to force the polytheists into battle. Muhammad's charisma and remarkable power of suggestion were able to inspire his men so that they completely routed the far more numerous enemy. A number of the Meccans, including Abū ʿAbdullāh Qāhil, were slain and several, including Muhammad's uncle, al-ʿAbbās, were captured as prisoners and taken to Medina. Muhammad had two of them, al-Nadr and ʿUkba b. Abī Muʿayyā, put to death, while the others were held for ransom (Ibn Hīṣām, 457-61).

The battle of Badr, which might seem small and insignificant from a modern perspective, must be judged in light of the conditions of Muhammad's time. See the observations by Doughty (Travels, ii, 378) and Glubb (Muhammad, 179 ff.), both of whom knew the country well. This battle became of the utmost significance for Muslims. Muhammad saw in the victory a powerful confirmation of his belief in the one true God (VIII, 17, 65; III, 123; cf. Ka'b b. Mālik, in Ibn Hīṣām, 520 f.) and in his own call. Also, because the commercial city of Mecca
enjoyed such great prestige in Arabia, anyone who was able to defeat its forces in battle was bound to attract all eyes to himself. He therefore displayed even greater energy and was able to utilise the advantages he had won. After completing the arrangement for ransom for the Meccan prisoners, Muhammad began to besiege the Jewish tribe of Kaynukṣā in their forts. The Munāfīkūn (q.v.) did not dare to oppose him seriously by openly supporting the Kaynukṣā, and the other Jewish groups left their co-religionists in the lurch (cf. LIX, 14) so that this first Jewish tribe was forced to leave their longtime home in Medina and move north to other Jewish settlements.

In order to protect himself and his followers from attacks from other foes in the northern part of the Ḥijāz (q.v.), Muhammad at this time adopted a plan that is a further proof of his outstanding political ability. He concluded alliances with a number of Bedouin tribes in which the two parties pledged themselves to assist one another. (For examples of two such treaties made by Muhammad, along with a brief analysis and references to the Arabic sources, see Watt, Medina, 362-5.)

In the year 3/624-5 Muhammad continued his attacks on the Meccan caravans so that the Kurayṣā finally saw the necessity of taking more vigorous measures and revenging themselves for Badr. An army of about 3,000 men was equipped and set out for Medina with much display under the leadership of Abū Sufyān, who was clearly the most prominent leader in Mecca after the death of Abū Dāhāl at Badr. Although several of his followers advised Muhammad to make his defence within the Medinan settlement, he decided to go out with his forces, which at the last moment were much reduced by the departure of the Munāfīkūn, and took up a position on the lower slopes of the hill of Uhud (q.v.). In spite of the numerical superiority of the Meccans, the fighting at first went in favour of the Muslims, until a number of archers who had been placed to defend his flank left their position, against Muhammad’s express orders, to pursue some of the Meccan fighters who appeared to be retreating. This at once enabled the keen superiority on the slopes of Uhud. The tables were now turned and many of the Muslims began to flee, especially when the rumour spread that the Prophet had fallen (cf. sūra III, 144). In reality he was only wounded and escaped with a few faithful followers through a ravine on the south side of the hill.

Fortunately for him, the Meccans were unwilling to follow up their victory and, thinking that Muhammad had been punished enough and their honour had been reestablished, they turned quietly back to Mecca. The Prophet was thus saved from the worst, but he had to lament many fallen friends including his uncle, ʿAḥmaẓ. His newly acquired prestige naturally suffered. With all the eloquence in his power he endeavoured to raise the morale of his followers by exhortation and censure alike (cf. Ibn Ḥīqām, 392-606, and sūra III, 118 f., 139-60, 165-80). In this strategy he succeeded since the expected negative consequences of his setback at Uhud did not materialise in Medina.

Some of the Jews in Medina who had taken no part in the fighting made no secret of their delight at his misfortune. It was thus all the more necessary to make an example, and a second Medinan Jewish tribe, the Banū ʿAṣār, obliged Muhammad by providing justification for his action against them. Tradition imputes all sorts of crimes to them, but their actual offences are difficult to determine. The Kurāʾān says simply that they defied God and his Messenger (LIX, 4). After a siege of several weeks (al-Ṭabarī, i, 1850) they were expelled from Medina and forced to immigrate to Khaybar and other Jewish settlements in the north. They left behind them their weapons and their gold and silver as a rich booty, the distribution of which on this occasion Muhammad reserved for himself (LIX, 6 ff.).

While Muhammad was endeavouring to restore his weakened authority, a new and threatening storm came upon him and Medina from Mecca. The Kurayṣa, whose caravans were being continually harassed by him (cf. Ḥassān b. Ṭabībit, no. 16 f.) and who were urged on by the Jews of Khaybar, recognised that the victory at Uhud had not seriously weakened Muhammad’s position, and they realised the necessity of occupying Medina, which they had then neglected to do. Conscious of their slight military skill, being city merchants with little experience in warfare, they negotiated vigorously with various Bedouin tribes and thus raised a large army—said to have been about 10,000 men—with which they set out against Medina some time in the year 5/626-7. The varying accounts of the season of the year (sometimes said to have been a month after the barley harvest, sometimes during cold winter storms, the latter in agreement with sūra XXXIII, 9; cf. Ḥassān b. Ṭabībit, no. 16) could be reconciled only by the unlikely assumption that the siege lasted for a considerable length of time.

The advance of this imposing army produced great consternation in Medina, which was further increased by the vacillating attitude of the Munāfīkūn and by the discovery, or perhaps only the suspicion, that the Jews were conspiring with the enemy (XXXIII, 10 ff.). Muhammad in order to strengthen the defences had a trench (khandak, a Persian word) dug in front of the unprotected parts of the settlement (Ibn Ḥīqām, 670). Nowhere does Ibn ʿIṣāḥ in the recension by Ibn Ḥīqām attribute the idea of building the trench to Salmān the Persian (al-Farisi). According to other accounts, however, this trench is said to have been a Persian military tactic suggested to Muhammad by Salmān (e.g. Ibn Saʿd, ii, 1, 47). Modest as these defences must have been, they imposed a sufficient deterrent upon the enemy, who had little experience in such military tactics, and the siege gradually dragged on. Muhammad used the time for secret negotiations with the Ghatafaṇ and cleverly stirred up distrust among his opponents. When weather conditions became unfavourable the besieging forces lost heart and gradually began to retire, so that the last effort of the Kurayṣā to defeat Muhammad by force came to nothing.

For one group among the inhabitants of Medina, the largely uneventful “War of the Trench” became a bloody tragedy. Hardly had the Meccans and their allies retired than the Prophet declared war on the last Jewish tribe of any size in Medina, the Kurayya (q.v.), and began to besiege their forts. Once the Jews realised the serious nature of their predicament, they no doubt hoped to escape under terms similar to those of the Banū Kaynukṣā and the Banū ʿAṣār, especially since their allies, the once powerful tribe of Aww, were very actively trying to induce Muhammad to clemency. This third Jewish tribe, however, was not to be allowed the leniency shown to the other two. According to one account given by Ibn Ḥīqām, all of the men, numbering between 600 and 900 according to the varying accounts, were beheaded in compliance with a judgment given by Saʿd b. Muʿṣārid (q.v.) of the tribe of Aww, and “the property was divided among
the Muslims] and the women and children were taken as captives" (689 f.). In another account Ibn Hisham says "The Messenger of God ordered that every adult [male] of Banu Kurayya be killed ... and then he divided the property, wives, and children of Banu Kurayya among the Muslims" (692). Tradition endeavoured to put the responsibility for the massacre of the Kurayya on Sa'd b. Mu'adh (cf. Hassán b. Thábit, no. 167), who asserts Sa'd's sincerity, but there are various indications that it was the Prophet himself who was responsible for the decision. The expulsion or elimination of these three Jewish tribes brought Muhammad closer to his goal of organising an umma strictly on a religious basis. Some Jews from other families were, however, allowed to remain in Medina (cf. Ibn Hisham, 895; al-Wákidí/Wellhausen, 264, 309, 393; Hassán b. Thábit, no. 133).

The failure of the Meccan siege of Medina and the elimination of this last major Jewish tribe became one of the main turning points in the life of Muhammad and the rise of the Muslim community. From about six months after his arrival in Medina, when he sent out the first Muslim raiding party under the command of his uncle Hamza, until the time of the Meccan failure in their siege of Medina, Muhammad dispatched a steady stream of raiding parties against Meccan caravans (see Watt, Medina, 39-41, for a complete list and for references in Ibn Hisham and al-Taban, Wellhausen). This practice ceased after al-Khandak and the elimination of the Kurayyá (about a year before Muhammad agreed to a ten-year truce with the Meccans at al-Hudaybiya), and the Prophet turned his major attention towards the north.

Muhammad led two of these expeditions himself, one against the Banu Lihyán, early in the year 6 A.H. (August 627), which ended without fanfare or fighting and the more famous expedition against the Banú Mustalik, which is of interest for several reasons. It was on the return trip to Medina on this latter expedition that the celebrated adventure involving 'A'ishah [q. v.] occurred that might have cost her her position as a wife of the Prophet except that Muhammad received a revelation (XXIV, 4-5, 11-20) that exonerated her. More significant in the history of Islam, the 'A'ishah affair gave rise to a serious conflict within the ranks of the leaders of the Emigrants and also caused a breach between the Emigrants and the Helpers that continued well into the period after Muhammad's death. The political upheaval that arose after the raid on the Banú Mustalik might explain why this is the one significant expedition led by Muhammad on which the sources present widely differing opinions regarding its date. Ibn Hishám (725) states explicitly that this expedition occurred in the eighth month (Sha'íbân) of the year 6 A.H., after Muhammad's raid on Dhù Karad (sometimes called the raid of al-Qhāba), usually listed as his nineteenth personal expedition (see, e.g., Ibn Hishám, 972 f., and al-Tabari, i, 1757). Ibn Sa'd (iv/v, 45), on the other hand, following al-Wákidí (Wellhausen, 175 f.) states just as clearly that the expedition against the Banú Mustalik took place in Sha'íbân of the year 5 A.H. After Muhammad's raid on Dūmat al-Djandal that is usually listed as his fifteenth expedition (Ibn Hishám and al-Tabari, loc. cit.). This discrepancy serves as just one example of the difficulty or impossibility of reconstructing a precise chronology of the life of Muhammad even for the well-documented Medinan period.

Towards the end of the year 6 A.H., Muhammad thought that his position in Medina was so firmly established that he could risk a step that would bring him nearer to his desired goal. He and the Emigrants were still excluded from Mecca and its holy places, but through contacts in Mecca, including probably his uncle al-Á'bábas [q. v.], he knew that attitudes towards him in his native city were gradually becoming more favourable (cf. XLVIII, 25; LX, 7). In Dhu 'l-Ka'da of the year 6 (March 628) he gave orders to his followers to provide themselves with sacrificial animals and undertake a pilgrimage (an 'umra [q. v.]) with him to Mecca, saying that in a vision God had promised him fulfillment of this long-cherished wish (XLVIII, 27). In Mecca many were inclined to meet his wishes but the belligerent party was still strong enough to get a body of armed men sent to meet him and prevent him from entering the town. He therefore encamped at al-Hudaybiya [q. v.] where he began to negotiate with some leaders of Mecca. When these discussions failed Muhammad sent 'Uthmán, who was protected by his family connections, into the town as his representative. When 'Uthmán did not return after several days, a rumour that he had been murdered spread among the Muslims. The situation became critical and Muhammad dropped all negotiations, collected his followers under a tree, possibly one long held sacred, and made them swear to fight for him to the last, which nearly every man did with enthusiasm (XLVIII, 10, 18).

A short time later a number of Meccans arrived with 'Uthmán and offered a compromise according to which the Muslims would return to Medina without fulfilling their goal that year, but the Meccans promised to allow Muhammad and his followers to perform an 'umra the following year. He agreed to the proposal and also concluded a ten years' truce with the Kurayyá, further promising to return to the Meccans any of their captives or the Jewish or Christian refugees who sought refuge in Medina. Some of Muhammad's followers who had been determined to force their claim and perform the pilgrimage rituals inside Mecca that year became angry when they heard the terms to which the Prophet had agreed. Muhammad calmly ordered the sacrificial animals brought with them to be slain, which was to have been done at an 'umra in the town (see Lane, Lexicon, s.v. 'umra), and had his hair cut, and by his authority forced his grumbling followers to do the same. Only later did they discover that the so-called Treaty of al-Hudaybiya represented a brilliant act of diplomacy on the part of Muhammad, in that he had induced the Meccans to recognise him as an equal, had concluded a peace with them that promised well for the future, and had gained the admiration of many Meccans by incorporating their ancient religious rituals into his nascent religion. There is also evidence that a number of the leaders in Mecca were ready to abandon their polytheistic practices and adopt monotheism.

At the beginning of the year 7/628-9 Muhammad and those who had pledged themselves to him under the tree at al-Hudaybiya received ample compensation for the unfilled 'umra by the capture of the fertile oasis of Khaybar that was inhabited by Jews. This was the first actual conquest by the Prophet, and on this occasion he instituted a practice that set the precedent for future terms involving Jews or Christians who accepted the rule of the Muslims: he did not put the people to death or banish them but let them remain as tenants, as it were, with the stipulation that they had to pay a tribute (later called the jizya [q. v.]) every year. This expedition, which also brought the Jewish colonies of Wādî 'l-Kurá into his power, made the Muslim community wealthy for the first time (XLVIII, 18-21).
At about this time (the exact dates are given variously in the sources) tradition puts the despatch of letters from the Prophet to Mukawkiš [q. v.] the governor of Alexandria, the Negus of Abyssinia [q. v.], Suqun’ayrah, Heraclius the Byzantine emperor, the Persian king, and a number of others, in which he demanded that they adopt Islam (cf. al-Tabari, i, 1560-75). In the form in which these letters have come down to us they cannot be accepted as authentic, since they contain details that reflect a later period in the rise and power of Islam. Even if we disregard certain details that could have been inserted later, the substance of these letters hardly deserves the faith that most people have put in them (see, for instance, M. Hamidullah, Six originaux des lettres du Prophète de l'Islam, Paris 1985). It is very unlikely that so sober a politician and diplomat as Muḥammad would have engaged in so presumptuous a venture before the conquest of Mecca. This does not, of course, preclude the possibility that he sent letters to surrogates of the Byzantine and Persian emperors who lived on the northern fringes of the Arabian peninsula and also in the Yemen, and it can be accepted without hesitation that he maintained correspondence with the Negus of Abyssinia.

While it is true that passages of the Qur’ān that date from Muḥammad’s Medinan years do go beyond the explicit contents of the Qur’ān to send a message to the Abyssinian king, it must be noted that those verses that are so often cited as proof that the more prudent now could take control. Abu Ḥāritha [q. v.], who had been given command of a force said to have had 3,000 men. Also killed at this disastrous battle against the Byzantines at Mu‘āta was another potential leader within the early Muslim community, Dja‘far b. Abī Tālib [q. v.], Ali’s brother who had only recently joined the Muslims in Medina after remaining in Abyssinia with Muḥammad’s followers who had moved there from Mecca almost fifteen years earlier and remained (on Mu‘a‘a’ see Ibn Hishām, 3/27-31). The conclusions reached by Snouck Hurgronje (Muhammadanism, 48 ff.) and H. Lammens (Études sur le régime du califat Mo’awia, i, 422) are much more consistent with the evidence from the Kur’ān. (For a close analysis of the relevant verses of the Qur’ān and reference to literary and historical works on this issue, see Welch, Muḥammad’s understanding, 47-51.)

At the height of his power Muḥammad never demanded from Jews or Christians living in the Arabian peninsula that they should adopt Islam. He was content with political submission and the payment of zakāt (cf. Ibn Sa’d, 1/76, 15-38). In his eagerness to win the Arab tribes to Islam, Muḥammad is even said to have given the Dji‘ālāh [q. v.] on the Syrian coast a respite (amān) of two months after which they were to decide (see Ibn Sa’d, i/2, 82 f. and Watt, Medina, 108 ff.).

Late in 7 A.H. (early 629 A.D.) Muḥammad per-
all hearts by rich gifts (al-ta'if al-kulub, a new use of the alms; cf. IX, 60, and al-Mu'allaqa Kulubuhum). He demanded only the destruction of all idols in and around Mecca. Sura CX and XLVIII, 1 f. seem to capture some of the exaltation with which this victory filled Muhammad. It is striking that both of these unusually touching passages mention the forgiveness of Muhammad's sins after declaring that God has given him a clear victory (fath), suggesting that in some way the fulfillment of one of Muhammad's major goals, the peaceful surrender of his native city, served as a direct sign that God had forgiven him all his sins (cf. CX, 3 and XLVIII, 2).

Muhammad had no time to rest upon his laurels, for soon after the surrender of Mecca the Hawazin [q.v.] tribes in Central Arabia began preparing for a decisive fight and the town of Ta'if, which was closely associated with Mecca, was still unsubdued. Muhammad's forces fought the Hawazin and their allies at Hunayn [g.v.] on the road to Ta'if. At first the Prophet's forces seemed threatened with a fatal disaster, mainly because of the unreliability of a number of the new converts, but then some of his followers succeeded in recalling the fugitives and routing the enemy (IX, 25 f.). On the other hand, his inexperienced troops were unable to take Ta'if with its defences. It was almost a year later, after Muhammad had completed his successful expedition to Tabuk [q.v.] with nearly 30,000 men, that the people of Ta'if finally accepted their fate and sent emissaries to Medina to surrender to the Prophet and adopt Islam. After raising the siege on the well-fortified city of Ta'if early in 630, Muhammad returned to al-Dir'ana to supervise the distribution of the booty of Hunayn. The Helpers, who had earlier sided with Muhammad, had expressed the fear that he would take up his residence again in his native town, became very indignant about the rich gifts that he made to his former opponents in order "to win their hearts", while they themselves went empty-handed (cf. Hassân b. Thâbi, no. 31), but he spoke so kindly to them that they were said to have burst into tears and declared themselves Muslims (see Watt, Medina, 73-7).

The characteristic feature of the year 9/630-1 in the memory of the Muslims was the many embassies that came to Medina from different parts of Arabia to submit to the conqueror of Mecca on behalf of their tribes (cf. CX, 2). In the autumn of that year, Muhammad made up his mind to conduct a campaign against northern Arabia on a considerable scale, probably because the defeat at Mu'ta required to be avenged if he were to maintain the respect he had so far earned. Also, the Qassânid king was reported to have attempted to win the hearts of many of the Barbareans, the Thamûd, and the neighbouring Asad [q.v.]. With Mecca in his hands there was a noticeable inclination among the Bedouins in several places to submit to the will of the conqueror of this town in order to be safe against his attacks and to have a share in his new prosperity. In this respect Muhammad acted in keeping with reality and that it was only little penetration and found ardent followers in some places. But we must not allow ourselves to be deceived by the representations of the historians, from which it appears as if all the people in these lands adopted Islam. Caetani has shown that these accounts are not in keeping with reality and that it was only little groups that submitted, while there was a not incon siderable number who rejected the Prophet's demands. See Watt, Medina, 78-150, for a discussion of the major tribes in areas surrounding Mecca and Medina and also those farther to the north and south, along with an appraisal of the extent of Muhammad's success in winning over the major tribes of Arabia and, in some cases, the motives, whether political, social or religious, for the tribes' alliances with Medina.

In addition to the Jews who had already felt his strength, there were also a considerable number of Christians and some Zoroastrians [see magis] in the eastern and southern districts of the Arabian peninsula, who posed a problem of a different sort for Muhammad. While in the earlier teachings of the Qur'ân Muhammad is presented only as God's prophet to the Arab-speaking people, this situation changed in the later Medinan years. Sûra IX, 29 ff., for example, includes the Christians and the Jews among the polytheists, who gave God a son and honoured men as lords beside God. In contrast to such utterances, V, 82 mentions the Christians very sympathetically because they, unlike the Jews, showed kindness towards Muhammad and were not arrogant. Christian priests and monks are mentioned in particular; a more negative appraisal is given in LVII, 27, and yet the Christians of Nadjran [q.v.] are said to have received preferable treatment by Muhammad (Ibn Sa'd, i/2, 84 f.). Tor Andrae
explains these apparent inconsistencies by pointing to the differences between the Monophysites and the Nestorians, saying that the former aroused his unqualified displeasure by their Christology, while the latter, who were then predominant in the Persian sphere of influence, attracted him much more (Muhammed the man and his faith, 89-93).

On the other hand, statements in the Kur‘an about the Jews gradually become more severe after Muhammed’s first year in Medina, and passages dating from near the end of his lifetime appear to make little distinction between those Jews and Christians who rejected his prophethood. As People of the Book, however, who are assumed to worship the one true God, they were allowed to retain their religion if they recognised the political suzerainty of the Prophet by paying a tax (djizya [q.v.]). If they did not pay the djizya they were to be fought without mercy. The memory of the agreement between Muhammed’s reciters and the beliefs of the People of the Book that was emphasised in the earlier parts of the Kur‘an must have contributed to this inconsistent treatment of the groups that were coming under Muhammed’s control. In addition, there was the fact that treating the Jews and Christians as tax-paying tenants and allowing them to practise their religion, as had already been done at Khaybar, was much more practical for the Prophet than fighting them while they had resources to lose. A further favourable settlement with the “People of the Book” was that believers were allowed to marry their daughters and to eat food prepared by them (sura V, 5). According to a report in Ibn Sa‘d’s (i/2, 19) Muhammad included the Zoroastrians among the “People of the Book” in a letter he sent to a group of them (called Magians) in Hadjar. Muslims were forbidden instructions on religious beliefs and that must have contributed to this inconsistent treatment of the “People of the Book” does not occur in the Kur‘an. With these exceptions, the Prophet approached nearer to his objective of forming an umma on a strictly religious basis, for the inhabitants of a number of parts of Arabia were now actually bound together by religion, at least in the eyes of Muhammed. To bring their women and their lamps that continually stirred up new quarrels, were supposed to disappear, and all believers were to feel themselves brethren (IX, 11; XLIX, 10). There was to be no distinction among believers except in their degree of piety (XLIX, 13).

This very rapid extension of Muhammed’s sphere of influence through various types of treaties and other agreements naturally led to situations in which the new “converts” had little knowledge of the teachings and practices of Islam. Alongside the older adherents, who were really inspired by Muhammed’s recitations and whose faith had been tried by privations and dangers, there were now many new converts who had been gained mainly by political alliances, sometimes inspired by fear of Muhammed’s growing power. In spite of the teachers sent out to them there could be no question of any immediate deep-seated religious conversion among these Arabs. How the old Arab spirit continued to flourish among them unweakened is shown, for example, by the boasting and abuse in the poems included in Ibn Hisham (934 ff.). The Kur‘an itself in XLIX, 14, states clearly that the newly converted Bedouins were far from the true faith: they could say that they had adopted Islam, but they could not say that they had yet transgressed on religious beliefs and practices that constitute such a major theme of the early Medinan
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by the four 20th-century Egyptian writers Muhammad Husayn Haykal, Tahâ Husayn, Tawfik al-Hakim and 'Abbas Mahmûd al-Akâkîd, is provided by E.S. Sabanegh, Muhammad b. Ahmadallah "le prophète", portraits contemporains, Egypte 1936-1930, Paris and Rome 1981. Another valuable work that provides much more than the title implies is Mahser Jarrar, Die Prophetenbiographie im islamischen Spanien: ein Beitrag zur Überlieferungs- und Redaktionsgeschichte, Frankfurt 1989, which includes analyses of the early sources and of the various genres of writings about Muhammad. An annotated bibliography of biographies of Muhammad in Arabic, Persian, Urdu, Bengali, and several other South Asian languages, as well as English, French, German, Italian and Turkish is provided in Sayyid Ifîkhâr Shah, Armâghan-i had, vol. ii: Kutub strat, Multân, Pakistan 1981.


2. The Prophet in popular Muslim piety. A visitor listening to a good kauwâlí in the Indian subcontinent or attending a mevlâ'î (mauslîd) party in Turkey will always be impressed by the deep and loving veneration shown to the Prophet of Islam. Stories about him, his life and his intercession have permeated popular Muslim thought and poetry everywhere, and although Muhammad never claimed to have performed any miracle, traditional folk poetry, be it in the mountains of Cîrâl or in West Africa, in Turkey or in Indonesia, indulge in extensive descriptions of his marvellous attributes and actions.

Some miracles are inspired by Kur'anic expressions. The "Splitting of the moon" (sûra LIV, 1) forms a favourite topic of poets, especially in India. There, even the conversion of one King Farmâd at the Konkan coast is attributed to his having witnessed how the moon was split; after realising that this event had happened that very night in Mecca, he converted to Islam. A 19th-century miniature from the Hindu court of Kotah still shows this miracle. Even more important for popular mystical trends is the Kur'ânic term ummî which was given to the Prophet and interpreted as "illiterate". The conviction that the Prophet had to be illiterate in order to remain an immaculate vessel for the "incarnation" of the Divine word in the Kur'ân is central to Muslim piety. The folk mystics then extended this concept by claiming that it is enough to know only the alif, because this first letter of the alphabet contains the meaning of the four sacred books, and similar to the ummi Prophet, the true mystic is simply a vessel for divine inspiration. That is why whole groups of Turkish folk singers in the late Middle Ages adopted the sobriquet ummi (e.g. Ummi Kenâl, Umâmi Sinân).

Perhaps the most beautiful elaboration of a Kur'ânic remark about the Prophet is found in the concept of rahmat (sûra XXI, 107). In Oriental countries, rain is often called rahmat "mercy", and from this it was only one step to imagine the Prophet as a rain cloud dispensing blessing and stretching from Istanbul to Lucknow or whichever cities the poet had in mind (a 19th-century Balûqi poet enumerates 141 places where his mercy is operative, beginning with England!). The finest examples of this imagery come from Indo-Muslim poetry. Thus the Sindhi poet Shâh 'Abd-al-Latif (d. 1752) uses the concept of the cloud of mercy most ingeniously in his Risâlî to show how the Prophet's coming revives the dead hearts, just as rain revives the seemingly dead earth. Mirzâ Ghûlibî's (d. 1869) Abr-i gawharbdr "The jewel-carrying cloud" in honour of the Prophet is another good example of this imagery.

A favourite of high and popular piety is the Prophet's mi'raj (p. 25) which is described in ever-increasing details by poets in Turkey, India, and Africa. The story offered innumerable possibilities to sing of the radiant Prophet on his swift mount Burûq. In the course of time, Burûq became a kind of protective symbol, so that nowadays numerous representations of this creature with a woman's head and a peacock's tail are found on the rear of trucks in Pakistan and Afghanistan, as if Burûq were to carry the driver as safely through the rugged roads of the Hindûkush as he once carried the Prophet into the Divine Presence. On such pictures, Muhammad appears today usually as a white cloud or rose above the saddle, while former artists showed him in full, though usually with his face covered.

Other miracles have no basis in the Kur'ân, but belong to the general folk tradition. The Prophet's washing water was filled with baraka, charismatic power, he performed miracles connected with food (like milking Umm Ma'qar's barren sheep) and the pebbles in his hand and the doors and walls of the house greeted him. Trees bowed before him, and a cloud protected him from the sun. But perhaps the best-known story telling of love of inanimate things for him is that of the hamnâna, the "sighing" palm trunk on which Muhammad used to lean while preaching; when the first minbar (p. 25) was built and the old piece of wood was no longer needed, it began to sigh intensely because it missed the touch of the Prophet's hand.

His relationships with animals are often described, whether it be Ābû Hurayra's cat which killed a venomous snake to save the Prophet's life and was
therefore caressed by him (that is why cats never fall on their back), whether wolf and lizard attested ... completely impossible to compose an objective life of the Prophet. First there follows here a survey of the concrete

It is remarkable how many stories and concepts trickled down from high mystical circles to the folk level, even as far down to lullabies. The Divine saying lalwākā “But for thy sake I would not have created the spheres”, makes many singers call Muhammad simply “the lord of lalwākā”; the idea of the primordial light that was the first thing created is reflected in many songs, and legends tell of his “shadowless” presence. Legends about his birth “when the whole world was filled with light” abound, and from early times onward the day was celebrated by illuminations. To listen to stories or poems about his birth (mawlid) [see MAWLD, MAWLIYDA] is considered most meritorious. Yūnis Emre says. Thus descriptions of his overwhelming beauty and kindness occur frequently; he may be addressed, as often in Sindhi poetry, as “bridegroom” or simply as the “sweet prince”, mithā mir.

This devotion to Muhammad on the mystically-tinged popular level seems to intensify in the course of the centuries, and the poets would express their wish to be a dog at his threshold or claim that they were not worthy of his praise even though they might have cleansed their mouth with rose water a thousand times. They dreamt of visiting his nāuda in Medina (there is a whole genre of popular poetry in the various regional languages expressing their longing for the Prophet’s city), and despite the reminders by some theologians that not the Prophet but the Kur’ān is the veritable centre of Islam, the devotion to him was, and in most cases still is, the strongest binding power among Muslims, in whichever way they may interpret his role: as the trustworthy intercessor or as the primordial light, as gentle friend of humans and animals or as political leader of his community, as “cloud of mercy” or as the seal of prophethood who united in himself the stern, law-giving character of Moses and the loving kindness of Jesus to become the model for humanity in general. Ikhlās has voiced the general opinion about the position of the Prophet in his daring verse in the Lālāwāt-nāma (1932):

You can deny God but you cannot deny the Prophet. Bibliography: Complete references are given in A. Schimmel, And Muhammad is His Messenger, Chapel Hill 1985. (ANNEMARIE SCHIMMEL)

3. The Prophet’s image in Europe and the West.

A. The image in the Latin Middle Ages

In the learned, Latin circles of the Middle Ages in Europe (ca. 800-1400 A.D.), a remarkable amount of concrete data about the life of the Prophet Muhammad was known and available. (In the following we have limited ourselves exclusively to these; Islam as a religion is left aside, although the separation cannot always be maintained.) Even if the knowledge about Muhammad’s life which is at the disposal of an historian of Islam in our days is taken into account, it might be maintained with some justice that a historically reliable life of the Prophet, in its essential features, could have been written in medieval Europe when based on a selective choice of the correct knowledge then available. The main themes of the following section are that the character of the various important knowledge about Muhammad in medieval Europe, remarkably precise to some extent, and the answer to the question why it was yet completely impossible to compose an objective life of the Prophet.

First there follows here a survey of the concrete
knowledge about Muhammad's life (until ca. 1400). The time of his life and work could be fixed quite readily on the basis of the genealogical line 'Hagar/Isma'il', there was at least an accord with the self-evidence of Muslim genealogy. (The fact that the latter too was a fiction, is a matter of secondary importance here.) About Muhammad's milieu, Arabia, the following information was after all available: the lack of settled social structure, the warlike, predatory activities considered characteristic for the way of life; a manifold idolatry as religious expression (i.e. the essential marks of Arabian tribalism); and also the settlement of Christian and Jewish groups in Arabia. As for Muhammad's pre-prophetic period, it was known that Mecca was his native town, that he grew up as an orphan with foster-parents, that his kindred was not connected with the important ones in Mecca, that Mecca itself was active in trade and that in this context Muhammad's first wife was Kadhida, which fact, among other things, led to extensive journeys. Mediaeval tradition was also aware of possible contacts, during such journeys, with homines religiosi, who transmitted to the later Prophet elements of monotheist religiosity, such as the Bahirà story or his accounts of Muslim contact with the 'sacred right (khwāṣîf)' known in Muslim tradition; these contacts were likewise considered as forming the connection with the themes of the Old and New Testaments of later Qur'anic revelations.

Muhammad's comparatively late call was known as such, as was the fact that he experienced it as having taken place partly under strong physical or psychological pressure, and that he perceived Gabriel as the transmitter of divine messages. The knowledge that Muhammad was conscious of being an exclusive transmitter (missus, nuntius, legatus, apostolus) of divine orders, of being purely human, not endowed with supernatural powers (no miracles), and finally also of being illiterate (ummi) corresponds with historical reality. About the general character of the divine revelations (only this can be discussed here), correct knowledge had been collected, together with numerous fictions: apart from parallels with Old and New Testament traditions, it was known that monotheism (i.e. the explicitly hostile opposition against the surrounding polytheism) played a central role; that judgement would be passed about reward or punishment at a coming Day of Judgement; that the divine precepts also dealt with matters of this world (the Qur'anic revelation is therefore often indicated as lexe).

Muhammad's initial failure in Mecca, generally known as such, could be specified with correct details: only a few followers (a certain number of names are given here); assessment by the Meccans that he was a 'magic man' or was possessed, endeavours on their part to 'buy him off' from his divine assignment; his short-lived temptation through the so-called 'Satanic Verses'; the temporary emigration of a part of the Muslims to Ethiopia. The fact that it was necessary for the Prophet to migrate to Medina (even the older name Yathrib, in various forms of transcription, may appear here) was also known, as were his ultimate successes there and his intensive warlike activities to conquer the Meccans, successful in the end, and to subdue and oust the Jews of Medina. There was even some correct information circulating about the Prophet, such as anecdotes about his personal life; Muslim biographies, however, mention his marriage to A'ishah being Muhammad's most important consort during the Medina period, including the temporarily rife rumours about her infidelity; also about the delicate Zaynab/Zayd/Muhammad affair and its reflection in the Qur'anic revelation. Finally, Muhammad's ascension to heaven (isrâ or mi'râj [q. v.]) and a number of details corresponding with Muslim tradition about this, were also known; correct statements about the occurrence of his death and further circumstances surrounding it could be made: the Prophet's quite human (painful) death in 632, his unpretentious burial, 'Umar's refusal to believe that he was dead and the danger that the Muslim community might disintegrate after the Prophet's death.

This certainly impressive knowledge of mediaeval Europe about the life of the Islamic Prophet (the preceding enumeration, by the way, does not claim completeness) should, however, be assessed in its historical context, i.e. put in perspective. With this, the quality of that knowledge is lost almost completely, even if, on its face value, it may appear as positive since we are dealing in a historiographical way with unfamiliar material. In this context, three aspects have to be considered and explained.

1. The knowledge presented here has been brought together during a very extended course of time and partly along extraordinarily tortuous paths. The single elements of knowledge, increasing gradually, were recognised as 'true' and given preference over other 'tarnished' information by the first authors only, but not by their later followers. Moreover, the fact that at first fragments and later complete knowledge was at hand, did not in any way entail general diffusion and availability. Hence not one of the mediaeval authors who tried to describe the life of Muhammad, rendered the state of knowledge which was theoretically possible at any given time; how much correct information appeared at any time in a writer's representation depended more or less on chance.

2. Correct information about Muhammad's life obviously originated ultimately from genuine Islamic sources. But it was spread in Europe by non-Muslim transmitters, who had lived in the Islamic environment for a longer period of time or permanently (and almost without exception were versed in Arabic). However, as non-Muslims under Islamic domination or in Islamic surroundings, they were, as a rule, not concerned with the diffusion of an objective, let alone a positive, image of Muhammad. Consequently, in both the selection and the transmission of 'true' elements of Muhammad's biography their emphasis is distant if not polemical.

3. Already coloured in a mildly negative way, the correct assertions about the life of the Islamic Prophet then reached the studies of Christian authors, who were not only complete outsiders to Islam but also intent on using their pens to completely disqualify Islam and thus the Prophet in the first place. With this, these assertions were used selectively and mainly in so far as they were suitable for polemics, which went as far as scornful malignity. Occasionally, these assertions were also changed accordingly, but they were above all interwoven with fictitious elements in such a way that they were often divested completely of their historical value. The most different mista-composita of this kind became for a long period the basis of the image of Muhammad in Christian Europe.

The general assertions given under 2. and 3. have to be illustrated and specified in the following by concrete data, such as the contemporary remarks and the dominant motives of the mediaeval Muhammad biographies. First we shall deal with the transmitters and the transmission of the biographical material.

The essential starting-points for the traditions
about Muhammad which were circulating in the European Middle Ages were Byzantium, on the one hand, and the Crusaders, resident for a longer period in the Orient, on the other. The Oriental Christians, as well as the Crusaders, resident for a longer period in the Orient, do not seem to have contributed much material. Of the Oriental Christians it was above all the very early John of Damascus (7th-8th century) who left distinct traces; from the circle of his fellow-Christian, the translation. Altogether, in the 13th century there was a remarkably wide spectrum of correct information: the Quadruple reprobatia, whose author remains obscure, and the writings concerning Islam of Petrus Venerabilis, Abbot of Cluny (first half of the 12th century) to be translated in Toledo in order to bring about an extensive refutation of the Islamic religion on a solid basis. The treatises Liber generationis Mahomet, Doctrina Mahomet and Summa totius haeretic Saracenum from this collection, which, as in well known, also contained a Latin translation of the Qurʾān, have certainly been important for the later image of Muhammad in Christian Europe. The most considerable influence, however, seems to have been that of the treatise Epistolae Saraceni or Rescriptum Christiani, the translation from Arabic of a polemic (risala) which is dated before the year 1000 and composed by an Oriental Christian (?), whose name ʾAbd al-Malik b. Isḥāk al-Kindi (cf. the name of his Muslim opponent ʾAbd Allāh b. Ismāʿīl al-Ḥāshimi) is undoubtedly a pseudonym. The corresponding passages in the Speculum Historiale of Vincent de Beauvais (13th century) are above all based on this translation. Altogether, in the 13th century there originated then those writings which finally completed in essence the whole knowledge of the European Middle Ages and which—apparently by always going back directly to Arabic-Islamic sources—transmitted a remarkably wide spectrum of correct information: the Quadruple reprobatia, whose author remains obscure, and the writings concerning Islam of Petrus Paschasius or Pedro Pascual, of Ricoldus de Monte Crucis or Ricoldo da Monte Croce (going back ultimately to a text written in Arabic by a Mozarab, known in Latin as Contrataes eisylia), of Ramón Móri, or of Ramón Lull or Ramonjus Lullus.

Just because of its considerable popularity, mention should finally be made of the “Corozan legend”; this legend appears for the first time in Hugo of Trever (beginning of the 12th century).

We shall deal now with the most important motives and groups of motives which decisively marked the image of Muhammad in the European Middle Ages and fixed it afterwards for a long time (with offsets until today).

With very few exceptions, the concept of the mediaeval biography of the Islamic Prophet was dominated by a single tendency, namely to prove that Muhammad, in the way he had lived and acted, could not have been a prophet, that his alleged divine revelations consequently were man’s work and that Islam at the very most is an abstruse heresy of Christianity. Made subservient to this basic concept, there appear in the mediaeval Muhammad biography four kinds of motives, which may perhaps be characterised as follows:

1. Authentic accounts which—hardly or not at all changed—were, according to the mediaeval Christian concept, already as such sufficient to disqualify Muhammad as a Prophet.

2. Authentic accounts which by a little shift of emphasis and/or by inserting them into a false context of history or argumentation, unmasked Muhammad as a magician.

3. Motives which ultimately are based on authentic material but which hardly permit one to recognise this connection because they have been garbled by being shortened, enlarged or contextually placed so as to serve a polemic argumentation (these manipulations can also be found in various combinations or all together).

4. Pure fiction (not very often found).

When we follow Muhammad’s course of life in outline, while characterising the main motives, his origin and conditions of life should be mentioned as the first important group of motives. Muhammad and his contemporaries, the Saraceni, are descendants of the Dondi maid’s (Hagar’s) son Ismael, for whom already in the Bible (Gen. 16,12; 21,13) an extensive but wild and warlike posterity is predicted. It was not difficult to apply this Ismael filiation, already used by Isidore of Seville and Bede for a (negative) representation of the Arabes or Saraceni, in a polemical way against Muhammad: as a descendant of a rude, barbarically warlike people, who had neither government nor law and who moreover practised an unrestrained polytheism, he was not exactly predisposed to prophethood. Add to this his own low status in his tribe, to which his “illiteracy” could be added as an aggravating and fitting epithet. This quality of ummi, which in the Islamic tradition formed a solid argument in favour of the divine origin of the Qurʾānic revelations, thus in the West—where it was known since about 1100—almost served the opposite aim. Being of humble origin in several respects, surrounded by polytheists and, on top of that, “illiterate”, Muhammad could evidently easily be misread. To this are linked the manifold versions of his intercourse with doubtful haminis religiosi, who passed on to him, in his ignorant naivety, heretical Christian and/or Jewish doctrines as the true religion, a main primary motive which—linking up remotely with Islamic traditions—apparently had already reached the West through John of Damascus. As seducers of this type there appear the Arian-Nestorian monk Sergius or Bajhrā (taken directly from Muslim tradi-
to which Muhammad’s prophethood is confirmed by exponents of pre-Islamic religions (who see prophesied signs as being fulfilled by Muhammad), is turned by the very same people into a seduction to prophethood of the ignorant Saracen. Seducer and seduced in the end could, incidentally, melt into one and the same person. The abstruse motive of Muhammad being a Christian cleric, even a cardinal, who through ambition had become an apostate and had fulfilled his aims by founding a new sect, must thus have come into being. For the rest, the entire group of motives of “Muhammad being seduced by deceitful figures” is the context for the view, predominantly represented in the learned mediaeval West, that Islam is a Christian heresy, while the representation of Muhammad as part of the pantheon of a polytheistic Islam is a persistent element of the “popular” image of Islam in the Middle Ages.

Muhammad’s origin from humble conditions, in combination with the knowledge about his marriage to Khadidja, active in trade (and thus rich), could also be used polemically in another direction: having suddenly become familiar with the so far unknown possibilities of wealth (i.e. social influence), Muhammad was seized by an unrestrained striving for power, which in the end brought him to work his way to be a ruler by means of alleged prophethood. Thus the motives used by Muhammad himself about his origin and his personal life, both not worthy of a prophet anyhow. It is not necessary to enter here into the details of the mediaeval polemic against Muhammad in sexualibus. In any case, the emphasis given to this matter shows that it does not seem unfounded to think that the Christian Middle Ages, prudish and extraordinarily restrictive in sexual matters, could give themselves a somewhat free verbal rein by anathematising an anti-hero. By mediaeval standards relating the Islamic—tradition, the Kuraysh see in Muhammad a charlatan. This summary may have made it clear that any human qualities of the Prophet, so essential for Islamic theology, constituted for the mediaeval Christian the most conclusive counter-argument, repeated and varied again and again, against Muhammad’s prophethood, and were simply the proof of his being a charlatan.

As for Muhammad’s time in Medina, the mediaeval polemic against him is marked above all by two groups of motives: his conduct of war and his sexual life, both not worthy of a prophet anyhow. Measured by the Christian exhortation to peace, a founder of religion who declared warlike activities to be religiously meritorious—as is again shown exquisitely by the Kurʾān and the Islamic tradition—and who called his followers to battle and acted as commander himself, could not be acceptable. Razzias, with the pseudo-prophet in person as princeps latronum in the vanguard and shamefully declared to be according to God’s directions, were inspired rather by pursuit of power and lust for booty.

Much more, however, than in Muhammad’s positive attitude about war, mediaeval authors were pruriently interested in his sexual life, a central theme already transmitted to Europe by John of Damascus. Many mediaeval representations give the impression right away that the real centre of life and the most important achievements of the Islamic Prophet had been his excessively strong sexual urge. It is not necessary to enter here into the details of the mediaeval polemic against Muhammad’s attitude, and that of his followers, towards women and marriage (having become known gradually), was already sufficient by itself to provoke great indignation and denial. Polygamy legitimised by the Kurʾān; Muhammad’s special rights in this respect; the suspicion of infidelity against ‘Ā’ishā, Muhammad’s favourite wife; the Zaynab affair vindicated by the ‘Amir; the deification of Islam; informal paradise; all these representations already by themselves enormities and became a welcome basis for imaginative and hedonistic adornments. The polemic against the lascivious lifestyle of the immundissiae totius amator or also carnalis viitis totius brutalis often went a step further: the alleged prophethood and the so-called “divine revelations” mainly served to legitimise Muhammad’s abnormal sexual needs (and those of his followers): this was pure blasphemy indeed.

The last group of motives consists of the mediaeval descriptions of Muhammad’s death. In this context also, correct knowledge could be useful for polemics, like the quite normal human death, which did not correspond to the representations of the demise of a holy man, even of a prophet, and Muhammad’s death in the arms of ‘Ā’ishā, a detail which was gratifying to sexual polemics. Other motives originated from contaminations, such as the fact that Muhammad expected an ascension to heaven (miʿrāj) which did not however occur, or the epilepsy motive was applied again, now as the cause of death. Finally, information according to which Muhammad died of a drinker’s delirium (the Islamic prohibition of wine being in the background) is a malicious fiction, as are also those reports which say that his dead body was torn to pieces by dogs and/or pigs (these animals being certainly known as the most unclean for Islam).

This summary may have made it clear that any
single group of motives might in fact already have suf-
ficed to disqualify Muhammad as a prophet. If all
polemic elements are added up, the image arises of a
monstrous anti-prophet, whose doctrine and the
religion built upon it automatically lack any
truthfulness. (A. North)

B. The image in mediaeval popular texts and in modern
European literature

1. Popular texts of the Middle Ages
(a) Heroic epic and Crusaders' epic: Muhammad as god

The knowledge of Muhammad's life as known in
Latin theological texts is at first hardly reflected in
popular literature. Muhammad (in French: Mahom,
Mahomés, Mahun, Mahum, Mahomet; in German:
Machmet; in Old Icelandic: Mæmét) is first mentioned
in the 12th-century genre of the Chanson de geste; next
to Térides (German Teregang), Apollin (German
Appolo), Jupiter and others, he is represented as an
idol, whose image the Saracen warriors take with
them into battle; after a defeat they throw it among the
dogs or pigs into the river or also trample on it
e.g. Chanson de Roland, ca. 1100, v. 2590 ff.; the
German Rolandslied of the cleric Konrad, second half
of the 12th century, v. 7135-41; Historia Caroli et
Rotholandi of Pseudo-Turpin, middle of the 12th
century). Like Christ or God the Father with theChris-
tians, he is implored for help by the Saracens, but is
shown as being ineffective (e.g. Chanson de Roland, v.
3640-7). Muhammad also appears as an idol in the
anonymous Cycle de Guillaume d'Orange, in which the
resistance against the Saracens in Southern France is
represented thematically. Wolfram von Eschenbach in his
Willehalm, as well as his imitators Ulrich von dem
Türlin in his history preceding theWillehalm, and
Ulrich von Türeheim in his Rennentre, represent him
likewise as an idol. Muhammad also remains one of the
heavenly gods in the epics of the Crusades (Richard
le Pêlerin and Graindor de Douai: La Chanson
d'Antioche (ca. 1180): La Conquête de Jerusalem (ca.
1180), La Chanson du Chevalier au Cygne et de Godofroy
de Bouillon (ca. 1200) and in Saladin, which belongs to
the cycle of the Second Crusade. When the fighting of
the Christians against the Saracens emerges as a
theme to be treated, Muhammad is still in the 13th
century considered as god or as idol, e.g. in Stricker's
Karl der Große (ca. 1230), in the Old Icelandic
Karlamagnus saga (end of the 13th-beginning of the
14th century), and in the Partonopier et Meliar of
Konrad of Würzburg (ca. 1277). Since the origin of
the Chansons de geste is to be considered as close in time
as well as in intentional connection with the first
Crusades (1096-9, 1147-9, 1189-92), it seems obvious
to suppose that this coarsely-counterfeited representa-
tion of Muhammad as god and of Islam as polytheism
conceals a polemic intention. The popular texts aimed
at a much larger public, one which was not trained in the
subtle argumentation of the theologians. If these
texts were to be successful, they had to adapt them-
selves to the imaginative powers, to the social,
political and religious interests of this public. Since
here a much more eye-catching resistance against the
foreign religion was necessary than was the case with the
discourses of the theologians addressed to the
specialists, the reproach of polytheism and idolatry
was above all apt to discredit the foreign religion in the
eyes of the Christians. Though the Christians
were likewise reproached by the Muslims of being
idolaters because of the dogma of the Trinity, it is not
likely that their representing Muhammad as an idol
was a conscious retort against the criticism of
polytheism.

In English literature, Muhammad appears as an
idol in Mary Magdalen from the Digby cycle. On
the other hand, in his Piers Plowman (1362, 1373-4, 1394)
William Langland takes over the representation of
Muhammad as a renegade cardinal, and in John
Lydgate's The Fall of the Princes (1438), Muhammad is
represented as an heretic and false prophet in the story
Off Machomet the false prophet.

(b) Romantic biographies of Muhammad

It was only after the middle of the 13th century that
romantic representations of Muhammad's life
appear: for the Roman de Mahum of Alexandre de la Pont
(1258) the poem Oita de Machomete of Walter of Com-
pieagne (middle of the 12th century) was the model. As
his informant, the narrator refers to a Muslim
converted to Christianity and represents Muhammad as
someone in bondage. Through his cleverly contrived
marriage to the widow of his former master, he not
only attains his freedom and wealth but also knows
how to cover up his epileptic attacks as phenomena
accompanying visitations of angels and to pose as a
new messenger of God's will through deceitful
machinations.

Based on Arabic sources and, apart from one
sentence in the foreword, free from Christian evalua-
tions, is L'eschiele Mahomeh, an Old French translation
of the Latin Scala Mahumate and composed after 1264.
The Scala de Mahumate (1264), is a translation of the (lost)
Escala de Maoma (between 1260 and 1264), which in its turn had been translated from
Arabic into Spanish at the order of Alphonso X. The
sources of the original Spanish text are the isra2 and
mu2nadž. Woken up by the archangel Gabriel, Muham-
bad begins his journey on the mare Alborak and sets
out for Jerusalem, where he is honoured by the resur-
rected prophets. With the help of a ladder guarded by
angels, he reaches the hereafter and visits the seven
heavens accompanied by Gabriel. In the eighth
heaven he meets with God, Who orders him to make
his people fast 40 days per year and to worship God
50 times a day. After the return to the seventh heaven
and a stay in a white, mysterious land, the journey
leads to the seven paradises, where Muhammad
receives from God the Kur'ân and is ordered to make
his people worship God 50 times a day and fast 60
days every year; at Muhammad's request the number of prayers is reduced to five per day. After consul-
tation with Moses, Muhammad also obtains from God
a reduction of the fast to 30 days. Through the de-
scription of Gabriel and a personal view from a safe
distance, Muhammad learns about the seven classes
of the subterranean hell which await the sinners. Gabriel
also informs him about the construction of the
cosmos, about the end of the world and the Last
Judgement. With the order to announce to his people
what he had seen, Gabriel accompanies him back to
Jerusalem, from where he returns on the mare
Alborak to Mecca to his still sleeping wife Omenhi.
He relates his experiences to her and, against her war-
nings, to the Kurayshites. The latter believe him only
after he, enabled to do so through a vision, foretells to
them how their caravan which is returning from
Jerusalem is organised.

Again more committed to Latin Christian polemics are
Brunetto Latini's Liere dou Tresor (composed before 1267, enlarged after 1268), in which Muham-
bad is represented as a former monk and cardinal, and
Dante's Divina Commedia, in which Muhammad
finds himself, together with Allah, among the sowers of
discord and the schismatics, being defeated again and again (Inferno, canto 28). The Legenda
Aurora of Jacob de Voragine (composed 1250-80 in
Italy, translated into German from the middle of the
14th century) stands also in this tradition. Here the motive of the renegade priest who assists Muhammad in obtaining power with the help of a trained pigeon, which picks seeds from his ear (cf. Vincent of Beauvais, Speculum historiale), is combined with the story of Sergius (cf. Petrus Venerabilis, Summa totius haeresis Saracenorum); the Nestorian (or Jacobite) monk Sergius functions as Muhammad’s secret counsellor, and he passes off his instructions as orders of the Holy Ghost. Falsified Christian doctrines came into the Kur'ān through the intermediary of Sergius.

Finding himself likewise in the tradition of the Latin Lives of Muhammad, John de Mandeville again takes up a series of well-known motives in ch. 1,44, of his travel account (middle of the 14th century; Latin, German and Dutch translations date from the end of the same century): the door which arches higher at Muhammad’s entrance; the marriage to Khadija notwithstanding his lowly origin; his epilepsy, which he presents as visitations by the angel; his descent from the tribe of Ismael; the murderer by his companions (imputed to him) of his eremitic counsellor while he sleeps intoxicated; and his interdiction of the pleasure of drinking wine, are all connected with this. The travel account of Johannes Schlüterber (latter third of the 15th century), in which the figures of the Kur’ān are mixed with stories he himself had heard in the Orient, depicts, without polemic value judgements, Muhammad’s poor childhood and the prediction of a Christian priest who recognises in Muhammad, because of a black cloud floating over him, the prophesied founder of a new religion, which is to press hard upon the Christians. The priest also recognises Muhammad’s rise to become a great scholar, an effective preacher and a mighty caliph (ch. 46).

2. Modern times
(a) Anti-Islamic tendencies

At the beginning of modern times, popular literature also admits altogether, with respect to Muhammad, the fabulous characteristics and degrading judgements of the Christian theologians. It is true that Luther, in the commentary of his translation of the Confutatio Alcorani of the Dominican friar Richard (1540), goes so far as to see the Antichrist in the Pope rather than in Muhammad because the latter attacks the Christians in a recognisable way and from the outside, but for the rest he adopts the prejudices transmitted since a long time and labels Muhammad among other things as the devil’s son. The Muhammad biographies of the 17th century, in accordance with the Christian tradition, impute to him sectarianism, robbery, indiscriminate warfare and whoring. Thus Michel Baudier (1625) and Ludovico Maracci (1696-8), who, within the framework of his Kur’ān translation, does however try his best to arrive at some degree of impartiality. Using Islamic sources, Jean Gagnier wrote a Muhammad biography (1732) which is a polemic against Boulainvilliers and a denigration of Islam. For a longer time even than in France and Italy, the image of Muhammad as an impostor and a destroyer who is driven by ambition and avidity lasted in England. Occasionally he is represented as the Antichrist or at least compared with him, by Alexander Ross in the preface of the English Kur’ān translation of 1649, as well as in his work A View of all the religions of the World (1653). Muhammad figures as a rival of Luther (ibid.) and in his De orbis terrae concordia (first half of the 16th century) and by Jean Bodin in his Heptaplomeres (middle of the 16th century). After the decline of the Turkish threat to Central Europe from the beginning of the 17th century, the endeavour to establish an image of Muhammad which also did justice to Islamic tradition clearly increases. This attitude is shown by J. H. Hottinger in his Historia orientalis (Zürich 1651), although he still represents the Prophet with a black cloud over his head (cf. Bayle (Dictionnaire historique et critique, 1697), Adrianus Reland (De religione Mohammedia libri II., Utrecht 1653).
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1705) and the English Orientalist George Sale in the Preliminary Discourse to his English translation of the Kur'an (1734) go still further. As was the case with Jean Gagnier (see above), Reland's representation of Muhammad is marked by the intention to weaken the polemically-inspired comparisons of Protestant belief with Islam.

The first biography of Muhammad which combined an endeavour towards historical accuracy with a positive appreciation of Muhammad's personality and of Islam, was La Vie de Mahomet by Boulainvilliers (published posthumously in London, 1730). Boulainvilliers described Muhammad as a man of genius, a great lawyer, a conqueror and monarch, whose doctrine is characterised by justice and tolerance. A positive image of Muhammad is also secured by Leibniz in his Théodizee (1710), because the Prophet did not deviate from the "natural religion". In his Essai sur les moeurs (1756), as well as in his Dictionnaire philosophique (1764), Voltaire appreciated Muhammad as a conqueror, lawyer, ruler and also as a priest. Influenced by Boulainvilliers's representation, he emphasised Muhammad's greatness and even saw in him an advocate of tolerance. Voltaire's positive judgement, expressed in his Essai, found its way to Turpin's biography of Muhammad in three volumes (1773-9). This was then admitted by the English historian Edward Gibbon (History of the decline and fall of the Roman empire, 1776-87), who in his valuation hesitated, however, between condemnation and respect. In his Bampton Lectures 1784 (To confirm and establish the Christian faith, and to confute all heretics and schismatics), Gibbon's contemporary and fellow-countryman Joseph White considered Muhammad as a swindler, to be sure, but he acknowledged his magnanimity (though calculated), seen in the release of prisoners. While Nathan Alcock, in The Rise of Mahomet accounted for on Natural and Civil Principles (1795), represented Muhammad as an impostor deceived by his own fantasies, and explained his success by the fact that he adapted his doctrine to the climatic and social conditions of his land, Godfrey Higgins (An Apology for the Life and Character of the Celebrated Prophet of Arabia, or the Illustrations, 1829), emphasised Muhammad's uprightness and denied that ambition and cupidity had been his motives. Thomas Carlyle went even further in his The hero as Prophet. Mahomet. Islam, a lecture delivered in 1840. He attested Muhammad's uprightness, justice, magnanimity and personal modesty, adduced the marriage to Khadija as an argument against the reproach of sensuality and ambition and justified the use of weapons to defend religion.

Savary's Kur'an translation, published in 1783, was accompanied by an informative biography of Muhammad, which endeavoured to be unbiased and testified to the growing interest of the Enlightenment in comparative religion, just as was done in Pastourelet's Zoroastre, Confutais et Mahomet, an academic paper published in 1787.

Jacob Morder's fragment Mohammeds Reise ins Paradise, published in 1785, dealt with the irá and míoirág. In his Ideen zur Philosophie und Geschichte der Menschheit (1791), Herder saw the Prophet as marked by influences exerted on him by his kinship, his time and the religions around him, as a desipser of idolatry, but also as someone endowed with an ardent fantasy which favoured his self-deception.

Historical greatness and personal performance are evaluated by a series of dramas about Muhammad in the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries. Karoline von Günderode's dramatic sketch Mahomet oder der Prophet von Mekka, published in 1804, by using selected historical details, described Muhammad as a faultless and magnanimous human being, whose consciousness of his mission, based on feelings, makes him into a symbol of the individual whom God has taken hold of. The Orientalist J. von Hammer-Purgstall also based his historical play Mohammed oder die Eroberung von Mekka, published in 1823, on the historical tradition, without however falling into romantic idealisation, as had been Günderode's case. Franz Kaibel (Muhammad, 1697) mixed historical and biographical elements with the fictitious into a drama with a positive tendency, while Margarete von Stein's Mohammed (1912) represented Muhammad as a self-assured prophet with a magical-mystic belief, who felt himself as above the law.

In narrative poetry, too, the life of Muhammad was more than once represented in Germany during the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th centuries. In Eduard Duller's short novel Mohammed (1844), the historically-attested was amalgamated with the invented into a historised narrative with an admiring tendency. The novel on Muhammad by Kluband, composed in 1917, whose source is the Life of Muhammad by Ibn Iskâk, in which Muhammad reaches a rebirth of the soul through spirit, justice and goodness, also belongs to the series of representations tending to the glorification of Muhammad. In Adalbert Schaffer's novel Die Rose der Hedscha (1923) Muhammad appears as being above all human weaknesses. Positive traits also prevail in poems which have Muhammad's life as their theme, as an epigram by Haug (1803) and in poems by Friedrich Rückert (1868), C.B. Büttner (1894), Martin Geiß (1909) and Adolf Huber (1909), today altogether forgotten. In his poetic cycle Mahom and sein Werk (1840), O.Fr. Daumer emphatically set Muhammad's greatness and his religion, which considered terrestrial gratification as a preliminary stage of celestial enjoyment, against the Christian religion, which is criticised for its disdain of this world.

(c) The life of Muhammad as a vehicle of literary expression

In 1742 Voltaire's tragedy Le Fanatisme, ou Mahomet (The Fanaticism, or Prophet Mahomet) performed in Paris, but with three performances under pressure of the clergy. Even the censorship perceived that the religious fanaticism, deceit and hypocrisy, exemplified by the figure of Muhammad, was in fact aimed at the Christian clergy. In the series of representations of Muhammad which came into existence since the beginning of the 18th century, Voltaire's drama, translated by Goethe in 1799, stands out most among those which aimed neither at a condemnation of Muhammad as inspired by Christianity, nor at a historically-justified description, but which made use of the figure in order to exercise veiled criticism against their own society, to set a far-away utopia against it, to gain a licence for describing behaviour which is considered to be offensive in the own cultural field, or to take as a theme the conflict between genius and human weakness. To this series belonged at an earlier stage the comedy Ariéquin Mahomet, performed in 1714, in which Harlequin takes Muhammad's name, lands in Başra with a flying sack bought from Boubekr and uses the authority, usurped as an alleged prophet, to assist a Persian prince get the princess worshipped by the latter. Whilst Harlequin plays here the role of match-maker, disguised as Muhammad, some chivalrous novels use Muhammad as a pretext licentiously to represent amorous adventures, such as Le Prophete, écrites par Aiesha, une de ses femmes (anonymous, 1750), and further, the Histoire secrete du prophète des turcs,
traduite de l’Arabe de Lausselin (1754), apparently republished in 1781 under the title Mémoires secrètes et aventures galantes de Mahomet, tirées d’un manuscrit trouvé dans la bibliothèque du Chérif de la Mequée.

In 1778 Henry Brooke adapted Miller’s translation of Voltaire’s Mahomet, already published in 1744, and gave the piece a happy ending. Influenced by Prideaux (see above), an anonymous cleric, in his Life of Mohammed (1799), described Muhammad as a discreditable monster and thus saw him as a negative example.

Goethe’s plan of a Mahomet drama (cf. Dichtung und Wahrheit, III, 14) was only realised in the poem Mahomet-Gesang, in which Muhammad’s divinely-inspired genius is represented in the image of a continuously increasing, all-sweeping stream. Goethe’s idea to exemplify by Muhammad’s figure “what influence a genius has over people through character and spirit ... and how it wins and loses at this” (Dichtung und Wahrheit, III, 14) has been taken up again in some dramas of the 19th and early 20th centuries. Here emphasis is laid either on the inward conflict between the Prophet’s duties and his human feelings and weaknesses (Georg Christian Braun, Mahomeds Tod, 1815; Franz Nissel, Mahomets Tod, 1858; Adolf Schaffheitlin, Mahomet, 1892) or on the corruption to which the purity of the doctrine is exposed because of the resistance of the world (Otto von der Pfordten, Mahomet, 1898). Philipp Ludwig Wolff (Mohammed, ca. 1855) saw himself as a critic of fanaticism in the tradition of Voltaire’s Mahomet drama, but tried to stick more closely to the historical facts. Ferdinand von Hornstein (Mohammed, 1906) was also occupied with the problem of fanaticism, but approached it psychologically and saw in the inspired believer’s autosuggestion the basis of his sweeping power. While Ernst Trampe in his tragedy Mohammed (1907) represented Muhammad as a human being upon whom prophethood is forced and who, having taken it up against his will, develops into an unscrupulous and calculating theocrat, Friedrich Wolf, in his Mohammed, written in 1917 under the influence of the First World War, published in 1924 and designated as an oratorio, represented the Prophet as an ascetic and radiant apostle of non-violence, whose aim was the fraternisation of mankind and the reconciliation of nations.

In narrative poetry, too, the conflict between purity of will and human weakness is exemplified in the figure of Muhammad, as in Ida Frick’s Mohammed und seine Frauen, a trilogy published in 1844 which describes Muhammad’s transition from a prophet, conscious of his mission, to a human being injured by envy, mistrust and doubt, who, out of vengeance and hedonism, becomes a robber and in his feelings for his wives has to fight with passion, jealousy and lust.

The Lives of Muhammad were made instrumental for various purposes in lyrical poems. In his Miscellaneen, published in 1794, Friedrich Bouterwek represented Muhammad’s work as a religious fight and heavenly promise. In his poem Poème des heigne Krieges aus dem Munde Mohammeds, des Propheten (1806), J. von Hammer-Purgstall used the figure of Muhammad as an example of courage in battle and self-sacrifice. Karoline von Günderode, in her Mahomet Traum in der Wüste (1804), elucidated the Prophet’s purification from doubt concerning his mission. This was also done by Adalbert von Hanstein in his poems about Muhammad, published in his collection Menschenleider (1867). A romantically exalted image of the ageing Muhammad was depicted by Victor Hugo in La légende des siècles (I, III: L’Islam, 1. L’an neuf de l’Hégire; 2. Mahomet) (1859). Here, Muhammad appears as a wise, ascetic old man, susceptible to what is beautiful in people and nature and not alien to human weakness.

Chronology

ca. 650-750 John of Damascus: De Haeresibus liber
8th c.
787 Theophanes Confessor: Chronographia
9th c.
1010 Synod of Nicaea (Nicaenum II), dealing with and anathematising the Mahometis Superstitiones as a heresy
middle 9th c.
1100 Anastasius Bibliothecarius: Chronographia tritpartita (in which is taken up Theophanes’s Chronographia and the chapter on Muhammad)
9th c.
1115 Niketas Byzantios: Conflutatio Alcorani
1140 Eulogius of Cordova: Liber Apologeticus
1160 Raoul Glaber: Historiarum libri quinque
1200 Embricho of Mainz: Vita Mahometi
1200 Guibert of Nogent: Gesta Dei per Francos
1200 Chanson de Roland (Muhammad as an idol)

before 1111 Guibert of Gembloux: Chronicon
before 1120 Hugo of Fleury: Historia Ecclesiastica
before 1127 Fulbert of Chartres: Historia Hierosolimitana
before 1133 Hildebert of Tours: (distichs: Life of Muhammad; title?)
1143 Petrus Venerabilis: letter to Bernard of Clairvaux (in which a Life of Muhammad, PL, 189)
1137/155 Walter of Compiègne: Otia de Machomete
1160/70 the cleric Konrad: the Chanson de Roland (Muhammad as an idol)
1169-84 William of Tyre: Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum
before 1164 Gottfried of Viterbo: Memoria Secularis; Liber universalis
12th c.
1204/1209 Arnold of Lübeck: Chronicia Slavorum (in which is Gerhard of Strassburg’s account of his journey to Saladin at the order of Frederic I, 1175)
1211 Wolfram of Eschenbach: Willehalm
1256 Jacob of Vitré: Historia Hierosolimitana; Gesta Dei per Francos; Orientalis et Occidentalis Historia
around 1256 (?) Latin translation of the mi'raj: Scala de Mahomete
1258 Alexandre du Pont: Le Roman de Mahom
middle
13th c.
1264 Jacobus de Voragine: Legenda Aurea (in which is the Life of St. Pelagius)
before 1264 Vincent of Beauvais: Speculum historie
after 1264 French translation Eschiote Mahomet (on Muhammad’s mi'raj)
1267 Ramón Llull: Libre del gentil e los tres savis (three wise men, a Christian, a Jew and a Muslim, praise their own religion before a heathen, each full of respect for the others; each of them is convinced that the heathen will convert to his religion; open end)
William of Tripoli: Tractatus de statu Saracenorum et de Mahomete pseudo-propheta et eorum lege et fide (dependent on this: Mandeville; Schilberger (via Mandeville?))

2nd half 13th c.

Ricoldus de Monte Crucis

Conrad of Würzburg: Partenopier und Melur

cia. 1278

Thomas Tuscus ( = of Pavia): Gesta imperatorum et pontificum

before 1300

Petrus Pascual: Sobre la seta mahometana, Contro las fatalistas mahometanos

1307-21

Dante: La divina commedia (Muhammad (and ‘Ali) mained in the ninth circle of hell, cf. Inferno, canto 28)

middle 15th c.

Nicholas of Cusa: Cribratio Alchoran ( = “sifting of the Kurgan”)

1460

Enea Silvio Piccolomini ( = Pius II): Epistola ad Mahometem (Letter to the Turkish sultan Mehemed II on Islam and Christianity)

after 1482

Michael Christian: German translation of the Epistola ad Mahometem Pii II.

Modern times

France

1625

Baudier

1714

Arlequin Mahomet (comedy)

1730

Boulainvilliers: La vie de Mahomet. Biography published in London (attempt to reach historical accuracy with positive evaluation of Islam)

1730

Abbe Charte-Livry: Jupiter et Mahomet, (attempt to reach historical accuracy with positive evaluation of Islam)

1731

(Anonymous) Parallelle entre Mahomet et Moyse le Grand (pseudo-Muslim letter to a rabbi)

1732

Jean Gangier: Vie de Mahomet (directed against Boulainvilliers; depicts Muhammad after Islamic sources, but with negative evaluation)

1741 Lille

Voltaire: Le Panthéon, ou Mahomed le Prophète. Tragedy

1742 Paris

Dedicated to Pope Benedict XIV, who thanked with the papal benediction. First representation in Lille 1741; closed in Paris in 1742 after three performances; politico-clerical protest

1750

(Anonymous) Les Amours de Mahomet écrits par Aescha, une de ses femmes

1754

Lausselin: Histoire secrète du Prophète des Turcs, traduite de l’Arabe; republished in 1781 under the title Mémoires secrètes et aventures galantes de Mahomet, tirées (?) d’un manuscrit trouvé dans la Bibliothèque du Chiff de la Mesque

1756

Voltaire: Essai sur les moeurs, in which Ch. VI, De l’Arabe et de Mahomet; Ch. VII, De l’Alcoran et de la loi musulmane (based on Boulainvilliers)

1758


1762

Le couron de Mahomet ... histoire plus que galante

1763

Voltaire: Remarques de l’Essai (in which Ch. IX, De Mahomet (Muhammad’s greatness recognized; the comparison with Cromwell in the matter of fanaticism is in favour of Muhammad as far as the latter’s work is concerned)

after 1756

Voltaire: Lettre civile et honnête à l’auteur malhonnete de la critique de l’histoire universelle de M. Voltaire, qui n’a jamais fait (?) d’histoire universelle le (?) tout au sujet de Mahomet

1773

Turpin: Vie de Mahomet, 3 vols.

1859


1867

L. LeBoch: (Mahomet). Tragicomedy

1890

Henri de Bornier: Mahomet. Drama (not staged because of diplomatic complications with the Turks)

Spain

Comedia de los Milagros de Mahoma

1680

Francisco de Rojas y Zorrillo: El falso profeta Mahoma (put on the Index by the Inquisition)

Italy

1698

Ludovico Marracci: Rerutato

German-speaking area

1540

Luther: Translation of the Confutatio Alcorani by the Dominican friar Richard

1542

Cunin: Von geringem herkommen, schentlichem leben, schmeichelm ende, des Türkischen Abgots Macham und seiner von damaligen und Gotzleisteren L, allen fromen Christen zu disen gefeierten zeiten zur stierckung und trost im glauben an Jesum Christum

1779 Goethe: Mahomets Gesang

1785

Jacob Morder: Mohammeds Reise ins Paradies. Ein Prozestück

1779/1802 Goethe: Mahomet (after Voltaire)


1804

Karoline von Günderode: Mahomets Traum in der Wuste. Poem

1805

idem: Mahommed, der Prophet von Mekka. Drama

1806

J. von Hammer-Purgstall: Die Posaune des Heiligen Krieges

1815

G. Christian Braun: Mahomeds Tod. Tragödie

1823

J. von Hammer-Purgstall: Mohammed oder die Eroberung von Mekka. Historisches Drama

1844

Ida Frick: Mohammed und seine Frauen. Roman

1848


1852

(Anonymous) Mohammed. Tragödie. Bern

1853

Ed. Duller: Mohammed der Prophet. Historical novel

1855

Severus: Mohammed. Drama. Berlin

1859

Orientalis (pseudonym of M. Wassermann): Das Mädchen von Chaibar. Roman aus dem Leben Muhammeds

1860

Philipp Heinrich Wolff: Mohammed. Tragödie in 5 Akten

1868

Ludwig Rüben: Mohammed

1892

A. Schaleitlin: Mohammed. Religions. Drama in 5 Aufzeigen. Zürich

1896

1899 M. von Hanstein: *Achmed der Heiland. Eine epische Dichtung*
1907 F. Kaibel: *Mohammed* (Drama)
1912 E. Trampes: *Mohammed* (Drama)
1917 M. von Stein: *Mohammed* (Drama)
1924 F. Wolf: *Mohammed* (Drama, expressionist)
1926 A. Schaefer: *Die Rose der Hedschra* (Story, expressionist)
1931 P.E. von Hahn: *Mohammed* (Story)

English-speaking area
1362/1378-1438 John Lydgate: *Off Machomet the false prophete* (In *The Fall of Princes*)
1610 (?) George Sandys: *The True Nature of the Alcoran* (finished poem in hexameters)
1638 Sir Thomas Herbert: *Some Years Travels into Divers Parts of Asia and Africa* (Muhammad as Antichrist)
1649 Alexander Ross: *A Needful Caeasat or Admonition, for them who desire to know what use may be made of, or if there be danger in reading the Alcoran* (Introduction to the English translation of the Kur’ān)
1653 (?): (Anonymous) *Apocalypsis, or the First State of Mahummet the Prophet of the Turks, and Author of the Alcoran* (Novel)
1653 (?): (Anonymous) *In view of the religions of the World*
1678 (Anonymous): *First State of Mahometism, or an Account of the Author and Doctrine of the Imposture; 1679; appears in 1679 as Lancelot Addison: The Life and Death of Mahomet* (Drama, expressionist)
1697 Humphrey Prideaux: *The True Nature of Imposture Fully Display’d in the Life of Mahomet* (Drama)
1701 David Jones: *A Compleat History of the Turks* (Drama)
1708-18 Simon Ockley: *The History of the Saracens* (Drama)
1712 Four Treatises concerning the Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship of the Mohammedans (preceded by a Life of Muhammad)
1720 Miscellanea Aurea, or the Golden Medley (in which is a Life of Muhammad, directed against Prideaux, who is not named; defense of Muhammad against the reproach of deceit)
1731 John Pitts: *A Faithfull Account of the Religion and Manners of The Mohammedans* (London)
1731 English translation of Boullainvilliers’s *Life of Muhammad* (1730)
1734 George Sale: *Preliminary Discourse* (to the Kur’ān translation)
1735 Reflections on Mohammedanism and the Conduct of Mohammed. Occasioned by a Late Learned Translation and Exposition of the Koran or Alkoran

1744 English translation by Miller of Voltaire’s drama on Muhammad
1778 Henry Brooke: *The Impostor* (Drama; revision of Miller’s translation of Voltaire’s drama on Muhammad)
1784 Joseph White (Arabist in Oxford): To confirm and establish the Christian Faith; and to confute all heretics and schismatics
1788 Edward Gibbon: *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (with a ch. on Muhammad)
1790 James Bruce: *Travels to Discover the Source of the Nile*
1795 Nathan Alcock: *The Rise of Mohamet accounted for on Natural and Civil Principles* (published posthumously)
1799 (anonymous cleric): *Life of Mohammed* (uses Prideaux)
1808 Robert Southey (and Coleridge): *Mohammed* (unfinished poem in hexameters)
1829 Edward Upham: *A History of the Ottoman Empire*
1829 Godfrey Higgins: *An Apology for the Life and Character of the Celebrated Prophet of Arabia, called Mohammed, or the Illuminations* (Drama, expressionist)
1829 Walter Savage Landor: *Mahomet and Sergius* (dialogue in prose)
1830 Rev. Samuel Bush: *Life of Mohammed*
1840 Rev. Samuel Green: *Life of Mahomet*
1840 Thomas Carlyle: *The Hero as a Prophet. Mahomet. Islam* (Lecture given in London; published afterwards)
1843 William Coke Taylor: *History of Mohammedanism and Its Sects*
1850 George H. Miles: *Mohammed the Arabian Prophet, Boston*
1873 William Sime: *History of Mohammed and His Successors* (Drama)
1890 Hall Caine: *Mahomet, Drama* (not staged because of diplomatic complications with the Turks)


MUHAMMAD b. ABBAS [see KADAR].

MUHAMMAD b. ABD ALLAH b. CABD ALLAH b. ISHAQ [q.v.].

SAYYID/SIDI MUHAMMAD III b. ABD ALLAH [see IBN AL-ABBÁR; IBN AL-KHATIB; IBN MALIK].

MUHAMMAD III b. ABD ALLAH [see IBN AL-ABBÁR; IBN AL-KHATIB; IBN MALIK].

 MUHAMMAD — MUHAMMAD III b. ABD ALLAH — 387

Born in 1134/1722, he received a traditional education at the court and, in 1159/1746, his father, Mawlay Abd Allah b. Isma’il [q. v.] appointed him vice-roy (khalifa) at Marrakesh, where he was to make a lasting impression with his construction activities and which he was virtually to make his capital, without however neglecting the other cities of Morocco. Harassed by hostile tribes before being in a position to consolidate his power and to impose his authority, with a view to putting an end to a period of instability which affected the south as well as the rest of the empire, he was obliged to take refuge at Safi (Asf [q. v.]), where he succeeded in gaining the support of the local population and thereby facilitated his return to Marrakesh. After 1161/1748, he had the opportunity to demonstrate his loyalty to his father in restoring him to his throne at Meknès [see MKNAS], and the empire was rife with the aid of the works of al-Muqaddasi, al-Durra al-fidqhiya, Zaydun, and the metropolis of southern Morocco owes a large proportion of its buildings to the great Alawid sovereign (see G. Deverdun, *Marrakesh, Rabat 1959, 474-511* and index, ibidem, *Inscriptions arabes de Marrakesh, Rabat 1956*, index).

On the internal level, away from operations of *djihād* aimed at recovering places occupied by foreign powers, he was mainly concerned with justice and with fiscal and monetary matters, and it may be said that he cured the empire of the decay which had accumulated under his predecessors and that he had the support of the populace in pursuing his objectives (the list of his viziers, secretaries, kāds and regional authorities may be found in Lévi-Provençal, *Cherfa*, 403-4, 405-6). In external politics, he took pains to establish diplomatic and commercial relations with Europe and the East in the attempt to lessen the effects of the piracy [see KURSAH] which was rife in the Mediterranean, and he worked to obtain the release of the ransom of Muslim prisoners. In 1179/1766 he authorised al-Ghazzal [q. v. in Suppl.] to negotiate an exchange of captives and, in 1182/1768, he sent him to Algiers to initiate a reciprocal repatriation of Algerian and Spanish prisoners; the mission to Spain is described in a *Rihla* (ed. A. Bustanî, Tetouan 1941). His secretary, vizier and ambassador Ibn ’Uthman [q. v. in Suppl.] conducted three missions abroad on his behalf: the first (1193/1779) to Spain with the object of consolidating amicable relations with this country and discussing the issue of Algerian prisoners; the second (1196/1782) to Malta and Naples to ransom yet more prisoners; the third (1200/1785-8) to Istanbul to put an end to the unrest provoked by Turkish troops on the Algeria-Morocco frontier. (On the treaties signed during this period, see the articles cited in the *ibid. ibn ’Uthman*; also A. Caillé, *Les accords internationaux du sultan Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdallah.* Finally, al-Zayâni (1147-1249/1734-1835 [q. v.]), who served as negotiator with all the rebellious Berbers, was entrusted, in 1200/1786, with the task of bearing letters and gifts to the Ottoman sultan ’Abd al-Hamîd I; he left a detailed account of the vicissitudes of his journey (al-Tūgumûna al-Khârîj; ms. at Rabat). The previous year, Sidi Muhammad had sent a generous consignment of gifts intended for the inhabitants of Mecca and of various other regions of the Islamic East. As regards religion, he was a pious man who respected the obligations of Islam, drinking no alcohol and not smoking; he did not, however, allow himself to be dominated by the *fikah* [q. v.], whom he protected and with whom he held meetings at Marrakesh in the course of which judicial questions were discussed. He advocated a return to tradition and to study of the Kur’an and the ‘Ulama with the aid of the works of scholars of the Middle Ages; he showed himself sympathetic towards the Salafiyah [q. v.], and an impression of his tendencies may be gained through a perusal of the programme of studies of the Karawiyin [q. v.] which he instituted by a decree of 1203/1788 (see Ibn Zayyûn, al-Durr al-fikha, Rabat 1356/1937; 60; idem, *ibid. 3 al-’ulûm, in Maqallat al-Maghrib, v* [1355/1936], 8; cf. M. Lakhdir, *Le livre littéraire, 211-12*). He instructed the professors to teach only the canonical versions of traditions (al-Bukhâri and Muslim in particular), studies of Malikî fikh such as the *Maudawa* of Salman [q. v.], the *Mukadima* of Ibn Rushd [q. v.], the *Rsûla* and the *Šu‘ûba* of al-Kayrawâni [q. v.]. He also set up an academy of state documentaries on the *Mukhtasar* of al-Khallî b. Ishâq [q. v.], which were to be used, then recommended the *Hidâya*. 
of the Kal'a" [q.v.], the Sira of Ibn Sayyid al-Nas [q.v.], the Tashih and the Alfiyya of Ibn Mâlik [q.v.], in the context of rhetoric and literature, the syllabus comprised the Idhâh of Khabîb Dimashqî [see AL-KAZWÎNI], the Mautawwul of al-Taftazânî [q.v.], the Dinâm of six pre-Islamic poets, the Maqâmât of al-Hârîrî [q.v.], not to mention the classical dictionaries. The sultan submitted his curriculum to the scholars of Egypt, sending them a questionnaire in which spaces were left for replies. This dynamic individual also took an interest in pedagogy and he is the author of a treatise entitled Mawâlíth al-Mannân bi-mâ yata'akkad 'âla 'l-ma'allîm ta'lîmuh li 'l-sibydn Rîsâlâtî Manhâj al-taHim. In addition to sources with full references given in the article, see G. Hôte, Efterretninger om Marôkos og Fes, samlede der lander fra 1760 til 1768, Copenhagen 1779, Ger. tr. Nachrichten von Marokos und Fesen, Copenhagen 1871, passim; idem, Den Marokanske Kajser Mahomed ben Abdallah's Historie, Copenhagen 1791; L. de Chêneîer, Recherches historiques sur les Maures, Paris 1767, iii; G. de Lemprière, Voyage dans l'empire de Maroc et le royaume de Fes pendant les années 1791 et 1792, French tr. Sainte-Suzanne, Paris 1801, ch. IX (ed. A. Savine, La Maroc, il y a cent ans, Paris 1911); Ch. Pensa, Journal du consulat général de France au Maroc (1767-1778), Casablanca 1949-50, ii, 291-302; M. Lakhdar, Les historiens des Chorfa, Paris 1971, 210-13 and index. _ (Eo.)

MUHAMMAD III B. 'ABBÂD ALLÂH — MUHAMMAD B. 'ABBÂD ALLÂH B. AL-HASAN
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He and İbrahim had, according to al-Wâkidî, been brought up as future rulers, and Muhammad was called al-Mahdî by his father. As early as the reign of the Umayyad caliph Highâm, the two sectionalists at-Muhîrî b. Sa'id al-Qâlî and Bayân b. Samîn [q.v.], who did not recognise Muhammad b. 'All al-Bâkîr [q.v.], endeavoured to make propaganda for him. When signs of the imminent collapse of Umayyad rule became apparent after al-Wâlîd's death, 'Abd Allâh's family by his command paid homage to Muhammad, with the exception of al-Bâkîr's son Qâfar al-Sâdîk [q.v.]. Wider circles also recognised him as the legitimate heir, including the Mu'tazilis, who in those days had a distinctly ascetic character. Abû Qâfar, later the 'Abbâsîd caliph, was at this time attached to this school, and it is several times recorded that he was among those who paid homage to Muhammad. This is in itself by no means improbable and well explains his hostile attitude to him, although it remains remarkable that Muham-мед nowhere, even in his polemical letters to him, refers later to this important fact. The Umayyad government, on the other hand, regarded him as a rebel, and when he was besieged in Wâsit in 132/750, but dropped the matter when he received no answer to his letter.

When finally the 'Abbâsîd Abû ʾAbbâsîb in the same year won the caliphate and ousted the ʾAlîds, the two brothers disappeared and showed thereby that they would not recognise him. There now began for them a period full of adventure and excitement, to which they added a period full of adventure and excitement, to which they added a period of their own heart, Riyâh b. 'Abd Allah's father, in order to intimidate Khurasan with a certificate on oath that it was the descendant of the Umayyads, whose territory lay the hill of Radwa, which so often appears in the history of the ʾAlîds. The caliph was very uneasy at the continued lack of success of his search for them; more and more angrily he demanded of his governors in Medina that they should be pro-duced and he dismissed several in rapid succession, when they appeared, perhaps not without reason, ineffective and lukewarm in their efforts. He himself took very active steps, but with as little result. On his pilgrimage in 140/758, he had Muhammad and İbrahim's father thrown into prison because they would not betray their place of concealment, and on a later pilgrimage (144/762), the same fate met the sons and grandsons of al-Hasan, ʾAbd Allâh's brother. They and 'Abd Allâh were taken to Kûfâ, treated most brutally, and thrown into prison, where most of them died. The same thing happened to İbrahim's father-in-law Muhammad b. 'Abd Allâh, a descendant of ʾUthmân, whose head the caliph sent to Khurâsân with a certificate on oath that it was the head of the ʾAlîd Muhammad, in order to intimidate his followers there. Shortly before this (Ramâdân 144/December 761), he finally found a governor after his own heart, Rîyâh b. ʾUthmân, who conducted the search with the necessary vigour. But he was soon able to save himself the trouble for in Radjâb 145/November 762, Muhammad appeared in Medina and began the rebellion, while his brother İbrahim went to Baṣra to do the same. It is not clear whether
they did this because, in Muhammad's opinion, the time was ripe or whether they were forced by circumstances to hasten their plans. In any case, the enterprise was not sufficiently prepared, for although they had a large number of followers in Kufa, Basra, Egypt (where, however, Muhammad's son Ali was arrested by the Abbadid governor), in Khurasan and even in Sind (to which another son Abd Allah al-Ashhtar was sent), there was no question of any organisation, and, as so frequently, the enthusiasm for the 'Alids was like a forest of straws which blew up quickly but dies down soon. In Medina, where Riayah was completely taken by surprise, Muhammad in keeping with his character acted with great mildness; he opened the prison, forbade all bloodshed and was content with arresting Riayah. The best elements in the town came over to him after the jurist Malik b. Anas [q. v.] declared invalid his oath taken to the 'Abbasids; Mecca also surrendered to the new ruler. The outbreak of the revolt was really a relief to Abdi Djafar for he had now, as he said, enticed the fox out of his hole. He hurriedly left Baghdad, with the building of which he was busy, and went to Kufa, the point of danger. With keen instinct he saw that the weak point of the rebellion lay in Medina which must be attacked first, for in this remote spot there was a lack of organisation and there the rebels would not be easily barred. But he first of all offered a complete amnesty to Muhammad, which however only led to a characteristic exchange of letters, in which one reproached the other with the weaknesses of his family. He then sent his relative Isaa b. Musa against him with 4,000 men, with instructions however to set the matter peacefully if possible. His arrival had a sobering effect upon the Medina inhabitants. With a number seized the opportunity to get out of their difficult position. Muhammad, however, remained undismayed. He rejected the well-meaned advice of several men to abandon Medina as an insult to the town, but left his people free to stay with him or not. He trusted in Allah "from whom victory comes and its aftermath, see IBRAHIM B. ABU SABIT, to which should be added Y. Marquet, Le Shiisme au Xe siècle à travers l'Histoire de Ya'qubi, in Arabic, xii (1972), 120-9; H. Kennedy, The early Abbasid caliphate, London and Totowa N.J. 1981, 200 ff.

MUHAMMAD B. 'ABD ALLAH HASSAN, called by his British opponents "the Mad Mullah", the local Somali equivalent of the Sudanese Mahdi.

This Somali jihadi was born in 1250/1-1864 (or, according to Djama Umar Isse, in 1272-3/1856) near the watering-place of Bohote in the north-east of that part of the present Somali Democratic Republic. He belonged to the Ogaden clan, which inhabits the region of the same name in the disputed area of Eastern Ethiopia-Western Somalia, but lived with the Dubhala clan where his grandfather had settled. Muhammad received a traditional religious training and early manifested signs of extreme piety and religious zeal. In furtherance of his Islamic studies he travelled to Harar, Makdish and, according to some sources, as far as the Sudan. He went on pilgrimage to Mecca in 1311-12/1894, where he joined Muhammad b. Sahib's Salihiyya tariqa. On his return home, he began to preach the puritanical message of this order, and soon encountered resistance from the established Kadiriyya and the British consular régime on the western Somali coast. This rebuff, combined with the irritant of Christian mission activity and increasing Ethiopian military pressure in the Ogaden, led Muhammad to proclaim a jihadi against the Christian intruders. The major opening engagement in the ensuing holy war, which dragged on until 1338/1920, took place at Jigjiga in the Ogaden, where a large force of "Dervishes"—as Muhammad's followers called themselves—stormed the recently-established Ethiopian post.

During 1321-2/1904, with fifti Ethiopian rapport and Italian compliance, four major British expeditions were mounted against the Dervishes. Although not decisively defeated, the Dervishes prudently withdrew to Mijireynia in the north of Italian Somalia and signed a peace treaty (the "I'lig Agreement") with the Italians. By 1325-6/1908, the Dervishes had recovered their strength and renewed their campaign with increasing ferocity during the first World War until their final defeat by a concerted air, sea and land operation in 1920. Sayyid Muhammad, as the Dervish leader styled himself—having never claimed the title Mahdi—died amongst his own clansmen in the Ogaden in December 1920 at the age of fifty-six. Paradoxically, the end of this guerrilla war waged to free Somalis of foreign domination found the British, Ethiopian and Italian colonisers more firmly entrenched than they were at the start.

While Sayyid Muhammad sought to unite his countrymen in defence of their freedom irrespective of their clan allegiances, he inevitably drew heavily upon
traditional kinship and marriage ties in forming alliances. He was bitterly opposed by the Kadiiryia, whose leader in southern Somalia was assassinated by a part of the Darod. His support came from his own kin among the Darod, while the western Ishak clans, more firmly under British influence, never fully rallied to his call and indeed denounced him as a tyrant and fanatic. All, however, recognised his qualities as the leading Somali poet of his epoch and admired his brilliant command of Somali rhetoric. Sayyid Muhammad left behind no theocratic organisation, but left instead a legacy of patriotism which inspires Somalis to this day.


MUHAMMAD b. ‘ABD ALLAH b. TÂHIR DÎZ L-YÂMÎNAYN, ABD L-‘ARÂB, TÂHÎRÎDÎR GOVERNOR OF BAGHDAD.

Born in 209/824-5, Muhammad in 237/851 was summoned from Khorasan by the Caliph to Baghdad and appointed military governor (‘adih al-‘arb) in order to restore order in the chaos then prevailing. In spite of the great power of the Tahirids, who ruled Khorasan with considerable autonomy, although they nominally recognised the suzerainty of the caliph, his task was by no means a light one. After al-Mustâ’in had ascended the throne (248/862), he confirmed that al-Musta’in had nominally recognised the suzerainty of the caliph, his brother Abu Ahmad. The caliph had reluc-
tantly to confirm the treaty and abdicate in favour of his rival al-Mu’tazz (Dhu ‘l-Hijja 251/January 866), and the latter thereupon ascended the throne. Muhammad died in Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da 253/November 867.

Muhammad achieved considerable contemporary fame as a scholar as well as a soldier and administrator. Not only was he himself a poet, some of whose verses are cited by such authorities as al-Shabbushti and al-Safadi, and patron of the singer Zunayn, but he also related hadiths and had a lively interest in grammar and philology; prominent in the circle which he gathered round himself at Baghdad were such notable figures as al-Mubarrad, the Alids; Muhammad b. Tahir, governor of Khurasan, al-Alid dynasty which lasted about sixty years.

Arabia also did not escape ‘Alid plots. A descendant of ‘Ali named Ismâ‘îl b. Yusuf raised trouble there in 251/865, plundered Mecca and Medina and killed so many pilgrims that he received the epithet of al-Saffâ‘i, “the Bloodshedder”. It was also conti-
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(K.V. ZETTERSTEN-J.C. E. BOWSWORTH)
MUHAMMAD B. 'ABD AL-RAHĪM — MUHAMMAD IV B. 'ABD AL-RAHĪM

MUHAMMAD B. 'ABD AL-RAHĪM [see IBN AL-FURĀT].

MUHAMMAD I B. 'ABD AL-RAHĪM ĀN, caliph of Cordova [see AL-ANDALUS and UMAYYADS OF SPAIN].

MUHAMMAD III B. 'ABD AL-RAHĪM ĀL MUSTAKFI, caliph of Cordova [see AL-ANDALUS and UMAYYADS OF SPAIN].

SAYYID/SIDI MUHAMMAD IV B. 'ABD AL-RAHĪM, Ala'wīd sovereign who reigned over Morocco 1276-90/1859-73. Born probably around 1230/1815, he was appointed by his father, Mawlay 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Hishām [q. v.] as viceroy (khālifā) in Marrakesh, where he was to continue to reside after his accession to the throne and to leave behind a certain number of buildings (but less than Sīdi Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh [q. v.]). Memorable among them are the mausoleum erected in the cemetery (nasīla) of Bāb al-Rubb, the conversion of the 'Aṣrāt al-Ma'āsh into a military quarter, the renovation of the large Agdal gardens, the construction of the fountain of Sīdi Bal-ʿAbbās, the mausoleum of the madman called Sīdi A'mārā and the gates of the Sūk al-Madjādiliyya or market of the makers of trimmings (see G. Deverdun, Inscriptions arabes de Marrakech, Rabat 1956, index).

In his capacity as khālifā, he assumed command of the Moroccan troops who gave battle to Marshall Bugeaud, on the right bank of the Iṣy [q. v.], on the Algero-Moroccan frontier, on 14 August 1844, and suffered a defeat which opened the eyes of the Shāfi‘ī authorities to the weaknesses of their army. The amīr 'Abd al-Kādir [q. v.], who had taken refuge in Morocco, ceased from this time to enjoy the sultan's protection, and it was Sīdi Muhammad who was instructed to outlaw him. Forced back again to Morocco by the French troops, the amīr was still pursued, and it was partly due to the attitude adopted towards him by the sovereign and his son that he decided to surrender to the Duc d'Aumale on 23 December 1847.

During the years that followed, the khālifā of Mawlay 'Abd al-Rahmān had mainly to contend with the turco-Russian troops of the Atlas who constantly harried Marrakesh. Favourable to peaceful relations with foreign states, he used to receive not only travellers but also agents attracted by the possibility of profitable commercial exchanges. Furthermore, he was surrounded by renegades and had welcomed more or less competent foreign technicians who were indispensable to him in order to ensure the proper functioning of the equipment whose use he had begun to understand and appreciate; as early as 1854, he had in particular tried out a threshing-machine. The policy of reforms which he advocated to revitalise the country could be applied more boldly during the first years which followed his accession.

This took place without difficulty on the death of his father, on 29 Muharram 1276/28 August 1859. Sīdi Muhammad, who was then in Marrakesh, hastened to go to have himself recognised in Meknes and the conclusion on 26 April following, under the auspices of Great Britain, which believed the Spaniards would reach Tangiers, of an agreement which was ratified on 26 May. This agreement recommended the assignment of a piece of supplementary territory to Ceuta and Melilla [q. v.], the concession of the enclosure of Ifni [q. v.], the payment of a dear indemnity of 20 million duros (the duro being valued at around five gold francs), the conclusion of a commercial treaty and the monopoly of Catholic missions by the Spanish Franciscans. Nevertheless, as Tetwan was to remain occupied until complete payment of the indemnity, Sīdi Muhammad sent embassies to London and Paris in order to solicit the intervention of the governments with the Spaniards in order to obtain a diminution of the sum for payment. He had to take out a loan, which presented a problem owing to the prohibition against taking interest, regarded as applying as much to the borrower as to the lender; finally, capital and interest constituted a lump sum taken as representing the total amount of the loan. The convention signed on 24 October 1861 was ratified on 20 December following, and, after a long series of episodes which would reach Tangiers, of an agreement concerning the prohibition against taking interest, regarded as applying as much to the borrower as to the lender; finally, capital and interest constituted a lump sum taken as representing the total amount of the loan. The convention signed on 24 October 1861 was ratified on 20 December following, and, after a long series of episodes which would reach Tangiers, the Spanish troops left Tetwan. Meanwhile, the commercial treaty provided for in the agreement had been concluded on 20 November 1861 (on all these events, see J.-L. Miége, Le Maroc et l'Europe, ii, 349 ff.).

The previous sultan had begun instituting an open-door policy, notably through the treaty signed with England in December 1856, which recognised freedom of commerce and adopted the principle of extra-territoriality (see Miége, op. cit., ii, 261 ff.), and through the declaration of 18 May 1858 with the Netherlands, which from then on enjoyed the advantages of the most favoured nation. At his accession, the new sultan sent to France one of his entourage, Idrīs b. Muhammad al-Amārī (d. 1296/1878), who narrated the incidents on his journey and set down his observations in a rihla entitled Thābit al-maṣīḥ bi-manāšakat Bā‘rīc (printed Fas 1327/1900). Thus he showed his desire to maintain good relations with the European powers, and actually, despite the difficulties generated by his conflict with Spain between 1860 and 1862, concluded several international agreements. On 4 January 1862, a treaty of friendship, commerce and navigation was signed with Belgium; 19 August 1863 saw the conclusion of the Franco-Moroccan so-called Bélard Agreement, to which the United States, Great Britain, Sweden and Belgium adhered. This limited the right of protection which had sometimes been abused by the powers, but it also had unfortunate consequences for the ruler's freedom of action (see Miége, op. cit., ii, 395-409).

These agreements formed part of the policy of reforms that Sīdi Muhammad wished to carry out. He had provided for this purpose a programme for the revitalisation of the country which involved the creation of Moroccan enterprises in order to end the effective monopoly of foreign establishments, the undertaking of work to enlarge or improve the ports of Safi and Mogador, the erection on Cape Spartel of a lighthouse whose administration and upkeep were to give rise, on 31 May 1865, to an agreement with most of the European powers, the planting of cotton and sugar cane to strengthen the imports of raw sugar and the creation of a paper factory in Mogador and the construction of a steam mill in Tangiers, not to men-
tion the setting up of a lithographic press in Fas. He also occupied with reorganising the army and sent agents to Europe to buy arms and munitions, while developing the cartridge-making factory of Marrakesh.

He lived in peace with his neighbours, particularly with the French established in Algeria; a perfect entente was established with them after the battle of Isly and, independently of the diplomatic missions sent to France, for example, in the month of July 1863, an uncle of Sidi Muhammad visited Napoleon III in order to renew the relations of friendship between the two nations. The following year, the despatch of the kāda Mansūr to Touat [see Tūwaṭ] did not sour their relations although the region was the subject of dispute between them. On the contrary, quite a number of French settled in Morocco and participated in its economic life.

From another point of view, an important event in the reign of Sidi Muhammad was the visit, in 1863-4, of Sir Moses Montefiore, President of the London Committee of British Jews, in an attempt to improve the lot of his coreligionists, which left much to be desired. Well-received by the sultan, he obtained in their favour the dāhir (zhahir) of 5 February 1864 (see al-Nāṣiri, Iṣṭikā, Fr. tr. Fumey, ii, 256-68) which, without remaining a dead letter, did not, however, have spectacular results (see the sultan's attempt to reintroduce the traditional press in the Empire of Morocco in 1863 and 1864, London 1866; Th. Hodgkin, Narrative of a journey to Morocco, London 1866; see also Miège, op. cit., ii, 564 ff.).

The reforms undertaken nevertheless encountered the hostility of conservative Moroccan circles, whose resistance to foreign penetration blocked several attempts. In addition, in February-March 1866, the sultan was almost carried off by a serious illness from which he recovered, thanks to the care of his doctor Ḍurrāk [q.v. in Suppl.]. Despite the reorganisation, carried out in 1862, of the collection of customs duties which provided a large part of the state revenues, financial difficulties accumulated; furthermore, natural disasters, leading to famine and epidemics, which provided a large part of the state revenues, were circulating in Morocco; then, up to a relatively recent date, several works of Moroccan and other authors. Finally, it is said that this sultan who urged Ibn al-Nāṣir [q.v.] to write the history of the ʿAlawi dynasty, and also to produce al-Diyāṣ al-ʿaramram, which stops in the middle of his reign, on 15 Shaʿbān 283/23 December 1866. This historian, who is also the author of a poem in praise of his sovereign, of a certain number of compositions in verse, epistles and writings of a religious character, is one of the most notable representatives of a literary activity that was rather restricted and directed towards the denunciation of customs contrary to Islamic orthodoxy and the pernicious influence of foreigners. Sidi Muhammad did not participate much in this literature, and contented himself with cultivating dialectal poetry [see MAṬBAḤA].

He died by drowning, on 18 Rajab 1290/11 September 1873, during a boating party on the Agdal basin in Marrakesh, and was buried in the mausoleum of Mawālī ʿAli al-Ṣāhir which Sultan Muhammad b. ʿAbbās Allāh [q.v.] had rebuilt; the tomb is covered by a mēbkīriyya of marble engraved with an epitaph in verse (Ibn Zaydān, Iḥāḥ, iii, 577; G. Deverdur, Ibn ʿAtāwi, vol. viii, 138-40).

Bibliography: Apart from the works mentioned in the text, the essential works among the Arabic sources are, in addition to the Dīwān of Akansūs (lith. Fas 1336/1918), the Iḥāḥ aṣ-ṣālim al-nās of Ibn al-Zaydān (Rabit 1929-33, iii, 366-577), al-Ṭārīḍi bī man hālā Marrakṣī (Fas 1936-9, v, 336-73) and the Iṣṭikā of Nāṣirī (Fr. tr. Fumey, in AM, x, 1907). The eye-witness accounts of travellers, residents and diplomats (such as A. Beaumier, J. H. Hay and Merry y Colom), as well as the archives of Morocco, France, Spain, etc., are especially important for the history of the reign of Sidi Muhammad b. ʿAbbās al-ṣāhir, and all this documentation has been made use of by J.-L. Miège, Le Maroc et l'Europe (1830-1894), Paris 1961 (the first volume of 254 pp. is entirely dedicated to the bibliography). We should note among the references L. Arnaud, Au temps des maḥallas ou le Maroc de 1860 à 1910, Casablanca 1952, and should not forget the many works of J. Caillé on diplomatic history. Finally, it is useful to cite also some general works, such as H. Terrasse, Histoire du Maroc (Casablanca 1949-50, ii, 325-31); E. Lévi-Provençal, Historiens de Chorfa, Paris 1922, index, and 405; on his viziers, secretaries and chamberlains; G. Deverdur, Marrakesh des origines à 1912 (Rabat 1966, index); M. Lkhadr, Le vie littéraire au Maroc sous la dynastie alaouite (Rabat 1971, 313 ff.).

(Ch. PELLAT)

MUHAMMAD b. ʿABBĀS AL-RAHMĀN b. Abī ʿĀṭIYYA AL-ʿAṬAWĪ b. Abū ʿAbbās al-ṣāhir, minor poet of the ʿAbbāsī period, d. 250/864. A maṭbaḥa of the Banū Layth, which attached itself to Kinānā, he was born and grew up at Basra. Before arriving at Sāmarrā, he had written no poetry. He seems to have received a double education: as a secretary, which enabled him to fill what were probably minor functions, and as a muṭakallim, in which discipline he was said to be a disciple of Ḥusayn al-Nāḍijār [q.v.]. He is said to have been the first poet to speak about kalām in verse.

It is not known how he came to find the favour of the great personage who was to make his fortune, the Muṭazzīli chief ʿAbbās Ahmad b. Duʿād (d. 240/854 [q.v.]); Al-ʿAṭawi (sometimes al-ʿAtwī) dedicated to him numerous eulogies and then elegies, but his star waned after the death of his protector. He is reputed to have been close also to ʿAlid circles.

This individual attracts very little sympathy: he is described as "living on very little, evil-smelling and dirty". He was addicted to drinking and wrote some bacchic poetry. Of his work, we only possess 30 pieces with a total of 309 verses. His occasional poetry is mediocre and borrows the panegyric wording of the professional eulogists. He also wrote numerous short versified pieces held in honour and appreciated by the kuttāb.

Bibliography: The Dīwān was collected together by Muḥammad Djiḥābār al-Muṣṭafībād, in Maʿarrūd, v, 2; Baghdād 1971; Brahim Najjar, Madaṣwaṣṣat al-šuwarāʾ al-mukāllīn fi ʿl-fasr al-ḥāṣibi al-aʿwāl, thesis,

MUHAMMAD b. ‘ABD AL-WAHHAB [see Ibn 175]

MUHAMMAD b. ABI SÂMR [see al-nassîb b. abi ‘samir]

MUHAMMAD b. ABI BAKR, a son of the first caliph, who was prominent in the opposition against the caliph ‘Uthmân [q. v.] and who governed Egypt on behalf of ‘Ali b. Abî Tâlib [q. v.] for a time during the fitna. According to tradition he was born in the year of the Hijrząt al-Wâdât or “Farewell Pilgrimage” (10/632), and he is further associated with this important event by the report that his mother gave birth to him beneath the tree where the Prophet entered hujjâ on that occasion. He belonged to the Kurashî clan of ‘AÎ. He is said to have first voiced his opposition to ‘Uthmân [q. v.] when he and Muhammad b. Abî Bakr [q. v.] refused to campaign under the governorship of Egypt on behalf of ‘Ali b. Abî Tâlib [q. v.] for a time during the fitna. His father, Muhammad b. ‘Abî Talib, while his mother, Asmâ‘î bint ‘Umays, was of Khâṭîm b. ‘Abd al-Malik, through her he had a maternal uncle, ‘Ali b. Abî Tâlib, and it is said that he was raised in the care and protection (hidjr) of ‘Ali (presumably after the death of his own father when Muhammad would have been aged three). He was the father of the faqîh al-‘Kásîm b. Muhammad and thus had the same ism and kunya as the Prophet.

He is said to have first voiced his opposition to ‘Uthmân [q. v.] when he and Muhammad b. Abî Hudhayfâ [q. v.] refused to campaign under the governor ‘Abd Allâh b. Sa‘d b. Abî Sarh [q. v.] and put forward a list of the caliph’s “crimes”. When the rebels from Egypt came to Medina to attack the caliph in 35/656, Muhammad b. Abî Bakr supported them (there are variant traditions as to whether he came from Egypt with them or was already in Medina). He was prominent in the opposition to the caliph to the extent that he is sometimes described as the wâli of the killing, but although he is shown as having physically maltreated ‘Uthmân, he is never accused of having delivered the fatal blows himself. It is not really clear why he opposed ‘Uthmân so strongly, unless it was simply a result of his own inclination towards ‘Ali (in some traditions he is associated with the latter during the events of the siege of ‘Uthmân’s house). One tradition shows his mother’s sister urging caution upon him while he insists that he cannot forget what the caliph has done to him. Her question asking what he means, however, is left unanswered. Another tradition suggests that he was motivated by anger and jealousy (al-ghâbâ wa l-’arâm). Following the murder, Muhammad supported ‘Ali, by whom he was sent to arouse support in Kufa. He was with ‘Ali at the battle of the Camel [see al-‘qâma] and was entrusted with taking the captive ‘A’îshah [q. v.], his half-sister by his father, to Baṣra.

The final episode of his career and his life concerns his brief tenure of the governorship of Egypt on behalf of ‘Ali. This falls in the period between the Battle of the Camel and the conquest of the province by Mu‘âwiya and ‘Amr b. al-‘As (ca. 88/658), but the chronology, causation and associated events are reported in a confused and contradictory manner in different traditions. Wellhausen discussed the material available to him in some detail in his Das arabisch-islamische Reich and this was summarised by Fr. Buhl in his article on Muhammad b. Abî Bakr in WP. Among the material not considered by Wellhausen and Buhl, the traditions collected by al-Kindî in his Wuldt Misr are especially useful (1) since they indicate that Muhammad b. Abî Bakr and his son Mu‘awwiyah were prominent among the Kharijites in Egypt, (2) that they were themselves among the Kharijites in Egypt, (3) that they had as their leader Askia Muhammad, who had opposed the rising against ‘Uthmân but refused to throw in their lot with Mu‘awwiyah b. Abî Sufyân and ‘Amr b. al-‘As. These neutrals now made common cause with the ruler of Syria, and ‘Amr led an army into Egypt and defeated Muhammad b. Abî Bakr’s forces at a place called al-Musammât. He attempted to flee but was caught by Ibn Hudâyqî and killed, his body being wrapped in an ass’s skin and burned. When ‘A’îshah learned of his fate, she refused to eat oat meal for the rest of her days.


The accession of Askia Muhammad represented a victory for the more deeply Islamised non-Songhay populations of the western Middle Niger region who had been only partially subjugated and incorporated into the Songhay empire by Sunni ‘Ali. Under the new dispensation, Muslim scholars and holy men found favour at court, and the scholarly elite of Timbuktu, who had often suffered at the hands of Sunni
Ali, were the object of flattering attentions. At the same time, Abd Allah b. Abl Sarh. whose occupant, based at Tindarma near Lake Fati, appears to have been a viceroy for the entire western half of the empire. The importance of this office may be seen in the fact that when Asqia Muhammad left for the pilgrimage to Mecca in Safar 902/October-November 1496, he appointed its first incumbent, his brother ʿUmar, to rule in his stead. This pilgrimage served to enhance the prestige of Asqia Muhammad both within Songhay and more widely among the Muslim rulers of the western and central bilād al-Sudān. When he returned in Dhu l-Ḥiḍdājav 903/July-August 1498, he was not only possessed of the baraka of a pilgrimage, but through the good offices of the great Ethiopian scholar Qālāl al-Din al-Suyūṭī [q. v.] had obtained from the fāʾīnānt Abūbdāsīd caliph in Cairo al-Mustamik the authority to rule the "lands of Takrār" (i.e. the West African Sahel, see ʿUmar al-Naqār in J. Afr. Hist., x [1969], 365-74) in his name. He marked his new-found Islamic legitimacy with two kinds of action. First, by assuming responsibility for the appointment of kādīs in the major Songhay towns, beginning with the appointment of Muḥammad b. ʿUmar b. Muhammad Aḥkām as kādī of Timbuktu in 908/1498-9. Secondly, with a series of expeditions against the non-Muslim neighbours of the empire (the first of which was against the Muzz of Yatenja in 904/1498-9) and a large number of campaigns designed to establish Songhay hegemony and Asqia Muhammad’s authority as the caliph’s deputy over Muslim-ruled states to the east and west of the nuclear empire carved out by Sunni ʿAllī in the Middle Niger valley. Further sanction for these wars of expansion was the ʿamāra, or naval blockade, of the Non-Muslim neighbours (the ʿamāra of al-Salt, he joined the hostages sent to Muʿāwiyah, who had been in Egypt at the time. When the news of this bloody episode (18 Dhu ‘l-Hijjah 35/17 June 656), which had in fact made his way to Medina to give his report and in particular to inform Mu‘āmān of the conspiracies which his enemies were beginning to hatch against him; Ibn Abī Ḥudhayfa expelled ʿUtbah from Fustat and took the functions of governor into his own hands (35/655). He then set about preaching revolt in an overt fashion, making capital out of various grievances held by the army. Meanwhile the caliph had received the latter letter to Egypt ʿAbd b. Abī Waqāṣ [q. v.] with the purpose of retrieving the situation, but the usurper and his supporters forced him to turn back, also resisting the return of ʿAbd Allāh b. Abī Sarh. It is Ibn Abī Ḥudhayfa who is accused of having sent to Medina a contingent of 600 men, but although implicated among those responsible for the murder of Mu‘āmān, he was not personally involved, having been in Egypt at the time. When the news of this bloody episode (18 Dhu l-Ḥiḍdājav 35/17 June 656), became known, the supporters of the vicem were determined to exact revenge. The army mustered initially in Ṣaʿīd Miṣr routed the forces of Ibn Abī Ḥudhayfa and inflicted a decisive defeat on them at the beginning of the month of Ramadān 36/February 657 at Ṣaḥābah (see Yākūt, s. v.). Confirmed nevertheless by ʿAbī b. Abī Tālib in the post of governor, Muḥammad b. Abī Ḥudhayfa prevented Mu‘āwiya b. Abī Sufyān, who had come from Syria, entering Fustat, but he was not slow to conclude an agreement with him, putting an end to the conflicts. Leaving the government of the country in the care of al-Hakam b. al-Ṣalt, he joined the hostages sent to Mu‘āwiya, who threw them into prison and returned to Syria. The prisoners succeeded in escaping, but, pursued by the amīr of Palestine, they were killed in Dhu l-Ḥiḍdājav 36/May-June 657. This marked the end of an adventure which had lasted some two years. Bibliography: Ibn Ḥabīb, Muḥabbār, 104, 274;

(M. PELLAT)

MUHAMMAD b. AḤĪ‘UḤAYNA [see *MUḤAMMAD b. AḤMAHD AL-ISKANDARIYAH*]


(M. PELLAT)
tion of the divine secrets concerning plants, minerals and the characteristics of animals. The use of the word *tibyan* in the title of this book should remind the reader of Kur'ān, XVI, 89, "We have sent down to thee the Book as an explanation (tibyan) of everything."

In both these books the author discusses questions that in a primary or secondary school would be designated as natural history. In these discussions, the author always makes a connection with verses from the Kur'ān. Nowadays, this brand of Kur'ān exegesis is called *tafsīr* ʿālim, "scientific exegesis". The apologetic and political implications of *tafsīr* ʿālim are made clear by a caption which al-Iṣkandarānī often puts above the sections of his *Tībīyān*: "Would God have omitted to reveal to the people of His Kurgan knowledge about...", a formula which then ends with the mention of some "Western" invention or discovery that has been instrumental in creating a possibility.


J.J.G. Jansen

MUHAMMAD b. ʿALI (see also IBN DAWĀD AL-ISFĀHĀNĪ; IBN ʿABĀS; IBN ʿASKAR; IBN FAYH; IBN MUḤLA; IBN AL-TIKTAK; IBN WAḤSHIYYA.

MUHAMMAD b. ʿABD AL-LĀH b. AL-ʿABBĀS, great-grandson of the Prophet's uncle al-ʿAbbās and father of the Abbāsīd caliphs al-Saffah and al-Manṣūr.

Muhammad was an important figure in the establishment of the Abbāsīd daʿwā, but the sources are confusing and his role was embellished by later Abbāsīd historiography. He is said to have been only fourteen years younger than his father ʿAli and had taken over the leadership of the family well before the latter's death in 118/736. It seems most likely that Muhammad had become acquainted in Damascus with Abū ʿAḥšām [q.v.], son of Muhammad b. al-Hanafiyya [q.v.], and become his most promising pupil. During the reign of al-Walīd (86-96/705-15) the family settled in al-Humayma [q.v.], and it was there shortly before his death in 96/716-17 that Abū ʿAḥšām is said to have delivered his famous testament which entrusted his followers to the leadership of the Abbāsīd family. Muhammad's achievement seems to have been to translate this testament into reality. According to some sources, it was he who decided that al-Kūfa was unsuitable and that the centre of the daʿwā should be in Khurāsān. He never visited the province himself, but attempted to keep in touch through Bukayr b. Māḥān in al-Kūfa. This was not entirely successful, as was shown when Khidrāsh [q.v.] (executed ca. 118/736) clearly deviated from the accepted line. After Khidrāsh's death, Muhammad found Sulaymān b. Kaḥṭūr al-Khursānī a more amenable leader. It seems to have been the failure of the rebellion of Zayd b. ʿAli [q.v.] in 122/740 and especially the execution of his son Yāḥyā b. Zayd in Khurāsān in 125/743 which finally induced the leaders of the Khurāsānī daʿwā to accept fully the claims of the Abbāsīd family. Muhammad died in Dhu ʿl- Kaʿda 125/August-September 743 before this was complete, and it was left to his son Ibrāhīm to assume effective control of the movement which was to overthrow the Umayyads seven years later.


H. Kennedy

MUHAMMAD b. ʿALI AL-RIDA b. MŪṢA b. DĀʾĪʾAR, Abū DĀʾĪʾAR AL-DĀʾĪWĀR O.TAṬĪ, the ninth Imam of the Twelve Shīʿa. He was born in Ramāḍān 195/June 811 at his grandfather's estate Surayshiyā' near Samarqand. His mother was a Nubian concubine called Sabīka who was reported to be of the family of Mārīya al-Kibtiyya [q.v.], the concubine of the Prophet and mother of his son Ibrāhīm. According to other reports, her original name was Durrā and she was called al-Khāzyūrānī by the Imām ʿAlī al-Rida. Muhammad is described as black-skinned, and the caliph al-Maʿmūn's decision to marry his daughter Umm al-Fadl to him seems to have been motivated partly on that ground. ʿAbbāsīd opposition to the marriage was, however, more deeply motivated by disagreement of al-Maʿmūn's pro-ʿAlīd policies. At the time of ʿAlī al-Rida's death (203/818), Muhammad, his only son, was seven years old. His succession to the imamate as a minor stirred up considerable controversy among the followers of his father. A group of them recognized ʿAlī al-Rida's successor, Muhammad b. Musa as the successor. Another group joined the Wākīfā, who recognized Mūsā al-Kāẓim [q.v.] as the last Imām whose return they expected, while others, who had backed ʿAlī al-Rida's imāmate after his appointment as successor to the caliphate for opportunistic reasons, returned to their Sunnī and Zaydī communities. Of those who recognized Muhammad as the Imām, some held that he had received the requisite perfect knowledge of all religious matters through divine inspiration from the time of his succession, irrespective of his age, while others maintained that he acquired it from the books of his father when he reached maturity. Muhammad's marriage with Umm al-Fadl was contracted in his absence while he was still a child. Al-Tabarī (iii, 1027) reports it under the year 209/822, but al-Mas′ūdī also gave his daughter Umm Habīb in marriage to ʿAlī al-Rida, while al-Yaḥṣūbi (ii, 552-3) places it after al-Maʿmūn's arrival in Baghdad in 204/819. The actual marriage took place in 215/830 when al-Maʿmūn summoned Muhammad from Medina and met him, on his way to lead a campaign against the Byzantines, at Takrit in Safar/April 830. Al-Maʿmūn ordered him to cohabit with Umm al-Fadl, and the two resided in the house of Ahmad b. Yūsuf, a secretary of al-Maʿmūn, on the banks of the Tigris in Baghdad until the pilgrimage season (January 831), when the Imām left with his family and dependents for Mecca and then returned to his estate near Medina. His son and successor ʿAlī had already been born in 212/828 by a concubine, and the marriage with Umm al-Fadl remained without issue. She is reported to have complained to her father about his preference for his concubine, but al-Maʿmūn rejected her complaint. A year after his accession, al-Maʿmūn's successor Muʿtaṣim summoned the Imām, for unknown reasons, to Baghdad. He arrived in Muharram 220/January 835 and died there towards the end of the same year (6 Dhu ʿl-Hijja/30 November 835 seems to be the best attested date). Al-Maʾṣūdī (Manṣūr, vii, 115 § 2790) appears to be mistaken in placing his death in 219/834. The alternative date mentioned by him (vii, 171 § 2855), during the
caliphate of al-Wathik (227-32/842-47), was evidently in 220/835) led the funeral prayer for him. Some Shi‘i sources accuse al-Mu‘tājim or Umm al-Fadl of having poisoned him, but this is expressly denied by Shaykh al-Mu‘īd. He was buried near his grandfather Musa al-Kāzīm in the Ma‘ākār Kuraysh on the west bank of the Tigris, where the shrine of al-Kāzīmayn came to house the tombs of the two Imams.


MUHAMMAD b. ‘ALI b. ‘UMAR, Abu ‘l-Hasar, poet, man of letters and Shā‘ī fakhr al-‘ilm, was evidently in 220/835) led the funeral prayer for him. Some Shi‘i sources accuse al-Mu‘tājim or Umm al-Fadl of having poisoned him, but this is expressly denied by Shaykh al-Mu‘īd. He was buried near his grandfather Musa al-Kāzīm in the Ma‘ākār Kuraysh on the west bank of the Tigris, where the shrine of al-Kāzīmayn came to house the tombs of the two Imams.
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Al-Bakir also defended the doctrine of dissociation (bard^a) [q.v.] from the enemies of the Imams, chief among whom were the majority of the Companions and in particular the Muslims of the Omayyad. It is the belief in this tenet that Sunni authorities put it about that al-Bakir declared his loyalty to Abû Bakr and 'Umar. Al-Bakir also maintained that under certain circumstances, self-protection through dissimulation (tekifya [q.v.]) is permissible, and that in case of danger to life or limb it is mandatory.

The systematic, public teaching of Imam! law appears to have been initiated by al-Bakir (al-Kulml, viii, 52-7). Al-Bakir may also have met 'Abd al-Malik himself (though such a meeting would have had to take place before al-Bakir's assumption of the imamate): according to a story on what the Imam had said, and for this al-Bakir
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Al-Bakir's decision to issue an Islamic gold coinage, replacing the authority of Harun al-Rashid,
Bâkir's designated successor (wasi); another was reportedly al-Mughlra b. Sacid... Haydarabad 1388-90/1968-70, i, 124-5, no. 109; Safadl, al-Wa^ibi 'l-wafaydt, iv, ed. S. Dedering, Damascus 1959, 102-12.

Sayings by the Imam.

Djabir b. Yazid al-Dju (d. 127/744-5 or 128/745-6). Djabir occupy a prominent role in the composite gnostic text Umm al-ki^abî. In the opening section (of uncertain date), the five-year old al-Bakîr appears in a manner not further explained) in a saddle on which al-Bakîr sat while returning home from a meeting in Damascus with the caliph Hâgâm (reigned 1050-7254-43); al-Bakîr later died of the effects of the poison. Other accounts say that it was Hâgâm himself who had him poisoned. Three reports place al-Bakîr's death even later. According to the first, Hâgâm passed away before managing to have al-Bakîr poisoned. In the second report (al-Masûdî, Murûdî, vi, 17-18 = § 2252), al-Bakîr is said to have died during the caliphate of al-Walid b. Yazid. In the third report (cited by Ibn Bâbawayh) has al-Bakîr poisoned by order of the Umayyad Ibrâhîm b. al-Walîd during his brief reign (1267-744) (Risâla fi l-tîrîbîdât, Tehran 1371, 105 = A Shi'ite creed, tr. Assaf A. F. Fysee, Oxford 1942, 102). This latter claim is reproduced without comment by some later Shi'î writers, including Ibn Shahrahshâbî (d. 588/1192) (Mandkîb, iii, 340) and Ibn Tâwús (d. 664/1266) (al-Shahrastanî, al-Milal wa 'l-nihal, ed. al-Wakîl, Cairo 1309/1990, 335). A possible explanation for these later death dates is that they originally referred to al-Bakîr's namesake Muhammâd b. 'Ali b. 'Abd Allâh b. 'Abbas (d. between 124/741-2 and 126/743-4; for the date see J. Lassner, Islamic revolution and historical memory, New Haven 1986, 82-90), and were then mistakenly applied to al-Bakîr. Such a conflation might also explain the report (al-Safadl, al-Wâ^î, iv, 102) that al-Bakîr died in al-Humâyûn (d. 102/619). This explanation gains support from the 'Abbasid revolution, since it was there that the dying Abu Hâgâm [g.v.] transferred his rights to the imamate to the 'Abbasid Muhammad b. 'Ali, and it was probably there, too, that the latter died.

Al-Bakîr was buried in the Bâkî al-Charqâd cemetery in Medina, and was succeeded by his son Dja'dîr al-Sâ'dîk. According to some Sunni heresiologists, the Shi'i sect of al-Bakîrîyya refused to accept his death and awaited his return as Mâdîb (al-Bâgîlî, al-Fark bayn al-firak, Cairo 1367/1948, 38; cf. al-Shahrastânî, al-Mîlal wa 'l-nîdal, ed. al-Wâ^îl, Cairo 1381/1968, i, 165).

MUHAMMAD b. ‘ALI ZAYN AL-‘ABIDIN — MUHAMMAD b. AL-ASH‘ATH


(3) Muhammad b. al-Asbagh, from the village of Bayvanya [q.v.] (Baena, near Cordova); died 303/915-16 or 300/912-13. No further details are mentioned. Apparently he belonged to the family of Muhammad b. Asbagh b. Muhammad b. Yusuf b. ‘Ata‘, whose brother Kaisim b. Asbagh [q.v.] lived in the same village and partially had the same teachers (see Yafi‘i).

(4) Muhammad b. al-Asbagh, from the village of Bayvanya [q.v.] (Baena, near Cordova); died 303/915-16 or 300/912-13. No further details are mentioned. Apparently he belonged to the family of Muhammad b. Asbagh b. Muhammad b. Yusuf b. ‘Ata‘, whose brother Kaisim b. Asbagh [q.v.] lived in the same village and partially had the same teachers (see Yafi‘i).

(5) Muhammad b. al-Asbagh, from the village of Bayvanya [q.v.] (Baena, near Cordova); died 303/915-16 or 300/912-13. No further details are mentioned.

(6) Muhammad b. al-Asbagh, from the village of Bayvanya [q.v.] (Baena, near Cordova); died 303/915-16 or 300/912-13. No further details are mentioned. Apparently he belonged to the family of Muhammad b. Asbagh b. Muhammad b. Yusuf b. ‘Ata‘, whose brother Kaisim b. Asbagh [q.v.] lived in the same village and partially had the same teachers (see Yafi‘i).
but in the course of the campaign he was killed. A poem on his death is attributed to Abū Ḥafṣ al-Muḥādīn (al-Tabarī, ii, 729-31; R. Geyer, Gedichte von..., Al-Maʾmūn, London 1928, 331, no. 26).

For his son 'Abd al-Rāhām, see Ibn al-As'afī.


(G. R. Hafting)

**MUHAMMAD B. BADR AL-DĪN [see AK ḤISĀRĪ].**

**MUHAMMAD B. BAḤṬĪYAR [see MUḤAMMAD BAḤṬĪYAR KAZĀDI].**

**MUḤAMMAD B. BAṢĪR [see MUḤAMMAD B. YĀṢĪB].**

**MUḤAMMAD B. DĀWŪD [see IBN AQDURRŪM; AL-ISFĀHĀNĪ].**

**MUḤAMMAD B. DĪJĀFAR [see DĪJĀFAR B. ABI ṬALĪB; DĪJĀFAR AL-SAḤĪK; AL-RĀTṬĀNĪ; AL-KAŻĀZ; AL-BAḴTIYĀR, B. AL-UNūS; ABU ‘1-HUDHAYL AL-MAṢḢĪ; AL-MUṬṢALĪ AL-BAḴTIYĀR; AL-MAṢḤĪ].**

**MUḤAMMAD B. AL-DĪJĀHM AL-BARKĀḤI, senior Muṭṭalī official of the caliphate, wit and philosopher, of Persian origin, possibly associated with the famous 'Abbāsid viziers, at least through ties of goodwill. He is scarcely known except through the great authors of a treatment of the Aṣnām, which must have been the object of a translation of the Aṣnām entitled like the other Kitāb Ṣirār maṣalik al-ʾAdjam (or Fībrīst) and of a Kitāb al-Iḥtiyārāt, which must have been the treatise on astrology mentioned above (al-Kīfī).**

Thus there is general agreement that Muḥammad b. al-Dījāhm was a suspect person in the eyes of Sunni opinion, but probably also of quite a scandalous nature to other currents of thought. It is probably this that explains the reticence that he arouses in the biographers, notwithstanding the importance of the administrative and political functions which he is supposed to have performed. It is no longer forbidden to think that he was a victim of the relative prejudice of silence, and even of disinformation, which in subsequent periods surrounded the history of the Muṭṭalī caliphate as a whole.


(G. Lecomte)

**MUḤAMMAD B. AL-DĪJĀZARĪ [see IBN AL-DĪJĀZARĪ].**

**MUḤAMMAD B. DUGHMANZIYĀR [see KĀḴĪYıld].**

**MUḤAMMAD B. FARĀMARZ [see KHUSREW MOLLĀ].**

MUḤAMMAD B. ḤABĪB, Abū Ḍījāfar, an Arabic philologist of the school of Baghdaḏ. Only scant facts of his life are known to us. Ḥabīb
is said to have been the name of his mother, a manumitted slave of the family of Muhammad b. 'Amr. The only known date of his life is that of his death on 23 Dhu 'l-Hijja 248/231 March 860. Ibn Habib had the reputation of being a reliable scholar, especially on poetry, genealogy and history. Among his teachers were Ibn al-Arabi, Kutrub, Abdi 'Ubayda, Abu 'l-Yakzan and, most important, Ibn al-Kalbi, whose Djamharat al-ansab he transmitted (cf. G. Levi Della Vida, in Actes du XIIème Congrès international des Orientalistes, Leiden 1932, 236 f., and W. Caskel, Gamharat an-naab, Leiden 1966). Two mutually contradictory anecdotes regarding his scholarship have come to us. The first, found in the Aghdam, xi, 156 ll. 23 ff., and in Yakhir, vii, 8 ll. 12 ff., reports that Ibn Habib boasted of his superiority even over his teacher Ibn al-Arabi. Once when he had asked him the meaning of eighteen uncommon expressions used by al-Tirimmi in his poems, Ibn al-Arabi had answered each time: "I don't know, I don't know." The second anecdote, however, tries to diminish his reputation. Thalab relates that, having heard him recite the beginning of the Thabiti poetry, he attended the lecture. When Ibn Habib became aware of his presence, he stopped lecturing. Thereupon he asked Ibn Habib to go to the mosque and continue his lecture there. Ibn Habib did so after prolonged urging and the people gathered around him to listen. He began commenting on a poem, but in his comments passed over a difficult passage. Asked to explain the difficulty, he had to declare himself unable to do so; thereupon Thalab took over and explained the passage. As a result, Ibn Habib did not lecture in the mosque again. This anecdote seems to have arisen from a bias against Ibn Habib; it is related by al-Marzubani, who also accused him of having put forward works of other authors as his own.

Among the poets whom Ibn Habib served as a rauzi were al-Farazdaq (as ed. by Boucher) and Ibn Kayz al-Ruqayyat (ed. Rhodokanakis). He is also the main authority for the Nak'd of Djafir and al-Farazdaq (see intro. to ed. A.A. Bevan): therefore a Kitab Nak'd Djafir wa l-Farazdak and a Kitab Ayyam Djafir alalat alhakamat fi l-ruzi are listed among his works. As is to be expected from a disciple of Ibn al-Kalbi, Ibn Habib studied especially the history of pre-Islamic and early Islamic times and the genealogy of their leaders and representatives. The list of his works in the Fihrist and in Yakhir bears witness to this tendency (for a discussion of the titles mentioned in them and their subjects, cf. I. Lichtenstädt, Muhammad Ibn Habib and his Kitab al-Muhabbar, in JRAS [1939], 1-27).

Many of these "books" are no more than somewhat enlarged chapters of the two principal works mentioned among Ibn Habib's œuvre, viz. the Muhabbar and the Munammak, which his editor assumes limit itself to the same extent as the former in simply listing names of men or women represented in the chapters. The Munammak contains extended stories on these protagonists and detailed reports of the events in their times; in addition, both works contain a large number of poems and verses, many of which are not found elsewhere.

A question may be asked why, in view of the rich material offered by Ibn Habib's works, so few have survived? Both the Muhabbar and the Munammak have survived only in unique ms., the former in a ms. preserved in the British Museum, the latter in a ms. in a private collection in Lucknow. These works, however, offer a rich material on customs and the history of the Djahiliyya and early Islam, and in addition to anecdotes, a plethora of new genealogical material that deals especially with the extended genealogy on the mother's side (i.e. listing the line from the mother, her mother, her grandmother, and so on) often into antiquity. The Muhabbar especially tries to organise this material in the form of lists, an endeavour also occurring in the Munammak, although not to the extent as in the Muhabbar. Another problem posed by Ibn Habib is the use he makes of the insad. At a time when his contemporaries began to watch carefully over the "correctness" of the chain of authorities mentioned to support the authenticity of the main (contents) of the story told, Ibn Habib does not hesitate to cite "someone of the People of the Book" or "someone of the Jews (Yakub) in the Nahar Najdun," even "someone whom I have met" in a chain in which also well-known scholars are cited as authorities. (A detailed analysis of Ibn Habib's insad was made in the article on the Muhabbar cited above.) The editor of the Munammak, too, discusses this problem (introd., 13 ff.); Abu l-Hassan Muhammad b. al-'Abbâs al-Hanbali, its major authority, mentions this for his sources (he is to be expected from a disciple of Ibn al-Kalbi, Ibn Habib held an important intermediate position in the development of the insad; in a way, it also confirms the reliability of his works. His principal authority, often mentioned by name as such (see art. cit.) is generally Ibn al-Kalbi.


(IISE LICHTENSTÄDT)
Although he did not, like al-Hasan and al-Husayn, have the blood of the Prophet in his veins, he became involved not only in the political turmoils but also in the schemes which the boundless fancies and of the extreme Shi‘is is built up around the family of ’Ali. He was not to blame for this, for he was of a retiring disposition and acted very cautiously. But when al-Hasan had sold his rights and al-Husayn had fallen at Karbalāʾ in 61/680, many turned their eyes to him as the natural head of the family. This aroused the suspicion of ’Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr who, after the death of al-Husayn, appeared more and more openly as a pretender; the fact that Muhammad had no sympathy with the efforts of the opposition in the Hijāz is evident from the interesting statement of al-Baladhuri that he definitely declared the accusations brought against the caliph Yazid I by the Medinans to be false. The matter only became serious when the adventurer al-Mukhātir [q.e.] after several vain efforts to get others to join him stirred up a movement on a large scale in ‘Irāq in 66/686, as champion of Muhammad’s rights. Even now, Muhammad acted with great restraint and declared the significant title ‘al-Mahdī’ with which they wished to greet him (see al-Tabari, ii, 610, and Ibn Sa’d, v, 68, which has certainly been misinterpreted by Lammens). He obviously did not care for al-Mukhātir at all, and he had every reason to doubt a man’s goodness of heart from his entourage; but in view of the many dangers which surrounded him and probably also from a want of decision, he did not wish to break with him openly. Therefore, when some people came to him from Kufa to clear up his attitude towards al-Mukhātir, he only gave them a diplomatic answer which was non-committal (cf. the somewhat different versions: Ibn Sa’d, v, 72; al-Ya’qūbī, ii, 308; al-Tabari, ii, 607 and thereon al-Mubarrad, Kāmil, 598) but which they interpreted as a kind of approval, as it did not definitely disown him. As a result, the revolutionary movement spread in extent and much blood was shed to avenge al-Husayn and other ’Alīids. Muhammad was against this also (cf. Ibn Sa’d, v, 72-3, 77); but when Ibn al-Zubayr’s attitude became more and more hostile and he finally imprisoned Muhammad and several of his adherents, including ’Abd Allāh b. ’Abbās, at Mecca near the Zamzam well, he saw nothing else for it but to appeal for help to al-Mukhātir. This was what the latter wanted, and he sent a body of cavalry at once to Mecca and released Muhammad and the other prisoners in the nick of time, but by the latter’s express orders avoided conflict with Ibn al-Zubayr’s troops, as the town was not to be desecrated by bloodshed. Muhammad then sought shelter with his family at Minā (see Kāmil, 554, 597; Kitāb al-Aghāni, viii, 33; al-Kumayt, ed. Horovitz, i, 78) and later went to Tā’if. He made no further use of al-Mukhātir and was therefore not compromised when the revolution failed and his champion fell in 67/686-7. In spite of the threats of Ibn al-Zubayr and the demands couched in friendly language of ’Abd al-Malik, and although a safe place of residence was granted him neither in Hijāz nor in Syria, he defined his attitude by paying homage neither to one of the two pretenders and adhered to the principle that he would only recognise a ruler around whom the Muslim community could be united. He therefore appeared in the noteworthy pilgrimage of the year 68/688 along with the Zubayrids, Umayyads and Khāridjīs, as an independent head of a party, although only under an armed neutrality. Only when, after the fall of Ibn al-Zubayr (73/692), the unanimity of the vox populi which he had demanded, became a reality, did he finally recognise the Marwānid as the legitimate ruler and visited him in 78/697-8 at Damascus. He returned, however, to Medina, where he died in 81/700-1. His last act in the political field is always attributed to purely religious motives in the traditions; not human force but Allāh’s help alone should assist ’Ali’s family to their rights; but there is no doubt that a further reason was his lack of enterprise and self-confidence, a trait common to a number of ’Alids. That, like his whole family, he at the same time liked the good things of this world is evident from the heavy demands which he sent to ’Abd al-Malik for the payment of his debts and annual pensions for his children, relatives and clients; there is also evidence that he had the family fondness for fine clothes and cosmetics. It is all the more remarkable, then, that the more fanciful and extravagant school of Shi‘is seized upon him at once after his death and spread the belief that he was not dead but lived in a kind of fairy kingdom on the hill of Radwān west of Medina, whence he would return as the victorious leader of an army (cf. Kūthib al-Aghānī, vii, 4-5, 9-10, viii, 32). This was the idea of rādī’s which ’Abd Allāh b. Sabā‘ [q.e.] had associated with ’Ali (cf. Friedlander, in ZA, xxiii, 309 ff.) and which was now transferred to him; and in fact it was now easier to bring him into the forefront than it had been while he maintained an attitude of stubborn passive resistance in his lifetime.

Bibliography: Tabari, i, 1126-ii, 783 passim (see indices), iii, 2337, 2476, 2530; Ibn Sa’d, v, 66-86; Baladhuri, Anṣāb al-zāhrā, in ZDMG, xxxviii, 394; Ma‘ṣūdī, Murūd, v, 176 ff., 267-8; Ya‘qūbī, i, 267, 308, 311-14, 320; Mubarrad, Kāmil, ed. Wright, 296-7, 554, 580 ff., 597-8; Nawawī, Biographical dictionary, ed. Wüstenfeld, 113-15; Dīnawarī, 156 ff., 186-7, 234-5, 242, 274, 297-8, 303-15; T.W. Arnold, al-Mu‘āzila, 10-11; van Vloten, Recherches sur la domination arabe, etc., 1894; H. Banning, Muhammad ibn al-Ḥanafija, diss., 1909; Fr. Buhl, Der arabische Dichter der Abī al-Ḥusayn, 1910, 355 ff.; H. Lammens, Études sur le règne du Califé Omeyyade Me‘awīa, 166, 169-70. See also KAYSANYYA and the Bibliothèque. (Fr. Buhl) MUKHĀTIR [q.v.][see ibn Daryād; ibn Ḥamdūn; al-Sayyānī].

MUHAMMAD b. AL-ḤASAN [see ibn Durayd; ibn Ḥamdūn; al-Sayyānī].

MUHAMMAD b. AL-ḤASAN b. ‘ĀLĪ [see al-Ḥuray al-‘Āmili].

MUHAMMAD b. AL-ḤASAN b. DĪNĀR, Abu ʿl-ʾAbbās, better known as Ibn Dīnār al-Āhvāl, rāʾūi of Baghdād who lived in the 3rd/9th century and who died after 250/864. He followed the profession of bookseller (warrāk) and above all that of copyist (nāṭik). Earning 20 dirhams per 100 leaves, he copied the translations and personal compositions of Ḥunayn b. Isḥāk [q.e.] as well as the writings of al-Yaṣīdī [q.e.], whose courses he had more or less followed, as those also of Nifṭawīyā [q.e.], since he had an interest in philology. He himself wrote in turn a series of works or which a list has been preserved by the biographers: K. al-ʾAnṭājī, K. al-Dawdhi, K. al-Silāḥī, K. ʾamīr fakha laflatba wu-khalafa maʾnahu; K. Faʾala wa-ʾafaʾala and K. al-ʾAṣbaḥ. None of these seems now to be known.

He is furthermore credited with making recensions of the works of 120 poets, but it was mainly a commentary on the Dīwān of Dhu ’l-ʾRummāa (not cited in the art. on this poet, s.v.) which gained al-Āhvāl a lasting fame to the point that al-)”bgdādī, e. g. possessed a copy (Kāzma, ed. Bulāk, i, 51, iv, 496); but it is remarkable that this Shārī was known in al-Andalus and that, alone among the works of this
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philologist, a fragment copied in the West has survived, where al-Kall [q. v. ] has inserted it. This fragment, which is part of ms. Hamldiyya, Istanbul,
1408, fols. 188-208, contains 24 kasidas, of which
about one-third are the work of Dhu '1-Rumma. Since
the vocabulary of this poet was often made up of rare
and difficult words, the lexicographers—in particular,
the author of the Lisdn al-^Arab—extensively used alAhwal's commentary. The surviving fragment of this
commentary has been profitably used by the recent
editor of the Diwdn, cAbd al-Kuddus Abu Salih
(Damascus, i, 1392/1972, see 48-51, 81, 124, and in
the takhridj_ of the pieces commented upon).
Cairo, 117; Zubaydl, Tabakdt, 114; Kiftl, Inbah, iii,
91-2; BakrT, Mucdjam, 800; Ibn Khayr al-Ishblll,
Fahrasa, 291; Yakut, Irshdd, vi, 482-3 = Udabd\
xviii, 125-6; SuyutI, Muzhir, i, 506-16, passim, ii,
517; idem, Bughya, 33; SafadI, Wdfi, ii, 344-5; F.
BustanI, Dd^irat al-ma^drif, iii, 81-2; R. Sellheim,
Sprichwortersammlungen, The Hague 1954, 49, 70, 84
n.; Kahhala, ix, 191; Sezgin, GAS, viii, 138.
(CH. PELLAT)_
MUHAMMAD B. HAZIM B. C AMR AL-BAHILI,
c
Abu Dja far, satirical Arabic poet of the early
c
Abbasid period, flor. end of the 2nd/8th century and
opening of the 3rd/9th century. We do not know when
first he went to Baghdad, where he lived, nor the date
of his death. The most important persons with whom
he came in contact were Ibrahim b. al-Mahdi (d.
224/839 [q.v.]) and, above all, al-Hasan b. Sahl (d.
236/850 [0.fl.]), the caliph al-Ma D mun's secretary.
The poet was introduced to al-Hasan at the time when
he resided at Wash, probably after the assassination of
his brother al-Fadl b. Sahl.
We possess only 398 verses of this poet, and it is
uncertain whether he composed any more. He may
thus conveniently be described as mukill, specialising
in the short piece (mukatta^d), whose virtues he
defended with vigour. We have worthy of note here
an interesting reaction against the tendency to prolixity which characterised the grand poem aimed at
display or the politico-religious composition.
Al-Bahill was a satirical poet with biting humour
which did not spare his victims. He was a fiercely
importunate demander of favours and was often illtreated, nourishing strongly-held rancours. In this
way he pursued several well-known personages, never
accepting their excuses. But he was also the author of
moralistic pieces in which he posed as an advocate of
humility, moderation and serenity in face of the difficulties of existence (kanaka). This trait would not
appear to fit a poet who was importunate in his
demands and violent-tempered in his reactions; but in
fact, there may not be any contradiction here, for alBahilT was a pessimist who had a low view of human
nature. He showed no regard for the powerful and
passed a severe judgment on their jockeyings for
power. He held apart from all his friends who wished
to give him high office. He either did not know how
or did not wish to write panegyrics, and only a few
verses of his eulogising al-Ma D mun and al-Hasan b.
Sahl are known.
The collective cultural memory of the Arabs held
him to be a good poet whom the purist philologians
are said to have appreciated. Reading over the 86
pieces of his which have survived shows that he had an
easy way of handling the language and a sure mastery
of the art of versification, but little of what might be
called a genuine poetic temperament; if the formulation is sometimes felicitous and the verse stronglyconstructed, the expression is too often sententious,
heavy and lacking in brilliance.

Bibliography:
The Diwan was edited by
Muhammad Khayr Mahmud al-BikacI, Damascus
1984, unpubl., v, 135-6. Principal sources:
Aghdm3, xiv, 91-111; MarzubanI, Mu^djam alshu<ara\ 371-2; Ibn al-Muctazz, Tabakdt, 308-10,
518; Shabushtl, Diydrdt, 275 ff.; Ibn al-Djarrah,
Waraka, 109-12; Khatlb Baghdad!, Ta^rikh Baghdad,
ii, 295; Yakut, Bulddn, iii, 725. See also Zirikli,
AHdm, vi, 303-4; Sezgin, GAS, ii, 517, ix, 517.
(J.E. BENCHEIKH)
MUHAMMAD B HINDU-SHAH NAKH£IWANI,
Shams al-Dm, Persian official and l i t t e r a t e u r of
the 8th/14th century and apparently the son of HinduShah b. Sandjar Glranl or al-Dj Irani, author of an
Arabic adab work (Brockelmann, II2, 245, S II, 256)
and of a Persian version of Ibn al-Tiktaka's FakhrT, the
Tadjdrib al-salaf (see Storey, i, 81, 1233; StoreyBregel, i, 326-7).
Muhammad was a chancery secretary under the IIKhanids. He wrote a Persian-Persian glossary, Sihdh
al-Furs, dedicated to his superior Ghiyath al-Dln, son
of the great vizier for the Mongols, Rashld al-Dln
Fadl Allah [0.0.], and conceivably another Persian
glossary with interlinear Turkish explanations. But
his most valuable work, important for the light which
it throws on Il-Khanid administration, is his collection
of private and official model letters dating from
Mongol times onwards, the Dastur al-kdtib ft ta^-yin almardtib (ed. A.A. Alizade, 2 vols., Moscow 1964); he
had wanted to compose this in the reign of the IlKhanid Abu Sacld (716-36/1216-35), but only completed it in his old age for the Djalayyirid Shaykh
Uways (757-77/1356-75) (see Storey, iii, 5-9, 246-7).
Bibliography (in addition to references given in
the article): J. Rypka et alii, History of Iranian
literature, Dordrecht 1968, 434; A.K.S. Lambton,
Continuity and change in medieval Persia, London 1988,
371-2.
(C.E. BOSWORTH)
MUHAMMAD B. HISHAM [see IBN HICHAM].
MUHAMMAD II B. HISHAM AL-MAHDI, caliph
of Cordova [see AL-ANDALUS and UMAYYADS of SPAIN].
MUHAMMAD B AL-HUDHAYL [see ABU
'L-HUDHAYL].
MUHAMMAD B. HUSAYN [see MEHMED
KHALIFE; AL-SHARIF AL-RADI]._
MUHAMMAD B IBRAHIM [see SIMDJUR,
BANU].

MUHAMMAD B. IBRAHIM TABATABA [see
IBN TABATABA].
MiUHAMMAD B IBRAHIM II B TAHMASP,
sixth r u l e r of the c Adil-ShahI d y n a s t y [q.v.] in
the western Deccan, ruled 1035-66/1626-56 at the
capital Bldjapur [q. v. ] after the death of his father. In
the year 1044/1634 the armies of the Mughal ruler
Shah Djahan [q. v. ] invaded the Deccan and laid waste
the country of Bldjapur. After the subjugation of
Dawlatabad and other forts, Muhammad b. Ibrahim
c
Adil Shah agreed to pay a considerable tribute to the
emperor of Dihli. He was the last king of Bldjapur
who struck coins in his own name. In the latter part
of his reign, his vassal SlwadjI, son of the Marafha
leader ShahdjI Bhonsle, by stratagem and treachery
obtained great power, and the foundation of the
Bldjapur monarchy became weakened from the
attacks of both the Mughals and the Marafhas.
He died in 1066/1656, according to the inscription
on the tomb in Bldjapur, the splendid Gul Gumbadh
(on which see B!DJAPUR. Monuments).
Bibliography: Hashim Beg FuzunI Astarabadhl, Futuhdt-i ^Adil-ShdhT, B.L. ms. (Storey, i,
743, 1331), fol. 314b; Imperial gazetteer of India*, viii,


189; Cambridge history of India, iv. The Mughul period, ed. Sir R. Burn, Cambridge 1937, 188 ff. See also the Bibl. to 'al-Maḥānī'.

MUHAMMAD b. İLYAȘ [see abū 'Alī].

MUHAMMAD b. İSHA [see ıśâviyya].

MUHAMMAD b. İSHA b. AHMAD AL-MAḤĀNĪ, Abū 'Abd Allāh, Persian mathematician and astronomer of the 3rd/9th century, who is known to have made observations at Baghdād from the years 239/854 to 252/866.

The following mathematical works are attributed to al-Maḥānī: (1) Commentaries on Books I, V of Euclid's Elements; in the last of these, al-Maḥānī worked out a list of "plane" numerical irrational quantities (corresponding to the irrational segments considered in Book X) and "solid" (composed of roots to the third). (2) A revision (partial: up to proposition II, 10) of the notoriously deficient translation of the Spheres of Menelaus; al-Tūsī considered it—as also the new version of al-Harawī (see Bibl.)—as "in error". (3) A commentary on Book II of Archimedes' On the sphere and the cylinder; it is said that al-Maḥānī tried in this to solve algebraically the elevation of the third degree resulting from the problem, posed by Archimedes, of the cutting of a sphere by a plane so that the two parts have a given relation even if this was a failure, this attempt makes al-Maḥānī a precursor of the Italian algebraists of the later Middle Ages. (4) A treatise on relationship (fi 'l-nisba), in which the comparison of two relationships is made not in the Euclidean manner, using the equalities (a:b-c:d if na>mb involves nc>md for every pair of natural integers n,m; a:b-c:d if m,n exist like one has na>mb with mc>md, but—as certain of the Greeks did before Euclid—by considering the result of partial quotients resulting from each of the two relationships by the application of "Euclid's algebra" taught at the beginning of Book X. (5) A treatise on the squaring of the parabola, which Ibrahim b. Sinān mentions as consisting of some auxiliary arithmetical theorems and five or six propositions establishing the result by reduction to the absurd (in this case, by the so-called "defect limitation").

In astronomy, apart from some observations, we possess from him a treatise on the determination of the azimuth, which explains graphic methods, sometimes used numerically. A work On the latitude of the stars is known only by its title. Finally, Ibrahim b. Sinān mentions at the beginning of his K. fi 'ilāl al-ğalāl that al-Maḥānī was said to have composed a work on the determination of the ascendant with the aid of the solar clock.

Bibliography: Life and works. The most complete information is in Sezgin, GAS, v, 260-2, vi, 155-6, vii, 404 (who refers also to the older biographies and to the new ones like those of Suter and Brockelmann; to this should be added Y. Doke, Digt. of scientifc biography, under M). Particular works. (1) On the fragment preserved of the commentary on Book X, see pp. 258-60 of G. Mauvevskaya, The theory of quadratic irrationals in medieval oriental mathematics, in Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, no. 500 (1987), 253-77. (2) Only a version of the commentary completed and improved (by al-Harawī) still exists; see M. Krause, Die Sphārik von Menelaos aus Alexandrien in der Verbesserung von Abu Naṣr Mansūr b. 'Alī b. Ṣa'īd, in AKH. Gesell. Wiss. Göttingen, phil.hist. Kl., dritte Folge, no. 171 (Berlin 1936), 1, 13, 23-32. (3) Two references—one by 'Umar Khāyyāmī—in F. Woepeke, L'algèbre d'Omar Alkhayyāmī, Paris 1851, 2, 96 (cf. 43, 100). (4) Analysis in E. Ploojj, Euclid's conception of ratio ... as criticized by Arabic commentators, Rotterdam 1950, 50-1, 61. (5) Ibrahim b. Sinān, 490-510. As for his observations, Ibn Yūsuf, Haydarābād 1366-7/1947-8, no. 3, at p. 69 (autobiographical fragment), and no. 5, at p. 2 (his treatise on the same subject). Al-Maḥānī's methods in astronomy (or in goneometrics) are studied by P. Luckey at pp. 500-3 of his Beiträge zur Erforschung der islamischen Mathematik, in Orientalia, N.S., xviii (1948), 375-92. For his treatises, Ibn Yūsuf gives them in his Zādi al-kaḥīr al-Ḥākimī, 102-13, 164-7 (see also 58, 60), of the edn. by Causīn de Perceval, in Notices et extraits, vii (1804), 16-240.

(J. SESSANO)

MUHAMMAD b. İSHAKar [see ABU 'L-İ'ANBAS, in Suppl.; İBN İSHAKar; İBN İNALDI].

MUHAMMAD b. AL-KASIM [see al-ANBARI].

MUHAMMAD b. AL-KASIM b. İHAMMUD, al-Malht [see HAMMUDĪS].

MUHAMMAD b. AL-KASIM b. ıTHARAFI, a military commander of the Umayyad dynasty and conqueror of Sind.

A highly respected member of the tribe of Thaqif (ṣaḥīf Thaqāfi fi zamānihi), he was a favourite of Al-Hādżjdjādī who even considered him a suitable match for his daughter (Zahīrī, vi, 28-9). His fame is due chiefly to his military exploits in the western Indian province of Sind. Al-Hādżjdjādī appointed him to lead an expedition to Sind between 89/708 and 92/711 (for various dates, see F. Garbi, in East and West, xv [1965], 282, n. 1, and Ibn al-Aṯīr, iv, 425-7), after two commanders failed to punish Dāhir, the ruler of Sind, for his inability (or unwillingness) to restrain pirates who had interfered with Muslim shipping near the coast of his province. Muhammad b. al-Kāsim prepared the military expedition with great care. His main army took the land route across the desert of Makrān; further supplies and reinforcements were brought by sea. The first Indian city to be conquered by Muhammad b. al-Kāsim was the port of Daybul [q. v.], situated at the mouth of the Indus. Having established a Muslim settlement there, Muhammad b. al-Kāsim advanced to the north-east, killed Dāhir in battle, and conquered a number of cities. The most important of these was Multān [q. v.], which was famous for its temple and served as an important centre of Hindu pilgrimage.

Muhammad b. al-Kāsim's career came to an abrupt end after the deaths of al-Walid b. 'Abd al-Malik and Al-Hādżjdjādī and the accession of Sulaymān b. 'Abd al-Malik in 96/715. Together with other supporters of the former régime, he was relieved of his command, put in prison and tortured to death.

Only seventeen (or fifteen) years old at the time of his Indian campaign, Muhammad b. al-Kāsim became the paragon of a successful military career at an unusually early age (Ibn Kutayba, 'Uyūn al-aghār, Cairo 1925, i, 229). His conquests and dealings with the vanquished rulers and populations constitute a main theme in the famous Indo-Muslim history, known as the Cāl-nāma [q. v. in Suppl.]. According to this work, Muhammad b. al-Kāsim was executed not as a result of the change of government in Damascus, but because Dāhir's two daughters, seeking vengeance for their father's death, falsely accused him of indecency towards them while they were in his custody, before being sent to the court of the caliph ('Allī b. al-Munṣīr b. Abī Bakr Kūfī, Cāl-nāma, ed. U. Dāūdpōta, New Delhi 1939, 243-7; for translation, see Bibl.). The utterance attributed to him, according to which "the idol temple is similar to the churches of

MUḤAMMAD b. KAḤĪFĪF: under IBN KAḤĪFĪF reference has erroneously been made to MUḤAMMAD b. KAḤĪFĪF, whereas the latter name is in fact that of the mystic deal with in the article preceding the reference.

MUḤAMMAD b. KAḤALAF b. AL-MARZŪBĀN, philologist of ‘Irāk, who lived in the Bāb al-Mubawwad quarter of Baghdād and who died in 309/921. According to Ibn al-Nadīm (Fihrist, 86, 149-50), Ibn al-Marzūbān was above all a transmitter of historical traditions (aḥkār), of poetry (aḥkār) and of anecdotes (maθāl), but was also a specialist in the Kur’ānic sciences, being the author of a Kitāb al-Hāfiṣ in 27 volumes. Yākūt (Ifrīḥāt, vii, 105) adds that he translated some fifty works from Persian into Arabic and that he wrote a dozen books in the descriptive genre (waṣaf). Out of his abundant production, only a few works have come down to us, and only one of these edited, his Kitāb Tafṣīl al-kālid ‘alā kālid mim-man tabās ‘l-thāqib, by L. Cheikho, in Machriq, xv [1912], 515-31.

Bibliography: Brockelmann, i, 130, Si, 189-90; Kaθbālā, Muṣafīn, ix, 285; Ziriklī, A’lām, vi, 348; Muḥammad b. Maraglī, Muḥammad b. Maraglī, ed. Y. Friedmann.)

MUḤAMMAD b. MAḤMŪD b. MUḤAMMAD b. MAḤLĪK-SHĀH

MUḤ. b. AL-KĀSIM — MUḤAMMAD b. MAḤMŪD b. MUḤ. b. MAḤLĪK-SHĀH


The death in 547/1152 of Sultan Maṣūd b. Muḥammad [q. v.] without direct male heir instituted a period of confusion for the Great Saldījuk sultanate, in that there were left several Saldījuk princes with claims to the throne, including Maṣūd’s brother Sulaymān-Salāh and the sons of his brothers Muḥmūd and Ṭoghrīl. All but Muḥammad, out of these contenders, were of mediocre abilities, and were largely dependent on the Turkish Atabegs and other ambīrs, some of whom kept Saldījuk princes at their local courts with the aim of serving both their own personal ambitions; it is only Muḥammad who is praised by ‘Imād al-Dīn (in Bundārī, ed. Housma, 248) as the most majestic, learned and just of the Saldījuk princes.

Muḥammad, born in Raḥfī II 522/1128, had been brought up with his brother Maḥlīk-Shāh by the Atabeg of Fārs Bozaba as a potential rival to Muḥammad’s uncle Maṣūd, but was later adopted by Maṣūd. The latter may in fact have intended Muḥammad as his successor, for after Maḥlīk-Shāh had shown his incapacity, Muḥammad was in 548/1153 summoned from Khūzestān and made sultan by the amīr Maṣūd Bēg b. Paḷang-Eri. Muḥammad nevertheless soon got rid of his dangerous power in the state by executing Maṣūd Bēg, but was soon himself involved in a struggle to retain his throne with his uncle Sulaymān-Salāh, who had now escaped from captivity under Maṣūd. Sulaymān-Salāh could not hold out against Muḥammad’s superior force, but escaped to Baghdād in 550/1155 and became a protégé of the caliph al-Muktaflī [q. v.], who hoped to use him against Muḥammad. This was the period of the resurgence of Ḍabbāṣid power in ‘Irāk, aided by the skill of al-Muktaflī’s vizier ‘Awān al-Dīn Yahyā ibn Hūsāyīn [q. v.]; after Maṣūd’s death in 547/1152, the Saldījuk ṣarhā and military representative had been expelled from Baghdād, and Saldījuk influence henceforth excluded from the city. Sulaymān-Salāh’s ventures came, however, to naught with his defeat and capture by Muḥammad and his ally Maṭbūd b. Zangi of Mawjīl (551/1156), and Muḥammad now felt strong enough to attack and besiege Baghdād in Dhu ‘l-Qa‘da 551/December 1156-January 1157, being joined in this by the Mazayyid [q. v.] amīr ‘Alī b. Ḏubāy. However, he had to raise the siege in the following year, on hearing news of the appearance at Hamadhān of the Atabeg of Ḍarbārdijān, Ildīnīz [q. v.], together with the rival Saldījuk princes Maḥlīk-Shāh and Arslān b. Ṭoghrīl b. Muḥammad.

The last years of Muḥammad’s life were spent campaigning against Ildīnīz and his protégés, now including also Sulaymān-Salāh; he defeated them at Nakhchīvān and was about to march on Baghdād again when he fell ill and died at Hamadhān at the end of Dhu ‘l-Qa‘da 534/December 1159. He was then briefly succeeded as sultan by the ineffectual Sulaymān-Salāh.


MUHAMMAD b. MAHMUD b. MUH. b. MALIK-SHAH — MUHAMMAD b. MAKKI

Abd QamIt Al-Djizzini, Shams al-Din Abu Hamid al-Kadi, (17x580)two occasions 421/1030 and 432/1040-1.

GIN, Abu Ahmad Djalal al-Dawla wa-Djamal al-

of both the Kara Khanid Kadir Khan Yusuf of Milla, sultan in Ghazna and northwestern India on Khotan and Kashghar and of the last FarTghunid lands in western and central Persia to the latter, and mad was made governor of that region by his father Mahmud of Ghazna [q.v.]. Towards the end of his life, Sultan Mahmud, who had already made Muhammad his deputy in Ghazna whilst campaigning at Kanawd [q.v. in India in 409/1016, divided his empire between his two sons Muhammad and Mas'ud [q.v.], assigning only the newly-conquered lands in western and central Persia to the latter, and then just before his death left the whole of his empire to Muhammad. So when in Rabl* II 421/April 1030 Mahmud died, the hadjib 'Ali Karih b. Il-Arsalan raised Muhammad to the throne in Ghazna. But the superior military experience and capability of Mas'ud was such that, when he marched eastwards from Isfahan, Muhammad's support in Ghazna melted away; he was deposed in Shawwal 421/October 1030 and imprisoned in a fortress at Mandish in Ghur [q.v.], but contrary to information in some later sources, does not seem to have been blinded.

When after his defeat by the Saldjiks at Dandikan in [q.v. in Suppl.] in Ramadan 431/May 1040, Sultan Mas'ud decided to abandon Afghanistan for India, he was able to make a plausible appeal in both his ability and his judgment. At the Indus crossing it mutinied, and brought out Muhammad, who was accompanying the column, for a second reign as sultan, although only after threatening him unless he co-operated (Rabi II 432/December 1040). Mas'ud was subsequently killed, apparently on the orders of Muhammad's son Ahmad, for Muhammad's sons seem to have wielded the real power at this time. However, Mas'ud's son Mawdud [q.v. advanced from Ghazna to average his father's death, defeated Muhammad's forces near Djalalabad. In Suppl.] in Radjab or March or April 1041, killed Muhammad and his sons, and ascended the throne. Although clearly little fitted to rule the Ghaznavid empire, still extensive even after the triumph in the west of the Saldjiks, Muhammad was a person of considerable culture who had received a thorough education in the Islamic sciences.


MUHAMMAD b. MAHMUD b. MALIK-SHAH — MUHAMMAD b. MAKKI [see MUKADDAM b. MU6AF6 b. KABARI]

MUHAMMAD b. MAKKI b. HAMID b. NABATI b. AL-AMILI b. DZIJZINI, Shams al-Din Abu Abd Allah, called al-Shahid al-Arewal, Imm Anshi Shir'i scholar, fakih, traditionalist who was regarded as trustworthy, expert in the transmission of traditional sciences, poet and litterateur (734-86/1333-84).

In addition, he had been equated as a master of the selection of canonical learning and for his trial and death. He was a pupil of the shaikh al-Hilli [q.v.], and in one of his uqasas he claims to have transmitted also Sunni works by means of direct instruction from forty Sunnis 'ulama. At all events, Imami scholars coming after him often claim his authority for their works, and one may note that, among his own disciples, figures also his wife Umm 'Ali and one of his daughters Umm al-Hasan Sult al-Mashavikh Fatiima. The sources provide us with a long list of his works, of which the most important, according to the Dharfsa (x, 40; viii, 145-6; xvi, 17; v, 43, 174-5), are the following:

— K. al-Dikr, completed in 784/1382, of which the sections on the worship and on ritual purity survive; — K. al-Durdi al-sharifyya fi fikh al-Imamiyya, begun in 780/1378-9 but never completed; this work is said to have been re-copied firstly in 851/1447 and then again in 857/1354; — K. Chayat al-mard fi sahr nukat al-irhah, on the principles of knowledge; — K. al-Jurr, on the shaikh al-sharh, which contains the commentaries on the Tahdib al-usul of al-HillI written by two of his nephews; and — K. al-Bayfan fi 'l-fikhr, also devoted to law, but incomplete.

Muhammad b. MakkI was a native of Nabiyya in the Djabal Amili, and resident in the little village of Dizzin in south Lebanon. He made the usual travels of the scholars of his time in order to meet the masters whom he mentions and then in order to teach himself in his turn: 'Irak, the Hijaz, Egypt, Palestine and Damascus. It was at the latter place that he died, killed by the sword, hung from the gibbet, stoned and burned (whence his name al-Shahid) during the reign of the Mamlik sultan Barkd (d. 801/1399). The source is now given by a Malik! Burhan al-Din, who gave a fatisa in this sense, contrary to the opinion of the Shahid's father. Abd Ibrak Ibn Qanawd was made to swear that Muhammad b. MakkI had made a request—whether by virtue of takya or through genuine belief is unknown—to join his majdhab. The accusation followed a denunciation by a group of persons, amongst whom there had been, according to certain accounts, a certain Muhammad b. Ya'bari who had been hunted down and killed by our shaikh as being a magician and a false prophet. He was accused of having written defamatory works against the Sunnis. During the period which he spent in prison before execution, he put together al-Lum'a al-dimashqiyya on fikh (al-Dharfsa, xviii, 352).

most of the Nizāmiyya, the sons and clients of Nizām al-Mulk [q.v.]. beginning with Murāydi al-Mulk before he became sultan and then in 500/1107 employing his brother Nizām al-Mulk Diya' al-Mulk Ahmad as his vizier.


MUHAMMAD B. MARWĀN B. AL-ḤAKAM, Abū "Abd al-Rahmān, son of the first Mawwālī caliph by a slave mother, hence half-brother to the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik [q.v.]. ʿUmayyad commander and governor.

In 65/684-5, he was sent by his father to al-Dīzārī, probably with the aim of securing Armenia once more, and in the battle of Dayr al-Dajjal in 67/691 in which he distinguished himself, with his nephew and his son Zangi, and then sent other Turkish amirs to exercise substantially undisputed power in western Persia, an attack by the Georgians on Gandja was repelled (503/1110-11); measures were taken against the predatory Shabankara Kurds in Fars by the governor Čavlo Sakāwū, who had fled to his court, and in the battle of Dayr al-Djathalik in 72/691 ʿAbd al-Malik led an expedition against Armenia. Along with his nephew ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd al-Malik, he was sent to the governor of ʿIrāk and the East al-Hādūdār in the year 82/701 to support him against the rebel ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Malik [q.v.]. the caliph's half-brother, was the actual commander, but the former retained his governorship for some time until in 91/709-10 he was replaced by Maslama here also. Muhammad died in 101/719-20.


MUHAMMAD B. MUHAMMAD — MUHAMMAD B. MUHAMMAD

MUHAMMAD B. MALIK-SHĀH, Abū Ṣaḥūdī Qāʾīyāh al-Dunyā wa l-Dīn, with the Turkish name Taqīr "he who conquers, wins" (see P. Pellion, Notes sur l’histoire de l’Empire Ottomane, Paris 1950, 182-3), Great Saljuq sultan in ʿIrāk and western Persia 498-511/1105-18.

Born in Shaʿbān 474/January 1082, he was a half-brother of Malik-Shāh’s eldest son Berk-Yaruk [q.v.], a full brother of Sandjar and of the former vizier Nizām al-Mulk’s son Muʿayydi al-Mulk. The ensuing years were filled with continuous struggles between Berk-Yaruk and Muhammad, until in 497/1104 Berk-Yaruk agreed to a division of power, with Muhammad to have north-western Persia, ʿIrāk and ʿArān, whereas Sandjar was to remain in Khūrāsān. Muhammad as his vizier as co-regent during the years 493, 496-5, 497-504, 506-9, 110-19. 2. Secondary sources. M.F. Sanaullah, The decline of the Saljuk empire, Calcutta 1938, 114-32; C.E. Bosworth, in Camb. hist. of Iran, vi, 108-19; C.L. Klausner, The Seljuk state, Cambridge, Mass. 1973, index. (C.E. Bosworth)

MUHAMMAD B. MALIK-SHĀH, Abu Shudja

Ghiyath al-Dunya wa l-Dīn, with the Turkish name Taqīr "he who conquers, wins" (see P. Pellion, Notes sur l’histoire de l’Empire Ottomane, Paris 1950, 182-3), Great Saljuq sultan in ʿIrāk and western Persia 498-511/1105-18.

Born in Shaʿbān 474/January 1082, he was a half-brother of Malik-Shāh’s eldest son Berk-Yaruk [q.v.], a full brother of Sandjar and of the former vizier Nizām al-Mulk’s son Muʿayydi al-Mulk. The ensuing years were filled with continuous struggles between Berk-Yaruk and Muhammad, until in 497/1104 Berk-Yaruk agreed to a division of power, with Muhammad to have north-western Persia, ʿIrāk and western Persia, c. 493-496; ʿIlbān, ʿAlī Thālim, 492-5, 497-504, 506-9, 110-19. 2. Secondary sources. M.F. Sanaullah, The decline of the Saljuk empire, Calcutta 1938, 114-32; C.E. Bosworth, in Camb. hist. of Iran, vi, 108-19; C.L. Klausner, The Seljuk state, Cambridge, Mass. 1973, index. (C.E. Bosworth)
Muhammad led his first expedition into India in 571/1175, expelled the Isma'ili heretics who ruled Multan, and recaptured the orthodox governors in that province, and captured Uqba. In 574/1178 he rashly led an army into Gujrat, was defeated by the Raudja, Bhima the Vaghela, and returned to Ghazni with no more than the remnant of his army; but in the following year he took Peshawar, and in 577/1181 Lahawr, taking prisoner Khursaw Malik, the last of the Ghaznavids [q. e.], and adding the Pandjab to his brother's dominions. In the winter of 586-7/1190-1 he invaded the Cawhan kingdom of Dihl and captured Bhatinda, but the Raudja, Prithvi Raudj, marched against him and defeated him at Tarawri near Karnal. He was wounded, but escape, and in 588/1191 returned to India, defeated and slew Prithvi Raudj at Tarawri, captured Hansi, Sama, Guhram and other forresses, and plundered Ajmer. On returning to Ghazni, he left Kubl Al-Din Aybak [q. e. in India as vicerey, and at the end of 588/1192 Aybak took Dihl and made it his capital. In 595/1197 Aybak was beheaded in Ajmer, and Muhammad sent a relieving force which enabled him to defeat Bhima of Gujrat and to plunder his capital, Anhilvara.

Muhammad was now employed with his brother in recovering Khurasan. On the death of Muhammad b. Sahnun, the extract translated by M. Talbi in his Emirat, 354-5, according to a citation of Riyad al-nufus, possibly taken from no. 22 above, shows.


Muhammad b. Musa Al-Din, was the fourth of the Shamsabani princes of Ghur to rule the empire of Ghazni [see ghanja and ghatrib]. His dakhil was originally Shihab Al-Din, but he assumed that of Mu'izz Al-Din. His elder brother Khayyab Al-Din succeeded his cousin Sayf Al-Din in 558/1163 and made Muhammad governor of Harat, entrusting him also the duty of extending the dominion of the house in India.

Muhammad led his first expedition into India in 571/1175, expelled the Isma'ili heretics who ruled Multan, and recaptured the orthodox governor in that province, and captured Uqba. In 574/1178 he rashly led an army into Gujrat, was defeated by the Raudja, Bhima the Vaghela, and returned to Ghazni with no more than the remnant of his army; but in the following year he took Peshawar, and in 577/1181 Lahawr, taking prisoner Khursaw Malik, the last of the Ghaznavids [q. e.], and adding the Pandjab to his brother's dominions. In the winter of 586-7/1190-1 he invaded the Cawhan kingdom of Dihl and captured Bhatinda, but the Raudja, Prithvi Raudj, marched against him and defeated him at Tarawari near Karnal. He was wounded, but escaped, and in 588/1191 returned to India, defeated and slew Prithvi Raudj at Tarawari, captured Hansi, Sama, Guhram and other forresses, and plundered Ajmer. On returning to Ghazni, he left Kubl Al-Din Aybak [q. e. in India as vicerey, and at the end of 588/1192 Aybak took Dihl and made it his capital. In 595/1197 Aybak was beheaded in Ajmer, and Muhammad sent a relieving force which enabled him to defeat Bhima of Gujrat and to plunder his capital, Anhilvara.

Muhammad was now employed with his brother in recovering Khurassan. On the death of the

Muhammad b. Salm al-Katjjan 'anhu, a ms. of which is known in the library of the Imperial Library in Tunis (see edn. by 'Abd al-Wahhab al-K. Adb Auxallmin, 14); 24. Kitab Adb al-mussallmin [see 'lmata al-mussallmin], ed. H. H. 'Abd al-Wahhab, Tunis 1348, French tr. G. Lecomte, Le livre des regles de conduite des maistres d'eleve..., in REI 1953, 77-105.

Apart from his activities as the promoter of the still fragile Malikism, and his pedagogical work, the biographers note that, like his father, he is said to have paid with his life in defence of the Tunisian Sahel against the incursions of pirates, especially Christians (Ifardj, Rumi). Whatever the case may be, the problems of privateeating in Ifrikiya, see kursan, calling attention to it as a part of gihad, have been made a subject of consideration, even of fatawa in the work of Muhammad b. Sahnun, as the extract translated by M. Talbi in his Emirat, 354-5, according to a citation of Riyad al-nufus, possibly taken from no. 22 above, shows.


Muhammad b. Musa Al-Din, was the fourth of the Shamsabani princes of Ghur to rule the empire of Ghazni [see ghanja and ghatrib]. His dakhil was originally Shihab Al-Din, but he assumed that of Mu'izz Al-Din. His elder brother Khayyab Al-Din succeeded his cousin Sayf Al-Din in 558/1163 and made Muhammad governor of Harat, entrusting him also the duty of extending the dominion of the house in India.

Muhammad led his first expedition into India in 571/1175, expelled the Isma'ili heretics who ruled Multan, and recaptured the orthodox governor in that province, and captured Uqba. In 574/1178 he rashly led an army into Gujrat, was defeated by the Raudja, Bhima the Vaghela, and returned to Ghazni with no more than the remnant of his army; but in the following year he took Peshawar, and in 577/1181 Lahawr, taking prisoner Khursaw Malik, the last of the Ghaznavids [q. e.], and adding the Pandjab to his brother's dominions. In the winter of 586-7/1190-1 he invaded the Cawhan kingdom of Dihl and captured Bhatinda, but the Raudja, Prithvi Raudj, marched against him and defeated him at Tarawari near Karnal. He was wounded, but escaped, and in 588/1191 returned to India, defeated and slew Prithvi Raudj at Tarawari, captured Hansi, Sama, Guhram and other forresses, and plundered Ajmer. On returning to Ghazni, he left Kubl Al-Din Aybak [q. e. in India as vicerey, and at the end of 588/1192 Aybak took Dihl and made it his capital. In 595/1197 Aybak was beheaded in Ajmer, and Muhammad sent a relieving force which enabled him to defeat Bhima of Gujrat and to plunder his capital, Anhilvara.

Muhammad was now employed with his brother in recovering Khurassan. On the death of the
Khwarzm-Shah Tekish [q.v.] in Marw, in Ramadan 596/July 1200, Muhammad b. Tahir marched against him but suffered a crushing defeat near Andkhâti and fled to Talâkan. He was besieged by the army of Gûr Khân of the Karâ-Khatîv [q.v.] and purchased a safe retreat only by the surrender of the whole of his baggage and material of war. On his arrival before Ghazni in this plight, his slave Ilidiz refused to admit him, and he passed on to Multân where the governor likewise refused him admittance; but he attacked and defeated him and appointed Nâzîr al-Dîn Kabaca to the government of the province of Sind [q.v.]. He returned to Ghazni and established himself there, sparing the life of Ilidiz. By the treaty which he concluded with the Khârsân-Shâh Muhammad, he was permitted to retain Balhâr and Harât but not Nishâpûr and Marw.

In Rabî’ I 602/October 1205, he marched from Ghazni for India and, with the help of Kûth al-Dîn Aybak, defeated the Khokars, but on returning towards Ghazni was assassinated in Sha’bân 603/March 1206 on the bank of the Indus, either by Ibrâhîm heretics or by some Khokars. He was succeeded in Ghûr by his nephew Muskâmîd, son of Ghîyâth al-Dîn, the vice-roy of the provinces, Aybak in Dihll, Kabaca in Multân, Tâjd al-Dîn Yildiz in Kirmân and Ilidiz in Ghazni, became independent.


MUHAMMAD b. Sîrîn [see Ibn Sîrîn].

MUHAMMAD b. SU’ûd b. Muhammad b. Mukrîn of the Anaza clan, the founder of the first Su’ûdi state in Nadjî [see SU’ûd, AL], assumed office as amîr al-Dîrîyya [q.v.] in 1137/1242 following his father’s death or in 1140/1252 after the brief rule of a cousin, Zayd b. Markhân. His claim to fame rests on his association with the religious reformer Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhâb [see Ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhâb], whom he welcomed at al-Dîrîyya in 1158/1745, pledging support for his mission. Two of his brothers were already disciples of the Shaykh, and they and his wife are said to have been instrumental in promoting the alliance. From then until his death in late Rabî’ I 1179/September 1765 Muhammad b. Su’ûd was engaged in a continual and largely indecisive struggle against his opponents, such as Dahmân b. Dâwûs, ruler of al-Riyyâ, and his former suzerains, the Banû Khâlid of al-Ashâb. The most serious challenge arose in the last few months of his life, when the Su’ûdi state was in danger of falling to a coalition of these enemies combined with forces from Nadjîr and many discontented Nadjîrs. The aim of this opposition was to prevent the Su’ûdis from uniting Nadjî under their control. However, Muhammad b. Su’ûd contrived a skilful diplomatic settlement with the amîr of Nadjîr, thus breaking his opponents’ solidarity. Although he took little part in military operations, assigning command chiefly to his able son ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz, he showed political acumen that proved of great value in ensuring the survival of his state and the maintenance of the Wahhâbi cause.

MUHAMMAD B. TAHIR — MUHAMMAD B. TUGHLUK

HARITHI, from Harith, a well-known tribe and a branch of the Hamdan [q. v.], was a prominent figure in the Mustawfiyya, a group influential in the transformation of early Islamic law in the second half of the 11th century. After the death of his teacher, Ali b. al-Husayn b. al-Hasan al-Kashif, Harithi succeeded him as amir al-adl and al-madhun al-tarbiya, a position he held until his death in Shawwal 334/November-December 1188.

His Madjam al-tarbiya, in two volumes, is a classic chrestomathy of Isma'ili literature which served as a model for later compilers. Thanks to his work, numerous excerpts from earlier works and small treatises which are otherwise lost have been preserved. Another work of his, al-Anwar al-latifah, is considered an important work on hukkaf, to be read by students especially in 327/938 when he threatened to have the Fatimid al-Kahin's name proclaimed from the pulpits and suggested that his daughter marry the Fatimid imam's son. These actions were related to a power struggle in Palestine with the former amir al-umara [q. v.] Ibn Râ'iq.

In late 327/939 Ibn Râ'iq invaded Syria, taking Ramla. Al-Ikhshid offered a generous peace, ceding the lands from Ramla northwards and agreeing to pay an annual tribute. The offer was refused. Warfare continued into late 328/940 when Ibn Râ'iq, whose goal was Baghdad, accepted similar terms. The murder of Ibn Râ'iq in Shabâbân 330/April 942 and the rise of the Hamdanids [q. v.] was the background to al-Ikhshid occupying Damascus for six months from Shawwal 330/June 942. During this campaign, he had his troops take an oath of loyalty to his son Abu 'l-Kasim Unudjur as his successor, indicating his plans for a dynastic succession. Two years later, in Muharram 333/September 944, al-Ikhshid was in Rakka where he met with the caliph al-Mu'tamak and urged him to join him in Egypt or, at least, remain in Rakka. The caliph did not accept the offer, but he did receive a letter from the amir of Egypt, al-Muharram b. al-Harawi, urging him to join him in al-Hijaz for himself and his descendants for 30 years.

A military struggle with members of the Hamdanid family had been under way since 332/944, but intensified with the rise of power of Sayf al-Dawla [q. v.]. Muhammad b. Tughdj now undertook a military campaign in Shabâbân 333/April 945, while offering a generous peace, ceding the lands in northern Syria and agreed to an annual tribute was reached in Rabî I 334/October-November 945. He retreated to Damascus, where he died on 21 Dhu 'l-Hidjah 334/June 946. He was succeeded by his son, but power was more and more in the hands of his principal military commander and African enuch Kâfir [q. v.].

There is very little information on al-Ikhshid's internal policies. He was not a major patron nor a builder. In fact, he has a reputation for parsimony and timidly, although the latter may be a misunderstanding of his willingness to settle for limited military and political goals while securing the succession of his family to the governorship of those lands he controlled.


MUHAMMAD B. TUGHLUK, the second sultan of Dihli (724-5/1324-51) of the Tughlukid dynasty, was a prominent figure in the early Islamic world, known for his contributions to the transfer of Tulunid rule to the Mamluk dynasty. Born in Baghdad on 15 Ragib 318/February 882, Muhammad b. Tughj spent part of his youth in Palestine, gaining military and administrative experience during this period.

Increasing internal chaos in Egypt, fear of Fatimid invasions of Egypt from North Africa and political intrigue in Baghdad, led to the naming of Muhammad b. Tughdj as governor of Egypt in 325/935. This time, however, he was not as successful as his father. He was officially designated by the caliph al-Radi with the title al-Ikhshid in 327/938. His major task after securing control from the Mamluks was to establish a dynasty which he established is known as the Ikhshidids. Following the transfer of Tulunid rule to the Mamluk dynasty, Muhammad b. Tughj now undertook a military campaign in Shabâbân 333/April 945, while offering a generous peace, ceding the lands in northern Syria and agreed to an annual tribute was reached in Rabî I 334/November-December 945. He retreated to Damascus, where he died on 21 Dhu 'l-Hidjah 334/June 946. He was succeeded by his son, but power was more and more in the hands of his principal military commander and African enuch Kâfir [q. v.].

There is very little information on al-Ikhshid's internal policies. He was not a major patron nor a builder. In fact, he has a reputation for parsimony and timidly, although the latter may be a misunderstanding of his willingness to settle for limited military and political goals while securing the succession of his family to the governorship of those lands he controlled.


MUHAMMAD B. TAHIR, a well-known figure in the early Islamic world, known for his contributions to the transfer of Tulunid rule to the Mamluk dynasty, was a prominent figure in the early Islamic world, known for his contributions to the transfer of Tulunid rule to the Mamluk dynasty.
MUHAMMAD b. TUGHLUK — MUHAMMAD b. UMAR

[...] dynasty and the eldest son of its founder, Qiyāhū al-Dīn Tughluk. Before his father came to power in 720/1320, he bore the name of Malik Djawnā, and subsequently was entitled Ulugh Khān. While heading an expedition to annex Tilang (Tel- ingana) in ca. 723/1323, he made an unsuccessful bid for the throne, and a number of writers implicate him in the accident which caused Tughluk’s death. The chronology of his reign is fraught with difficulties, including even the date of his accession: on a monum ent erected by his successor Firūz Shāh, it appears as 1 Sha’bān 725/13 July 1325 (Corpus inscriptum Iranicarum, xvii. Haryana, 1, ed. M. Shokoohy, London 1988, 21-2), but the year is possibly an error for 724 (24 July 1324: see the review by Jackson, in JIRAS [1990], 171-2). Muhammad’s reign is associated with abortive projects which are severely criticised by our principal Indian sources. The selection of Dawaišāh [q.v.] (Deūgūr) in the Deccan as the second capital around 727/1327, and the removal thither of many of the aristocratic households of the old capital, were both a logical response to the considerable southward extension of the empire over the previous few decades and a measure to foster Muslim colonisation of the new Deccan province. This episode also coincided, apparently, with a similar move of the Mongols of the Čaghātay khanate, which, ‘...Kurāshān’, i.e. present-day Afghanistan, then occupied by the Mongols of the Čaghātay khanate [q.v.], in Central Asia. Most of the enormous army was disbanded, however, and part of it was decimated in a campaign against Karačil, i.e. some region in the sub-Himalaya or the Hindu Kush (possibly Kash-mir). Two other controversial measures must be viewed in this same context. A low-denomination coinage (often misleadingly labelled a ‘mir’). Two other controversial measures must be...

The first, Muhammad b. Ahmad, was an expert in the field of arithmetic and geometry and devoted himself to astronomical observations, at the same time as performing the functions of bādī of Shurriyun (Saffarid court), in the region of Jazāra. In the date of his death (405/1015), the number of the tens has probably been omitted, for if it were exact, his master would have outlived him by more than 40 years.

The second, al-Ḥasan b. Ābd al-Rahmān, was interested, as were his fellow disciples, in mathematics and astronomy, to which he added logic and the natural sciences. He was still alive in 462/1070 when Sa'īd was writing his Tabakāt.

The third, the Cordovan al-Ḥasan b. Muhammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Tudjibi, is the only one to have left a summary of astronomy “according to the system of Sindhind” [q.v.], but this work has not been preserved. In 442/1051, Ibn al-Hayy left Spain to go first to Egypt, then to Yemen to the Sulayhid Imām ‘Alī b. Muhammad (d. 473/1080) [see al-Iṣḥāy] who set up the cōbūd al-ṣanīn and appointed chief of police. The maintenance of order in the city was one of the functions of this independence, or at least, the sīdhib al-shurta (or the ‘Abbasid caliph al-Kā'īm bī-amr Allāh (422-671/1031-75 [q.v.]) in Baghdaḍ, where he was magnificently received. He then returned to Yemen, where he died in 456/1064.

(MUHAMMAD b. UMAYYA) b. ABD UMAYYA, kūbī and poet in Arabic who is the best-known member (Sezgin is in error on this point) of a family of kūbāt or secretaries quoted for their share in literary activities. He had several brothers, all poets like their father and grandfather: Āli, Ābi Allāh and Ahmad, and also an uncle, also called Muhammad, all of whom has inevitably caused confusion in the attribution of the verses drawn by biographers and anthologists from a collection which is said to have amounted to, for the whole family, almost 200 sheets.

Born ca. 200/815, Muhammad b. Umayya frequented the circles of police society at Baghdaḍ, where he met such famous poets as Ibrahim b. al-Mahdī, Abu ʿl-ʿAtaḥiya, Muslim b. al-Walid and Husayn b. al-Dabkāh [q.v.], and, not to mention the singer Muharrir [q.v.], various singing slave girls amongst whom were among others one whom he calls Khaṭīb, and some ephemera (gīḥmān), to whom he dedicated several varied pieces. There remains today of his work only some thirty fragments which hardly each exceed four verses. These remains all reveal a personal inspiration and have a strong sense of unity since they revolve round a central theme, that of desire and passion (ḥubb, shawk). The idealised image of the beloved, male or female, a shrinking creature, inaccessible, often associated with a summons, discrete, very much of the flesh, shines out through the ensemble of his poems. A hymn to beauty and to joie de vivre can be accompanied by a vocabulary of absence, nostalgia and suffering (ḥusn, lūdihā and lahu, but also ḥadīr, āmīl, būka', dunyā and ma'ūl). This thematic content thus recalls that of the Ḥūdāl elegists of the 1st/7th century, but the style of writing brings differences from the author’s ligatures in style and suppleness and does not exclude recourse to the figurative terms (baḍī) required by the taste of the period.

(Bibliography: Fehrist, ed. Tadjadddud, 185; Ibn al-Djarrāḥ, Waraka, 47-51; Dāwūd al-Isfahānī, Zohrah, 1st section, 113; Aqānī, ed. Cairo, xi, 144-55, ed. Beirut, xii, 139-49; Shāhābughī, Dīyārān, 29-31; Sarrādī, Masāq al-tabakht, 255, ii, 195; Sezgin, Gİ's, ii, 607-8; B. Najaj (Nadjijār), Muṣlama al-dājjikīr: ʿṣurārā' ʿaṣhabīyān, Tunis 1987-90, index. (B. Najaj))

(MUHAMMAD b. UTHMĀN) [see ʿabd al-wādīdīs).

(MUHAMMAD b. AL-WALĪD) [see al-Turtūgli].

(MUHAMMAD b. WAṢĪF, secretary in the service of the Saffārids of Sistān and one of the first known poets to write verse in New Persian according to the rules of Arabic quantitative metre, see ʿarād [q. v.]).

The local history of Sistān, the Taʾrikh-i Sistān, cites fragments from four poems, apparently kāsidas, by Muhammad b. Waṣīf (see G. Lazard, Les premiers poètes persans (IXe-XVe siècles), Tehran-Paris 1934/1964, i, 18, 54-6, ii, 13-15. The first of these was composed, the anonymous historian states, around the time of Yaʿkūb b. Ṭabarzīd. In 253/867 or his killing of ʿAmmār the Khurāsānī two years previously, and was, he says, the result of Yaʿkūb’s complaint that he could not understand the panegyrics addressed to him in Arabic by his court poets. Muhammad b. Waṣīf’s poetic career must have extended over fifty years, since the last of the fragments relates to the captivity of ʿAmr b. Layth’s two grandsons Tāhir and Yaʿkūb, which is said to have been during the second half of the 3rd/9th century. S.M. Stern, whilst accepting as probably Yaʿkūb’s catalytic role as an encourager of vernacular literature, was cautious over Muhammad b. Waṣīf’s pioneering role as a poet in New Persian, pointing out that the author of the Taʾrikh-i Sistān was aware only of his local scene, hence the claims for this poet’s primacy may have related to the Sistān area only.


(MUHAMMAD b. YAHYĀ [see Ibn Baḏrāqa].

(MUHAMMAD b. YĀKŪT, ABD BAKR, a chief of police (ṣabīl al-ṣerīr) in Baghdaḍ. In 318/930 Muhammad, whose father was chief chamberlain or bādī to the caliph al-Muktaḍar, was appointed chief of police. The maintenance of order in the capital at this time was much neglected, and the Turkish guards conducted a regular reign of terror. In a fracas between infantry and cavalry, Muhammad intervened on behalf of the latter; their opponents
were cut down, some driven from the city and only a small contingent of negroes, who at once surrendered, refused to renounce their disbelief (Muharram 318/February 930). Some months later, these last mutinied and demanded more pay; but they were driven out of the town by Muhammad and then routed by the chief amir Mu'nis [q.v.] near Wasit. The confusion was increased by the breach between Mu'nis and Muhammad. At the instigation of Mu'nis, Muhammad was dismissed in Dju'mâda II 319/June-July 931. Mu'nis was nevertheless not satisfied, but demanded that his hated rival should be banished. The caliph at first refused to grant his request; but when Mu'nis threatened him with force, he had to yield, whereupon Muhammad went to Sidjistan (Râjib 319/July 931). Soon afterwards, the caliph quarrelled with Mu'nis and recalled Muhammad. In Muharram 320/January 932, the latter returned to Baghda'd; the caliph then sent him with an army to al-Ma'shâkh in the region of Takrit. But when Mu'nis advanced from Mawil, the caliph's troops under Muhammad and Sa'd b. Hamdân retired to Baghda'd without striking a blow. After the victory of Mu'nis and the murder of al-Muktadir in Shawwâl 320/October 932, the latter's son 'Abd al-Wâhid fled with Muhammad and his other supporters to al-Ma'dînîn and then to Wasit, where a number of his generals abandoned him. When the forces of the new caliph al-Kâhir approached under the command of Yalbâk, 'Abd al-Wâhid and Muhammad fled to Tustar.

Muhammad was not popular on account of his arrogance and selfishness, so that one after the other of his partisans laid down his arms, and finally 'Abd al-Wâhid surrendered. Muhammad entered into negotiations with Yalbâk, and the caliph pardoned him. He then returned to Baghda'd, where he gained a great influence over al-Kâhir. On the accession of al-Râdi in Dju'mâda I 322/April 934, Muhammad became the real ruler in a short time; the caliph appointed him head chamberlain and also made him his commander-in-chief, while the vizier Ibn Muklâ [q.v.], played a more subordinate part. When al-Muktadîr's cousin Hârûn b. Gharîb, whom al-Kâhir had appointed governor of Mâh al-Balâd, al-Dinâwâlî and Mâsibâdshân, rebelled, Muhammad was sent with an army against him. In the resulting battle, Muhammad suffered a defeat (Dju'mâda II 322/May 934); soon afterwards, however, Hârûn fell from his horse and was killed by one of Muhammad's slaves. With the death of their commander the resistance of Hârûn's followers collapsed; Muhammad was nevertheless unable long to retain his position of power. On the advice of Ibn Muklâ, who feared his ever-increasing power, al-Râdi had him arrested, along with his brother Abu 'l-Fath al-Mu'azzâr and the secretary Abî Ishâk al-Kârâritl, on 5 Dju'mâda I 323/12 April 935. Muhammad died in prison in the same year.


(K. V. CzETTERSTREEN)

MUHAMMAD b. YASIR AL-RIYÂSHI, ABî DJAWAR, a minor poet who was born and lived in Basra. He was born at some time in the middle of the 2nd/8th century and died at a similarly uncertain date, probably during the caliphate of al-Mâmûn (198-218/813-33) or during that of al-Mu'tâsîm (218-27/833-42). His existence, of which barely nothing is known, has attracted scant attention on the part of biographers in that he seems to have followed an unremarkable and leisurely career, in an atmosphere untroubled by events of any magnitude. On the other hand, it has only been possible to determine the name of his father on the basis of a tradition (Aghânî, xii, 137) according to which al-Mu'tâsîm drew a favourable augury from the sense of yur which it implies; thus the reading Bâhîr, adopted by numerous sources and their editors, may be rejected. On the other hand his name, which shows his connection, as a muawil, with the Banû Riyâshî of the Khaðî'âm, is sometimes replaced incorrectly by al-Hîmâyî.

The Aghânî (xii, 129) pays tribute to Ibn Yasir for never having left his native town to go "in search of his pasture" (muntâdîrî) in the capital, at the court of the caliphs, as did so many other poets and men of letters who "went up" to Baghda'd in the hope of acquiring recognition of their talent and gaining material advantage from it. The source of his means of livelihood is, however, unknown; he apparently engaged in no lucrative activity and lived in poverty, but he must have drawn some support from his association with the generous patron of poets Muways b. 'Imrân [q.v.] and with members of the 'Abâssid family, especially Harûn al-Râdi, whom he accompanied on his numerous travels. He died in Tustar.

Nevertheless, he does not seem to have addressed self-seeking eulogies to these Basrân personages; he was not attracted to this current genre, and the desire to preserve his independence led him to prefer epigram and satire, which he practised with moderation, to judge by the specimens which have come to light. It is true that his work, however scanty (Aghânî, xii, 129), must comprise a more significant number of verses than the total of some 320 recovered by the author of the present article when he attempted to reconstruct, at least in part, the dieuon of the poet (Muhammad b. Yasir al-Riyâshi wa-ashfârhu, in Machîr [May-June 1935], 289-338; in the passages which follow, the numbers in Roman figures refer to the pieces reproduced in this collection), and it is possible that some characteristic poems have escaped analysis, but it seems that the material available gives a fairly accurate impression of the personality of Ibn Yasir.

Despite his poverty, he was content with his lot; he endured adversity without complaint and enjoyed the pleasures which were available to him, if not approved (nos. viii, xvii, xxx, xxxiiii). While describing him as refined (zarîf), the author of the Aghânî (xii, 129) judges him debauched and unpleasant, although the remnants of his work rather give the impression of a debonair personality; his epigrams (nos. i, x, xxxii) are not particularly acerbic and do not seem to justify the comment of the Aghânî (xii, 134) which alleges that a grandson of Sulaymân b. 'Ali lived in healthy dread of him (see nos. xli, xliii). He participated, however, in the contests between Abî Nûwâs and al-Fadîl b. 'Abd al-Sâmad al-Râkîshî, unscrupulously reviving, in order to denigrate the latter, the old theme of the scantiness of the cooking-pot to express the greed of its owner (nos. xvii, xlix), and was in his turn the target of some fairly innocuous attacks (see Aghânî, xii, 140; al-Djahîz, Hayawdn, vi, 323-2, al-Sûlî, Arawd, 30).

According to the Aghânî (xii, 141), his son 'Abd Allâh accused him of drinking excessively to the point of being intoxicated every evening, but this detail too seems to be greatly exaggerated. It is observed more-
over that the surviving poems contain nothing ribald, and the debauchery which is attributed to him seems to have amounted to nothing more than an affair with a kagha [g.v.] by the name of Huns, which provoked complaints from his wife, to which he replied simply and frankly.

Ibn Yasar possessed, in general terms, an equable temperament, combining affability, gentleness, and simple sentiments such as Arab poets rarely express. His philosophy of life is formulated in a number of verses which have become almost proverbial (nos. ii, vii, viii, xii, xx, xxx, xxxii, xliv). His paean in praise of books (no. iii) was remarked by al-Djahiz, (no. xix) in which he curses a pigeon-breeder who has cheated him regarding the pedigree of pigeons sold to him, although not great poetry, does not lack originality; finally, the freshness of his sentiments is clearly shown in a poem (no. xxx) which enchanted the anthologists to the point that they preserved 51 verses bewailing the fate of his neighbour Manf and lamenting the loss of his notes, consumed by this accused animal.

To all appearances, this poet does not deserve the severity with which he is treated by the author of the Aghshi, who perhaps felt a degree of animosity towards him on account of his declared disapproval of Shi‘as and other heterodox persons. Ibn Yasar was also openly hostile to kalām [g.v.] and to theological polemics, but this aversion did not prevent him from being on the best of terms with the Mu'tazilis of his native town and especially with his friend al-Djahib, who mentions him and gives the impression of having great faith in his friend Muhammad b. Yasar, concerning his support for him and his influence with the government, and to seek in study a refuge from the annoyances of life.

Bibliography: The most substantial biography of Muhammad b. Yasar is that of the Aghshi (1st ed., xii, 129-41; Beirut ed., xiv, 18-48); other references are very brief, in particular those of Ibn Kutayba, Shī, 560-1 (ed. Shākir, 584-6) and of Kiṣīf, al-Muhammādīn min al-'ulūm'ūn, Riyād 1970, 161-3 (Muhammad b. Bashir al-Ḥayyāmī). See also the references indicated by Ch. Pellat in his Mūla' bayan, 170-1, and in his attempt at reconstruction of the Dīwān, and see Ṣafādī, Wafī, ii, 252-4; Ziriklī, viii, 15-16; H. Ritter, in Oriens, i (1956), 155-6; Sczgin, GāS, i, 506-7. See also T. al-Hādīgī, in his ed. of the Kitāb al-Bukhdādī, 267-9. In 'Irāq, Muḥ. Dī, al-Mu'aybīd has also attempted a reconstruction of the diwan, but it is not known whether this work has been published.

(Ch. Pellat)

MUHAMMAD b. YAZĪD [see ibn Māqūdā: AL-MUHARRID].

MUHAMMAD b. YÙSUF (MUHAMMAD V), sultan and later king of Morocco (1927-61).

He was born at Fās on 10 August 1909, the third son of the ruling sultan, Mūlāy Yūsuf. His mother, Lālā Yākūt, was a native of the Hawz (the region of Marrakesh). His father had nominated his eldest son Mūlāy Idrīs as crown prince and khalīfa at Marrakesh, and appointed his younger son Mūlāy Hasan to the same functions at Tizinit and Tinduf. Frail but intelligent, Śīdī Muhammad lived the sequestered life of a young prince without expectations, although he accompanied his father and his two brothers on a visit to France in July 1926. On 12 November 1927, the sultan Mūlāy Yūsuf abdicated following an attack of uremia. The Grand Vizier al-Mukrī, in conflict with the Chamberlain Tūhāmī Ḥabābī, campaigned actively for the proclamation of Śīdī Muhammad in the face of stern opposition from his rival. This choice was ratified by the authorities of the Protectorate. The 'ulama signed the act of allegiance to a young prince, 18 years of age, whom most of them had never seen. On 18 November 1927 Muhammad b. Yūsuf acceded to the throne of his ʻAlawīd ancestors. No opposition to the proclamation was expressed, either in Fās or in Rabat.

While French forces suppressed the last traces of rebellion which remained in his kingdom, the new sultan spent this time completely in education, with the aid of senior bureaucrats such as the Fakīf Ma'mīrī, of Algerian origin, who was to become his principal private secretary. He obtained no diploma, and subsequently his self-esteem was to suffer as a result of this. He married a cousin who bore him, on 29 June 1929, his first child, the princess Lālā Fāṭīma Zahrā. On becoming sultan he took a second wife, marrying a girl from the Hawz, Lālā 'Ablā, who, on 9 July 1929, while the sovereign was visiting France, gave birth to a son, Mūlāy Hāsān.

In 1930, when armed resistance in the rural areas had almost come to an end, groups of young urban Moroccans became engaged in political action. The Druse shaykh Shākir Arslān [g.v.], based in Geneva since 1921, served as their mentor. At the very time that Muhammad b. Yūsuf was still lacking any achievements, nationalism of the Orient, there developed in Morocco a converse, Islam-inspired movement envisaging a return to the sources (Safāiyyya [g.v.]), a movement which, between 1926 and 1930, made a certain impact in intellectual and popular Moroccan circles. It was during this period that certain elements in the French colonial administration entertained the notion of releasing the Berber tribes from Kurānīc law. A dahir of 16 May 1930 instituted new regulations for the Berbers, placing them under French jurisdiction. Only 21 years of age and still lacking experience, Śīdī Muhammad b. Yūsuf signed the dahir without expressing any reservation. Once known, this text unleashed, first in Morocco and then throughout the Muslim world as far as Indonesia, intense resentment. The lafiṣ, a prayer recited at times of major catastrophe, was promulgated in the towns of the kingdom. The two wings of the nationalist movement united to give birth to the first political formation: the Moroccan Action Committee. This body demanded of France the scrupulous application of Article 12 of the Treaty of Fās, and presented to the sovereign and the Resident-General a list of demands. The Berber dahir thus had the effect of uniting the various Moroc- can groupings in resistance to the Protectorate. The nationalists instituted the Festival of the Throne, commemorating each year on 18 November the anniversary of the Sultan’s accession to the throne. This was celebrated for the first time on 18 November 1933, and officially from 18 November 1934 onward. On this occasion the Moroccan flag was hoisted almost everywhere.

During this period, in Rabat the princess Lālā ʻAṭīsah was born on 17 June 1930, the princess Lālā Mālikā on 14 March 1933 and the prince Mūlāy Ṭabd Allāh on 30 July 1935. A last daughter, Lālā Amina, was born in Madagascar of another wife, in February 1954.

On 1 December 1954, when after 27 years of strenuous efforts the stabilisation and unification of Morocco and young completed his plan of annexation was solemnly presented by the nationalists to the French government. Invited to meet the Sultan, the delegation was informed by him that in his opinion, their action could only assist him in his task of defen-
The Sultan enjoyed a long-standing friendship with General Nogues, Resident-General from 1936 to 1943. This relationship no doubt accounts for the loyalty shown by the sovereign with regard to France, during the campaign of June 1940, loyalty which was to remain firm until 1943. At the time of the confluence of the Allies in Casablanca in January 1943, the Sultan met the principal Allied war chiefs, in particular the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who expressed to his opinions on the shape of the world after the allied victory and held out the enticing prospect of an independent Morocco. All of this took place against a background of incidents, petitions and demonstrations of
Vichy for control of North Africa, where the Allied landing had taken place on 8 November 1942. The nationalists who had taken refuge in the Spanish sector returned in large numbers to the French sector. They constituted the Istiklal party which presented to the Sultan, the Resident-General and the Allied governments, on 11 January 1944, a manifesto for independence, accompanied by petitions, that the Sultan convened the Makhzen in Rabat and urged support for the claim of independence. The Resident-General Gabriel Puaux, who had succeeded General Nogues, sought to gain time by invoking the state of war. Nationalists were arrested and exiled, and protests demonstrations ensued. Relations between the Imperial Palace and the Residence-General deteriorated, accompanied by an easing of tension emerged following the defeat of Germany and the coming to power of General de Gaulle. He invited the Sultan of Morocco to make an official visit to France, in the course of which he was awarded the Order of Liberation. A visit to the French troops stationed in Germany followed. The Resident-General Gabriel Puaux was replaced in 1946 by Eirik Labonne, who arrived in Morocco with a series of proposals for economic and administrative reform. He encouraged investment, and worked to restore amicable relations with the Sultan and Moroccan personages at all levels. The nationalist leaders returned from exile at the request of the sovereign. On 9 April 1947, the Sultan conducted an official visit to Tangier, then an international city. Popular enthusiasm was demonstrated at each stage of the royal progress and reached its climax in the city, where he stayed for four days. Here he delivered his famous speech in which he declared himself committed to re-establishing the national unity of a country split into three segments, having its independence recognised and bringing it into the Arab League. A month after the Tangiers speech, the French government terminated the appointment of Eirik Labonne with his liberal attitudes, appointing in his place as Resident-General the General of the Atlas, General Juin, conqueror of Italy and former associate of Lyautey. De Gaulle was no longer in power. ‘Allal al-Fāṣī, in the company of ‘Abd al-Khallak Torres and the Tunisian Habib Bourguiba (Bū Raḵiba [q.v.]), made his way to Cairo, where the three men engineered the escape of ‘Abd el-Krim, who disembarked in Port Said from the flagship, he was supposed to be taking him to France, on 1 June 1947, and with him created the Committee of the Arab Maghrib. Tiring of his exchange of notes with the French government, the Sultan decided, in the summer of 1950, to present himself in Paris, there to express his wish to put an end to the Treaty of Fās by direct negotiations. In the meantime, he refused to sign any more dāhers. His journey proved fruitless, but he received an enthusiastic welcome at Casablanca on his return to the country. General Juin reacted by expelling nationalist opposition members of the Council of Government for their advocacy of violent resistance. The Pasha of Marrakesh, for his part, made an approach to the Sultan demanding strict adherence to tradition. The two men became enemies. The Berber tribes of the High Atlas and the Middle Atlas mobilised against the Sultan and the cities which favoured Istiklāl. In Paris, the main concern was to find a compromise solution between the two Moroccan groups. After a march by tribal contingents on the towns, the Sultan chose to concede rather than give up power. As in 1944, he used his Grand Vizier as a mouthpiece in repudiating the Istiklālīs, in deliberately vague terms indicating his approval of the new form which had been held in abeyance. Misleading both parties became the Sultan’s policy. In September 1951, General Juin left Morocco, summoned to take command of NATO forces in Europe.

Paris appointed General Guillaume to the post of Resident-General, also entrusting him command of the land, sea and air forces of North Africa. The nationalist leader doubtless the efforts in Cairo continued in Paris. The council of the Arab League submitted the Moroccan question to the United Nations, which passed a resolution on the situation in Morocco. While, on the ground, General Guillaume made his presence felt with a number of declarations designed to assert the French role, against a backdrop of intermittent demonstrations and incidents, the Sultan sent a statement of intent to the French government on 14 March 1952, demanding the formation of a Moroccan government competent to negotiate the revision of the 1912 treaty. The long-delayed French response offered proposals on democratisation, insisting on the participation of the French residents in municipal elections. The Sultan rejected the French stipulations. On 5 December 1952, news of the assassination of Ferhat Hached, leader of the Tunisian syndicalist movement, provoked a general strike in Morocco, marked on the 7th and 8th of the month by numerous incidents. Repression ensued. But soon after this, on 7 January 1953, a campaign began, inspired by El Glaoui and the Sharīf al-Kettānī, demanding the deposition of the Sultan. A petition signed by 270 sayyids and pāshas, of the 370 present in Morocco, supported them. The two camps engaged in vigorous shows of strength. On 20 April 1953, the decision to depose Sīdī Muhammad b. Yūsuf was taken; he left with his family, moving first to Corsica and then to Madagascar, and his place on the Alawīd throne was taken by Muhammad ben ‘Arafa, 73 years of age and a member of the dynastic clan who had lived hitherto in total obscurity. On the following day, the aʿlāma of Fās ratified this choice. The new sultan appeared to be supported by the forces of the past. Several incidents followed, but it still was not sufficiently clear on the other hand, did not recognise the fait accompli. The affair took on an international dimension and provoked in the Moroccan population an upsurge of
feeling which was almost unanimously opposed to those responsible for the removal of Muhammad b. Yusuf. Mülây 'Arafa, who, after two attempts on his life, refused to leave the palace, lost all prestige. None of the reforms which had been promised were implemented. Gradually, the situation in Morocco deteriorated. European products were boycotted; acts of political violence committed by autonomous organisations increased both in number and in effectiveness. Agitation spread to the working and mercantile classes, and acts of counterterrorism were carried out by Europeans.

Disturbed by the worsening situation, the French government sought to obtain from the deposed sultan declarations which would put an end to the unrest. Through various intermediaries a conciliation procedure was worked out; this comprised the expulsion of Muhammad b. 'Arafa, the creation of a Throne Council, the establishment of Muhammad b. Yusuf and his family in France. While at the conference of Aix-les-Bains (July-August 1955) French ministers held talks with the Moroccan nationalists, the Council of the Throne was with some difficulty inaugurated on 15 October 1955, and a moderate nationalist, Si Fâmi ben Sliiman, was charged with the formation of the new government. The Istiklal refused to recognise that the prince would be a member of the Throne Council. But the really sensational move came on the 25 October 1955 from the Pasha of Marrakesh, al-Hâdîjî Tuhâmi Glauoi, who challenged the legitimacy of the Council of the Throne and declared publicly that he saw no solution other than in the restoration of Sidi Muhammad ben Yusuf, whose pardon he was now seeking. A few days later, the sharîf Si 'Abd al-Hâzy al-Kitâîni declared himself in agreement with al-Glauoi. On 30 October, Ben 'Arafa renounced his prerogatives. On 2 November, the members of the Council of the Throne offered their resignations to Sidi Muhammad, who had arrived in France two days before. On 6 November 1955 a joint declaration was issued by the Foreign Minister Antoine Pinay and the Sultan at the conclusion of the La Celle Saint-Cloud negotiations. Morocco was granted full and unconditional independence.

The return of the Sultan of Morocco took place in an atmosphere of general jubilation. The transition from the old to the new regime was accomplished without major difficulty, the process being smoothed by reciprocal good will. The issue was hastened by the need to disband the Moroccan Liberation Army, which was committed to Magnhrib's unity and advocated active support of the Algerian rebellion. Some of its contingents were incorporated into the regular army, while the hard core was diverted towards the liberation of the lands of the Sahara. In August 1957, Morocco was transformed into a monarchy and Mülây Hasan was designated crown prince. Muhammad V adopted the role of a consultative king in a conservative tradition typified more by negotiation and persuasion than by the use of threats and force. The Istiklal party never achieved the homogeneous government which it had campaigned for, and became fragmented. It was obliged to collaborate with successive governments which combined the representatives of various political forces as well as independents loyal to the monarch. A National Consultative Assembly, with limited powers, had been created in November 1956. After eighteen months of attempting to work in harmony with leftist elements of the Istiklal, in May 1960 the King finally took over the direction of the government, appointing Encyclopaedia of Islam, VII the prince Mülây Hasün to the post of Deputy Prime Minister. A constitution for the country was promised before the end of 1962. Troublesome incidents and death place in the Tafilalt, and especially among the tribes of the Rif and the Middle Atlas in October 1958. They were suppressed by an operation of the Royal Armed Forces commanded by the Crown Prince.

Recognised as independent, Morocco made its presence felt in the United Nations Organisation, joined the League of Arab States in 1958 and declared its support for Algerian independence. Tangier was economically re-integrated into the kingdom in April 1960. In the south, Spain relinquished sovereignty over the territory of Tafíyâ in April 1958, and over the zone of Ifni on 4 January 1961, but refused to withdraw from the western Sahara and from the towns of Ceuta and Melilla. Claims on Mauritania, which had become independent in 1960 with the support of France, were also fruitless.

King Muhammad V suffered from a nasal ailment which caused him persistent headaches. He was obliged to undergo an operation which was apparently successful, but he died of a heart-attack on 26 February 1961. His son Hassan II succeeded him.
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MUHAMMAD b. ZAYD b. Muhammad b. 'Ašrāfi ... b. 'Ali b. Abī 'Abla, Zayd b. 'Abla, who reigned over Tabaristan [q.v.] and Dju'djan [see
Gurğan] for some years during the second half of the 3rd/9th century. As the brother of al-Hasan b. Zayd [q. v.] al-Ḍāʾī al-Kabīr, he succeeded him in 270/884 and received the title of al-Ḍāʾī al-Jaghīr and the lakāb or honorific title of al-Kāʿīn bi ‘l-Haḳḳ. It is above all from this point that he is heard of, since before his assumption of power he seems to have lived in his brother’s shadow. The latter, however, had commissioned him to bring back to reasonableness their cousin al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḍāʾī who, during a period of absence on the part of al-Ḥasan b. Zayd, had rebelled in their capital of Sāriyā, had summoned the populace to recognise him and had gone to Durrūjān, where Muhammad b. Zayd had caught up with him, captured him and beheaded him.

After his brother’s death, he made some efforts to extend his family’s possessions. Thus in 227/845-6 he tried to seize Rāfī b. Ḥarthama [q. v.] against ‘Amr b. al-Layḥ al-Saffār [q. v.]. Expelled from Durrūjān by Rāfī, who was acting on behalf of the Sāmānids [q. v.], he found refuge with the Daylamis who had given their allegiance to the Zaydī Īmāms in 277/890; but two years later Rāfī came out of captivity and returned Durrūjān to him in return for the promise to provide aid for him against ‘Amr b. al-Layḥ, but his new ally was killed in 283/896 in an encounter with his enemies in Khurāzm. When the Sāmānīd Īmām b. Ḥāḏim [q. v.] defeated ‘Amr’s troops in Rāfī I/April 900, Muhammad b. Zayd thought that the moment had come when he could seize control of Khurāzm. Disregarding Ḥāḏim’s advice, who tried to dissuade him from the plan, he set out but was intercepted in Durrūjān by the general Muhammad b. Ḥāḏim, who seems to have gained the upper hand. At all events, the dāʾī was wounded, taken prisoner and died in Durrūjān, whither he had been taken, in Shawwāl 287/October 900 (Abu ‘l-Ḥarajī gives the date of his death as Ramaḍān 289/August 902, but the first date is the more likely one).

Despite his political activities, Muhammad b. Zayd had some sympathy for the Abbadīs, and it is even said that when al-Ṭuḥmāṣid [q. v.] learnt of his death, he showed sorrow and regret. In al-Masūdī’s time, his tomb was venerated. He behaved in an upright manner, was cultured and composed poetry; it was in a panegyric in his honour that Naṣr b. Nusayr [q. v.] committed a famous gaffe.

Bibliography: Ṭabārī, index; Ibn al-Ḥādhīr, vi; 59; Masūdī, Marāṣid, index; Abu ‘l-Ḥarajī, Maṭāḥil al-Tāḥīṭīn, 693–4, 712, 714; Ibn Ṣafīyāḏīr, Taḥrīr al-Taḥrīsān, i, 233, 252; Ibn Ṭahḥābīrīdī, ḑudām, iii, 122. See also the Bibl. to the article AL-ḤASAN B. ZAYD. (Ed.)

MUḤAMMAD ʿABBĀD AL-ʿĂRĪM AL-ALAWĪ [see ʿABBĀD AL-ʿĂRĪM MUNŠI].

MUḤAMMAD ʿABDĪLLE HASSĀN [see MUḤAMMAD B. ʿABD ALLĀH HASSĀN].

MUḤAMMAD ʿABDUH, a Muslim theologian, founder of the Egyptian modernist school.

Muhammad ʿAbduh belonged to an Egyptian peasant family and was born in 1849 in Lower Egypt. He spent his childhood in the little village of Maḥallat Naṣr in the nūṭysh of Bahayra in Lower Egypt, where his father had returned to his land. When Muhammad ʿAbduh had learned the Qurʾān by heart, he was sent in 1862 to the theological school of Ṭanṭā but he left this after a year-and-a-half, discouraged, and was only induced to resume his studies through the influence of a grand-uncle who aroused in him an interest in mysticism. In 1865 he returned to Ṭanṭā, but the next year proceeded to Cairo to the Azhar mosque. There at this moment the first movements of a new spirit were becoming apparent in the beginning of a return to the classics and an awakening interest in natural science and history, which agreed with mysticism in a lower estimation of the old traditional studies. In this milieu, Muhammad ʿAbduh at once devoted himself entirely to mysticism, practised asceticism and retired from the world. It was again his grand-uncle who persuaded him to give this up. About the same time, 1872, Muhammad ʿAbduh came into contact with Sayyid Ḥamāl al-Dīn al-ʿAlīfī [q. v.] who had just arrived in Egypt and was destined to exercise a profound influence upon him. It was he who revealed traditional learning to Muhammad ʿAbduh in a new light, called his attention to European works accessible in translations and attracted his interest finally to Egyptian and Muslim problems of the day. Muhammad ʿAbduh soon became his most ardent disciple and in his very first work of a mystic nature (Risālat al-Wardāt), 1290/1874 enthusiastically described Sayyid Ḥamāl al-Dīn as his spiritual guide. The influence of Nasrī Īmām is share the optimism of military circles nor approved of the use of force, he put himself on the side of the nationalist opponents of absolutism and endeavoured to exert a moderating influence on its leaders. After the suppression of the rebellion he was condemned to
banishment from Egypt at the end of 1882. He first went to Beirut and then to Paris where, in the beginning of 1884, he met al-'Azhârî. The two founded a society called al-‘Urua al-daulâ‘î, and published a paper with the same name, which had to cease publication after eight months but exercised a very profound influence on the development of nationalism in the Muslim east. In Tunis, Muhammad ‘Abduh continued propaganda for the society, but then cut himself off from it and settled in Beirut at the beginning of 1885. The ‘Urua expressed the views of al-‘Azhârî entirely. In Beirut, ‘Abduh taught at a theological school and engaged in Islamic and Arabic studies. In this period he produced his translation from the Persian of the Risâlât al-Radd ‘alâ ‘l-dahrîyin, the only considerable work of Sayyid Qâmil al-Dîn (1302/1886), and two valuable philological treatises, Sawrî Naqdi al-balâgha (1302/1885) and Sawrî madkâmât Bâlî al-Zamân al-Hanâqnhî (1306/1889). When in 1889 he was allowed to return, he at once went to Cairo. His wish to resume teaching again was not at once granted; instead, he entered the justiciary and was immediately appointed a judge on the Tribunals Indigènes, and two years later Conseiller at the Cour d’Appel; in 1899 he attained the highest clerical post in Egypt, that of state muftî, an office he held till his death. One result of his work in the courts was the publication of his Takrir fi isldh al-mahdîm (1318/1900) which gave the stimulus to important reforms in the administration of the sharî‘a, and the foundation of the college for kâdîs to guide him against the aberrations of reason; reason need not recognise a logical impossibility as a conviction that knowledge and religion, properly understood, are two factors. From this programme, which assured Muhammad ‘Abduh an important place among the founders of modern Egypt, must be distinguished his efforts to carry it through in the field of theology. Muhammad ‘Abduh was in the first place a theologian; his life was devoted to the attempt to establish and maintain Islam, at least as a religion, against the onslaught of the West, while he abandoned without a struggle those aspects of Muslim oriental life in which religion was of less moment. However great a stimulus he may have received from progressive western thought, the actual foundations of his teaching came primarily from the school of Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Kayyim al-Djawiyya, who favoured reform on conservative lines, and from al-Ghazâlî’s ethical conception of religion. Deeply convinced of the superiority of true Islam, unaffected by the vicissitudes of time, Muhammad ‘Abduh wished to get rid of the abuses which falsified the Muslim religion and made it out of keeping with the times, and to adapt Islam to every real advance by going back to its true principles. He was thus brought to attack the madhdhib and taklid [q.v.], to demand the restoration of idjihâd [q.v.] and a new idjâma [q.v.], in keeping with modern conditions, based on the Qur’ân and the true sunna, for the establishment of which he laid down strict criteria; he was also brought to reject the hairsplitting of the jurists and all bid‘a, and to the endeavour to create a more ethical and deeper religion instead of a mechanical formalism. The antiquated system of fiqh, against which Muhammad ‘Abduh claimed full freedom, was to be replaced by new laws capable of development, in which consideration for the common good (maslaha [q.v.]) and the times should, in keeping with the true spirit of Islam, have if necessary priority over the literal text (nass) of revelation, just as in any conflict between reason and tradition in settling what is laid down by religion, the verdict of reason should be followed. Alongside of the belief in the sublimity of revelation there was in Muhammad ‘Abduh the conviction that knowledge and religion, properly understood, could not come into conflict at all, so that reason need not recognise a logical impossibility as a religious truth: religion was given to man as a thread to guide him against the aberrations of reason; reason must therefore, after it has tested the proofs of the truth of religion, which it is qualified to do, accept its dogmas; Muhammad ‘Abduh’s object was a cooperation between religion and science. In dogmatics, he adopted essentially the most rational conception that could still be reconciled with orthodoxy. At the same time, he interiorised the conception of revelation to him it was intuitive knowledge caused by God and provided with the consciousness of this origin, but this kind of religious experience was limited to the pro-
phets) and deflected that of religion (to him it was an intuitive feeling for the paths to happiness in this and the next world, which cannot be clearly grasped by the reason. The task of prophecy for him was the sending of Muhammad; if the Muslim superior ideals of life.

In this theology, the religious content consists of humility before God, reverence for the Prophet, enthusiasm for the Kur'an. The basis of this Islam is the historical Islam but it takes into its system for society, which, excluding all fatalism, preached vigorous activity by every one and, following the ethics of the mystics, mutual support. His view of the substance of Muslim teaching Muhammad Abduh adhered to the four main duties: ritual prayer, the alms tax, fasting and pilgrimage; only he shifted them, as usual in mysticism, from the sphere of worship to that of religion and morals. On the old question of free will, he decided for indeterminism; he thereby opened the way to build up a moral system for society, which, excluding all fatalism, preached vigorous activity by every one and, following the ethics of the mystics, mutual support.

The superiority of Islam over Christianity in its closeness to reality and its avoidance of unattainable ideals of life.

He had entered the household of Bulût Kâpân 'Ali Bey al-Kabîr [q.v.] by 1174/1760-1, and quickly became his treasurer (ba'izâd). In 1178/1764-5, after returning from Pilgrimage (with his master died when he was emancipated), he was elevated to the beylicye, and obtained his nickname from scattering a largesse of gold coins on his appointment. His subsequent career falls into two periods: (1) Until 1185/1771 he was 'Ali Bey's principal lieutenant, and commanded three important military expeditions. In 1183/1769 a campaign in Upper Egypt broke the power of Nawawid [q.v.] under their paramount chief, Humân b. Yûsuf. An expedition to the Hijáz in 1184/1770 installed as amir of Mecca the candidate favoured by the Ottoman court. In 1185/1771 Abu 'l-Dhahab was sent to Syria for combined operations with Shaykh Zâhir al-Umar, the rebel ruler of Galilee, against 'Uthmân Pasha al-Sâlikî, the governor of Damascus. 'Uthmân Pasha fled, and the city had fallen, when Abu 'l-Dhahab hastily evacuated his forces and returned to Egypt. Various reasons have been suggested for this unexpected act, among them a reluctance to appear in open revolt against the sultan. A breach with 'Ali Bey now developed. Abu 'l-Dhahab fled to Upper Egypt, where he built up his forces, and returned in Muharram 1186/July 1772, driving 'Ali Bey to seek refuge with Zâhir. (2) Abu 'l-Dhahab was now the representative of Egyptian orthodoxy but against Christianity also by a thoroughgoing rationalism, which is essential and not for the elite. He regarded the Kurgan as the kingdom of God, and not for the masses. Religious teaching and compulsory education of the masses. Educational orthodoxy but against Christianity also by a continuous domination over a quasi-autonomous Egypt.

supported by the profitable ilîsîms which had been engrossed by 'Ali Bey and Abu 'l-Dhahab, his Mamlûk household, the Mâmlûdîyya, headed by İbrahim Bey [q.v.] and Murâd Bey, held almost continuous domination over a quasi-autonomous Egypt until the arrival of Bonaparte's expedition in 1213/1798.

The basic contemporary source is Djabarti (b. 1167/1753), 'Abd al-djâbîr; i., numerous references from p. 252 onwards; obituary at 417/20. Also contemporary are (1) the Lebanese chronicler, Haydar Ahmad al-Shihabî (b. 1174/1761), Lujmân fi 'abd al-umârât al-Shâhîyyin, ed. Asad Rustum and Fouad E. Boustany, Beirut 1933, i., numerous references especially at 81-111; and (2) al-Murâdî (eyewitness of the siege of Damascus in 1185/1771), Sîlkh al-durar fi a'sâm al-karn al-dhâli 'ulân, Bulâk 1310/1893-4, i., 54-7. The fullest modern treatment is by D. Crecelius, The roots of modern Egypt, Minneapolis and Chicago 1981 (comprehensive bibliography). (P. M. Holt)
tian theologian from the town of Damanhur. In 1930 he published a Kur‘an commentary which caused a commotion in Egypt. Because of this commentary, the well-known reformer Rashld Rida [q. v.] and the investigations committee of Azhar scholars condemned Muhammad Abü Zayd and his Kur‘an commentary. Nevertheless, this commentary is conceived in a spirit of rationalism which differs little from Muhammad Abduh’s rationalist ideas. According to its author, this investigation on which it evolved is due to political reasons. This may have been true. For instance, according to Muhammad Abü Zayd, the plural demonstrative pronoun in Kur‘an IV, 62/59 “Obey... those of you who have the command”, indicates that Islam does not admit of rule by one man. An autocratic ruler of a Muslim country may have doubts as to whether this conclusion is correct.

On the basis of Kur‘an III, 125/130, “Live not on usury doubled twice over”, Muhammad Abü Zayd taught that Islam does not forbid interest if the usury doubled twice over. However, Muhammad Abü Zayd died from a commotion in Egypt. Because of this commentary, the well-known reformer Rashld Rida [q. v.] and the investigations committee of Azhar scholars condemned Muhammad Abü Zayd and his Kur‘an commentary. Nevertheless, this commentary is conceived in a spirit of rationalism which differs little from Muhammad Abduh’s rationalist ideas. According to its author, this investigation on which it evolved is due to political reasons. This may have been true. For instance, according to Muhammad Abü Zayd, the plural demonstrative pronoun in Kur‘an IV, 62/59 “Obey... those of you who have the command”, indicates that Islam does not admit of rule by one man. An autocratic ruler of a Muslim country may have doubts as to whether this conclusion is correct.

On the basis of Kur‘an III, 125/130, “Live not on usury doubled twice over”, Muhammad Abü Zayd taught that Islam does not forbid interest if the usury doubled twice over. However, Muhammad Abü Zayd died from a commotion in Egypt. Because of this commentary, the well-known reformer Rashld Rida [q. v.] and the investigations committee of Azhar scholars condemned Muhammad Abü Zayd and his Kur‘an commentary. Nevertheless, this commentary is conceived in a spirit of rationalism which differs little from Muhammad Abduh’s rationalist ideas. According to its author, this investigation on which it evolved is due to political reasons. This may have been true. For instance, according to Muhammad Abü Zayd, the plural demonstrative pronoun in Kur‘an IV, 62/59 “Obey... those of you who have the command”, indicates that Islam does not admit of rule by one man. An autocratic ruler of a Muslim country may have doubts as to whether this conclusion is correct.

On the basis of Kur‘an III, 125/130, “Live not on usury doubled twice over”, Muhammad Abü Zayd taught that Islam does not forbid interest if the usury doubled twice over. However, Muhammad Abü Zayd died from a commotion in Egypt. Because of this commentary, the well-known reformer Rashld Rida [q. v.] and the investigations committee of Azhar scholars condemned Muhammad Abü Zayd and his Kur‘an commentary. Nevertheless, this commentary is conceived in a spirit of rationalism which differs little from Muhammad Abduh’s rationalist ideas. According to its author, this investigation on which it evolved is due to political reasons. This may have been true. For instance, according to Muhammad Abü Zayd, the plural demonstrative pronoun in Kur‘an IV, 62/59 “Obey... those of you who have the command”, indicates that Islam does not admit of rule by one man. An autocratic ruler of a Muslim country may have doubts as to whether this conclusion is correct.

On the basis of Kur‘an III, 125/130, “Live not on usury doubled twice over”, Muhammad Abü Zayd taught that Islam does not forbid interest if the usury doubled twice over. However, Muhammad Abü Zayd died from a commotion in Egypt. Because of this commentary, the well-known reformer Rashld Rida [q. v.] and the investigations committee of Azhar scholars condemned Muhammad Abü Zayd and his Kur‘an commentary. Nevertheless, this commentary is conceived in a spirit of rationalism which differs little from Muhammad Abduh’s rationalist ideas. According to its author, this investigation on which it evolved is due to political reasons. This may have been true. For instance, according to Muhammad Abü Zayd, the plural demonstrative pronoun in Kur‘an IV, 62/59 “Obey... those of you who have the command”, indicates that Islam does not admit of rule by one man. An autocratic ruler of a Muslim country may have doubts as to whether this conclusion is correct.

On the basis of Kur‘an III, 125/130, “Live not on usury doubled twice over”, Muhammad Abü Zayd taught that Islam does not forbid interest if the usury doubled twice over. However, Muhammad Abü Zayd died from a commotion in Egypt. Because of this commentary, the well-known reformer Rashld Rida [q. v.] and the investigations committee of Azhar scholars condemned Muhammad Abü Zayd and his Kur‘an commentary. Nevertheless, this commentary is conceived in a spirit of rationalism which differs little from Muhammad Abduh’s rationalist ideas. According to its author, this investigation on which it evolved is due to political reasons. This may have been true. For instance, according to Muhammad Abü Zayd, the plural demonstrative pronoun in Kur‘an IV, 62/59 “Obey... those of you who have the command”, indicates that Islam does not admit of rule by one man. An autocratic ruler of a Muslim country may have doubts as to whether this conclusion is correct.
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Mustaфа Kemal [see ATJU'] abolished the caliphate in 1924, and Muhammed Ali tried in vain to revive it through the Arabian ruler Abd al-'Aziz Ibn Su'Uy. Comrade was re-launched in October 1924 and Ham- dred in November. Falling leadership led to the closure of the former in January 1926, while the latter managed to survive until April 1929. By this time, a disorganised and hectic life had taken its toll of Muhammad Ali. Despite his illness, he insisted on attending the Round Table Conference in November 1930 at London, where he died on 4 January 1931. He was buried in the precinct of the Aksa Mosque in Jerusalem. Ahad bin SAWAI, the Egyptian poet, wrote his elegy, and he was the subject of a number of poems by Muhammad Ibqal. Muhammad Ali himself was a poet, thanks to long periods of detention, and collections of his Urdu poems were published in his lifetime; he used the poetic pen name (isikhâl'us) of Diawhar. He should not be confused with his contemporary, Muhammad Ali of the Lahori of the Ahmadiyya Movement [q. v.] who translated the Qur'an into English.

**Bibliography:** Mir'zâ Abu 'l-Hasan Lkhânwall, Mister Muhammad Ali. Un ki sawdnih umri, Calcutta 1918; Khurshid 'Ali Mirh, Siyâsat-e Muhammad Ali, Dihlî 1931; 'Isrâh Ramânî Râmûrî, Muhammad Ali 'Sîrâ'qaw, sawdnih hayât, Dihlî 1931; Nigârî Bârâmi, Hayât-e Diawhar; 'Alîgârî 1931; Khadîjâ 'Ali, Sayyid Kazim Rashti, Lahori of the Ahmadiyya Movement [q. v.], wrote his elegy, and he was the subject of a number of poems by Muhammad Ibqal. Muhammad Ali himself was a poet, thanks to long periods of detention, and collections of his Urdu poems were published in his lifetime; he used the poetic pen name (isikhâl'us) of Diawhar. He should not be confused with his contemporary, Muhammad Ali of the Lahori of the Ahmadiyya Movement [q. v.] who translated the Qur'an into English.


muhammad ali hudjdjat-i zandjani, mustafa kemal [see ataturk] abolished the caliphate in 1924, and muhammad ali tried in vain to revive it through the arabian ruler abd al-'aziz ibn su'uy. comrade was re-launched in october 1924 and hammer in november. falling leadership led to the closure of the former in january 1926, while the latter managed to survive until april 1929. by this time, a disorganised and hectic life had taken its toll of muhammad ali. despite his illness, he insisted on attending the round table conference in november 1930 at london, where he died on 4 january 1931. he was buried in the precinct of the aksa mosque in jerusalem. ahad bin sawai, the egyptian poet, wrote his elegy, and he was the subject of a number of poems by muhammad ibqal. muhammad ali himself was a poet, thanks to long periods of detention, and collections of his urdu poems were published in his lifetime; he used the poetic pen name (isikhâl'us) of diawhar. he should not be confused with his contemporary, muhammad ali of the lahori of the ahmadiyya movement [q. v.] who translated the qur'an into english.


(D. MacEoin)

MUHAMMAD ‘ALI PASHA (late 1760s-1849), Ottoman governor-general and effective ruler of Egypt, was born in the late 1760s (the exact date is under debate) in the small Macedonian port of Kavala [see KAVALA]. His father was an Ottoman soldier of Albanian origins, who rose to command the local force of irregulars, but also engaged in tobacco trading. His mother came from the family of the town governor. Muhammad ‘Ali followed in his father’s footsteps until he was appointed in 1801, deputy-commander of the contingent recruited in Kavala to join the Ottoman forces in Egypt. The Kavala contingent was to become part of the Ottoman-Albanian battalion dispatched to fight the French in Egypt. It was then that Muhammad ‘Ali began his spectacular rise to the pinnacle of power in that beleaguered Ottoman province.

Rapidly grasping the complex power-game that prevailed in Egypt at the time, Muhammad ‘Ali skilfully manipulated the various parties to promote his own interests. In just about four-and-a-half years, he manoeuvred so as to be appointed by the Porte, albeit reluctantly, governor-general of Egypt. The details themselves are perhaps less important than the method by which this extraordinary achievement was accomplished. The main vehicle that served the aspiring officer was the Ottoman-Albanian unit, whose leadership he indeed obtained in mid-1803 as the first stepping stone to power. The other competitors were the various factions of Mamlûk beys, the Ottoman governor-general and regiments, and the urban notables. The nature of the game consisted in striking the right balance, forming a durable coalition, playing opposition factions against each other, assessing the relative strength and vital interests of all parties, and possessing a fine sense of timing. In all these, Muhammad ‘Ali bettred his rivals.

Crucial events leading to the ascendancy of Muhammad ‘Ali took place between 1803 and 1805. The Mamlûk warriors [see MAMLUKS. (i) Political history (f)] were then split into two factions, one led by ʿUthman Bey al-Bardíší, the other by Muhammad Bey al-Allī. The Ottoman camp was also divided against itself between the wálī or governor Khusrw Pasha and the commander of the Albanian force Táhir Pasha. The cleavage within each camp turned the Mamlûk-Ottoman scramble for control of Egypt into a complex struggle between ad hoc coalitions of sub-groups. In April 1803, the Ottoman-Albanians mutinied in Cairo over pay demands, and Khusrw fled to Damietta. Táhir, who temporarily assumed the leadership, called in the Mamlûks from Upper Egypt, but was assassinated soon after. This enabled Muhammad ‘Ali to assume the position of commander of the Ottoman-Albanian unit, probably the most effective force in Egypt at the time.

Muhammad ‘Ali renewed the alliance with the Mamlûks, defeated Khusrw Pasha at Damietta, and brought al-Bardíší as governor of Egypt to England to rally support for his faction, the coalition depended on the political ties between al-Allī and Muhammad ‘Ali. Another governor-general, sent from Istanbul, was ultimately eliminated by that coalition early in 1804. As al-Allī returned to an unwelcome reception and was forced by an Ottoman-Albanian contingent to escape to Upper Egypt, al-Bardíší became the next target. The temporarily honoured mechanism of disrupting public order in Cairo was set in motion, and Muhammad ‘Ali’s troops rioted in demand of pay arrears. Al-Bardíší imposed a new tax on the population, bringing the situation to the verge of revolt. It was Muhammad ‘Ali who then appeared as the saviour of the Cairenes, abrogated the tax, and drove al-Bardíší out of town. He thus laid the foundations of the elite that would later become the urban notables—the leading ʿulamá? and merchants—which would legitimate his seizure of power in the following year.

In the interim period of sixteen months, Muham- mad ‘Ali allowed the appointment of an Ottoman wálī, while he himself engaged his troops in a campaign against the Mamlûks. The new wálī attempted to improve his subservient position in the Cairene power-play by introducing fresh irregular forces from Syria. The unruly behaviour of the Syrian force only provoked the wrath of the notables and drew Muham- mad ‘Ali back into the city. In collusion with the notables, Muhammad ‘Ali was proclaimed wálī of Egypt. After a brief showdown between the incumbent and the challenger, the Porte realised the strength of Muhammad ‘Ali’s position and endorsed his appointment. Future attempts to remove him from Egypt to govern other provinces (Djidda, Salonika) clearly indicate how unhappy with the appointment the Ottoman government really was.

The Porte’s endorsement was no more than a reluctant recognition of Muhammad ‘Ali’s superior position vis-à-vis other contenders for power in Egypt. In the following six years, between 1803 and 1811, Muhammad ‘Ali made a successful bid for hegemony by eliminating all challenges to his authority. This was mainly a political and military phase in the history of Egypt and the career of the Pasha, with
The first turning point in Muhammad ‘Ali’s struggle against the Mamluks occurred in late 1806-early 1807. Within four months, both al-Bardisl and al-Alfi died, neither of them in battle, leaving the Mamluks camp without the charismatic leadership needed to galvanise it against the wa’ali. Although the British agent and consul-general still advocated the reinstatement of the Mamluk regime, such plans were becoming less realistic than ever before. Through scattered skirmishes around Cairo and in Upper Egypt, Muhammad ‘Ali gradually increased his hold on the whole country. In March 1811, he dealt the Mamluks a final blow, treacherously massacring their leaders, whom he invited to a ceremony in the Citadel in honour of his son Tüsün’s promotion and departure for the Hijāj. A large-scale elimination of Mamluks followed in the provinces, bringing the number of casualties on all sides. The Citadel massacre marks the end of Mamluk power in Egypt, although individually, many Mamluks were incorporated into the Ottoman-Egyptian elite. Such men continued to serve in high military and administrative posts throughout the reign of Muhammad ‘Ali and beyond.

Other challenges to Muhammad ‘Ali’s hegemony came both from within and from without. Intending to assist the Mamluks in their capture of government of Egypt and hoping to pre-empt yet another French takeover, British forces landed in Alexandria in March 1807. As they failed to occupy Rosetta, the British troops were contained by Muhammad ‘Ali’s forces and trapped in Alexandria. They were later evacuated by agreement. When the reforming and vigorous sultan Selim III [q.v.] was deposed during the same year, the Greeks captured government plunged into a long period of internal difficulties followed by reconstruction. These developments afforded Muhammad ‘Ali a much-needed respite from both Ottoman interference and British intervention. However, before he could devote himself to the final eradication of Mamluk power, there remained one internal opposition group, sc. the urban notables.

During the first period of his career, Muhammad ‘Ali managed to play his hand so well that he virtually eliminated the urban notables from power politics in Egypt. The group most conspicuously affected in this way was the-ulamā’. Their highly influential leadership was nurtured on income from supervision of wa‘āfī property, ilţizāms and some commercial activity. The rank-and-file lived modestly off religious-judicial-educational services rendered to the community and paid for either directly or through wa‘āfī. ‘Ulāmā赞叹也 performed an important social function through the many Sufi orders that existed in Egypt at the time. As his reign progressed, Muhammad ‘Ali moved to curtail the power of the-ulamā’ and place them under state control. His first target was ‘Umar Makram [q.v.].

This highly respected and influential wa‘āfī al-‘aqqāfī allied and served Muhammad ‘Ali during the crisis of 1804-5 and greatly assisted in bringing the Cairene notables over to the Pasha’s side. His wealth, standing and independent mind marked him out as a potential focus of notable opposition to the wa‘āfī. In mid-1809, Muhammad ‘Ali set a dangerous precedent for the-ulamā’ by taxing wa‘āfī lands in the north-western provinces of Hidjaz. The-ulamā’, headed by ‘Umar Makram, protested and entered into conflict with the Pasha. Pressed for ready income to defray the mounting costs of his domestic military effort, and sensing that he was strong enough to take on notable opposition, Muhammad ‘Ali moved swiftly and decisively to get rid of ‘Umar Makram. Splitting the-ulamā’ ranks by threat and temptation, he managed to isolate ‘Umar Makram and, finally, exiled him.

Already during the period of consolidation, Muhammad ‘Ali began to introduce a centralised economic system and to tighten his control over the land. However, he worked cautiously and gradually, with the intention not to upset the delicate balance of power too drastically too fast. At first, he replaced ilţizām holders with his own family and household members. Also, in areas that came under his control, he monopolised production and export wherever circumstances permitted. The result was a temporarily mixed system, in which ilţizām continued to exist and be granted alongside direct tax-collection and the tangible presence of the central government in the provincial economy. A more intensive interference and reorganisation of agriculture and the land tenure system occurred after 1810. Even then, however, the Pasha knew he had to accommodate influential urban and rural notables and some powerful bedouin sha‘ikhs.

In the methods which he employed to achieve hegemony within Egypt, Muhammad ‘Ali was not different from previous Mamluk and other strongmen or warlords seeking the same purpose. At least partially, he was successful because he moved with caution and a proper sense of the possible and the expedient. He coerced his weaker opponents, placated those of his enemies whom it was too costly to defeat and co-opted his stronger rivals. Ultimately, he trusted and worked best and longest with a small group of associates, members of his family and Kavala companions. In the following decades, this group would form the core of his Ottoman-Egyptian governing elite.

2. Laying the foundations for a regional empire (1812-27).

The second phase in the reign of Muhammad ‘Ali Pasha spanned a period of roughly fifteen years. During that time, the wa‘āfī devoted a great deal of his energies to the recruitment and training of a loyal élite and to the creation of strong and well-equipped land and sea forces, a solid and prosperous economic base, an effective administrative structure and a network of social services capable of maintaining and reproducing the governing élite. All these were to serve the purpose of supporting viceregal power inside Egypt and carving for the Pasha a regional empire out of his Ottoman sovereign’s vast dominions. While concentrating on building up these capabilities, Muhammad ‘Ali dispatched his able sons on military expeditions in the Hijāj, the Sudan, Crete and the Morea. The campaigns which they led confirmed Egypt as the dominant regional power in the eastern Mediterranean, testing its army, navy, economic base, and logistic capacity in preparation for the 1830s, which were to become the imperial decade.

As soon as the realms of government rested firmly in his hands, Muhammad ‘Ali began to entertain the thought of extending his rule towards the Syrian provinces. He mentioned the idea confidentially to the British consul-general in 1812, repeating it on various
occasions in the two decades that followed. Immediately upon the elimination of Mamluk power, the wali moved to establish firm control over the wealth of the country. This, he learnt quite early, lay in the hands of tax-farmers who competed with the state and cut into its revenues. The process of surveying, registering, revoking privileges and taxing the land was gradual and took nearly a decade. By 1821, however, all land in both Lower and Upper Egypt had been surveyed, recorded in registers and taxed. The total cultivable area amounted to almost 5.5 million (allotted new, smaller) feddans. Lands on which taxes were imposed reached about 60%. Between 1812 and 1815, Muhammad Ali revoked all tax-farms (iltisams [q.v.]), with modest compensation to their holders, and taxed wakf lands. He also tightened the tax-collection network, relying on village headmen and Copic assessors.

To increase and maximise profits in agricultural trade and export, Muhammad Ali instituted an effective system of monopolies. Accordingly, the government controlled all aspects of agricultural activity, fixing prices and taxes, regulating transactions and reorganising production (forced labour [çarşı]) was exacted from the rural population in order to improve and substantially expand the irrigation system and provide water all-year-round. By 1816, the government managed to exclude competition in the country’s traditional cash-crops, namely wheat, barley, beans, rice, sugar, sesame, indigo, short-staple cotton and hemp. It then moved to introduce new crops, most notably long-staple cotton. Allowing for seasonal and market fluctuations, the sweeping success of this crop accounted for a sizeable share of state revenues from the 1820s onwards.

It was also during the second period of his career that Muhammad Ali launched his industrial experiment, which mostly aimed at import substitution and at supplying the armed forces. Quite naturally, monopolies factories were the first to be introduced. Beginning in 1815, such arsenals were established in the Cairo citadel, Bulâk, Rosetta and Alexandria. From about the same time, textile factories of various kinds were established in and around Cairo, spreading into Lower and Upper Egypt during the 1820s. Sugar refineries, indigo factories, rice mills and tanneries were also put to work by government initiative. Private production, too, came under government regulation, in conformity with the general concept of a state-monopolised economy. In the second half of the 1830s, Muhammad Ali’s industrial experiment, which was based on European technology and experts, met with great operational difficulties that ultimately brought much of it to collapse.

The second period in Muhammad Ali’s career is also marked by profound changes in the make-up and nature of the armed forces of Egypt. These changes took place amidst campaigns undertaken by the Pasha on foreign, far-away battlefields. These campaigns enhanced Egypt’s standing as the predominant power in the region and improved its relations with the Ottoman government. The Porte realised that Muhammad Ali’s visits to Egypt was a useful ally in time of need and not just a potentially threatening rival to the Ottoman government. The Pasha was discharged after 1814 and sought employment in Egypt. Problems of adjustment and high mortality induced Muhammad Ali to replace the Sudanese slaves with a conscript army made up of Egyptian jallâhân. This decision was to have far-reaching consequences for Egyptian society and the future composition of the Ottoman-Egyptian élite. Soon after its creation, the jallâhân was given a chance to test the capabilities of its Nizâm-i Jâfi, as the new army was called. The Ottoman sultan, Mahmid II [q.v.], bogged down in the quagmire of the Greek revolt, requested Muhammad Ali’s assistance. The Egyptian wali was offered Crete, Cyprus and in 1824 the Morea, in return for subduing them in the name of his Ottoman sovereign. His son Ibrahim Pasha led the new army from success to victory until he captured Athens in June 1827 [see MORA].

The new army was a useful ally in time of need and not just a potentially threatening rival to the Ottoman government. The Pasha was discharged after 1814 and sought employment in Egypt. Problems of adjustment and high mortality induced Muhammad Ali to replace the Sudanese slaves with a conscript army made up of Egyptian jallâhân. This decision was to have far-reaching consequences for Egyptian society and the future composition of the Ottoman-Egyptian élite. Soon after its creation, the jallâhân was given a chance to test the capabilities of its Nizâm-i Jâfi, as the new army was called. The Ottoman sultan, Mahmid II [q.v.], bogged down in the quagmire of the Greek revolt, requested Muhammad Ali’s assistance. The Egyptian wali was offered Crete, Cyprus and in 1824 the Morea, in return for subduing them in the name of his Ottoman sovereign. His son Ibrahim Pasha led the new army from success to victory until he captured Athens in June 1827 [see MORA].

Contrary to the views of Muhammad Ali and Ibrahim, a Russian-British-French imposed armistice was disastrously challenged by the Ottoman and French rivalry was acted out in Egypt, and the two powers were working to guarantee their strategic interests and increase their political influence. Until the mid-1820s, Muhammad Ali maintained good relations with both, as their consuls-general reported, through he came to rely more heavily on French advisers. From then onwards, preference to France was evident, which later would turn Britain against him and in support of the integrity of the Ottoman Empire.
Ottoman-Egyptian fleets, which were destroyed in Navarino late in October 1827. Following a negotiated settlement, Ibrahim’s forces, stranded in the Morea, were evacuated a year later. The Greek episode carried Muhammad ‘Ali beyond the sphere of his intended plans for expansion. Rather than portray him in the cloak of a loyal subject to his master, he exposed him as a formidable and dangerous challenger to Ottoman authority and European designs. After the end of the Greek chapter, Muhammad ‘Ali immersed himself in fervent preparations for the occupation of Syria, which launched him into the imperial phase of his career.

The imposition of the monopsony system, the introduction of long-staple cotton, and the creation of the new army opened the way to a major administrative reorganisation. The essence of this reform was to turn the government of Syria, in reward for his services during the Greek war, had been denied in 1827, the Paşa resolved to gain it by force. Considering the Syrian vilayets as lying within Egypt’s strategic and historical sphere, Muhammad ‘Ali had closely followed developments in those regions and struck alliances with local leaders. When his land and sea forces were sufficiently ready to advance northward, he looked for a pretext to launch the offensive. The governor of Acre ‘Abd Allâh Pasha, a former ally, was said to have refused a contribution to Muhammad ‘Ali’s war effort. He was also alleged to have harboured several thousand Egyptian fugitives evading the draft. This was used by the wâli in order to dispatch viceregal forces by land and sea, in October 1831, under Ibrahim Paşa, to lay siege to Acre.

By mid-1832, the Egyptian army captured Acre and the Palestinian districts, and with the assistance of the Amir of Lebanon Bashir II [q.v.], took Sidon, Beirut, Tripoli and Damascus. In December of the same year, the Ottoman-Egyptians defeated the Ottoman army near Konya, taking the Grand Vizier of his empire. Internally, economic problems and administrative difficulties combined to jeopardise the strong state organisation which he had so diligently deployed to realise his grand design.

This period began with the return from the Morea of Ibrâhîm’s expeditionary force, for ever since that point, all efforts were directed at the reconstruction of the army and navy in preparation for a major campaign. As his peaceful request to receive the government of Syria, in reward for his services during the Greek war, had been denied in 1827, the Paşa resolved to gain it by force. Considering the Syrian vilayets as lying within Egypt’s strategic and historical sphere, Muhammad ‘Ali had closely followed developments in those regions and struck alliances with local leaders. When his land and sea forces were sufficiently ready to advance northward, he looked for a pretext to launch the offensive. The governor of Acre ‘Abd Allâh Pasha, a former ally, was said to have refused a contribution to Muhammad ‘Ali’s war effort. He was also alleged to have harboured several thousand Egyptian fugitives evading the draft. This was used by the wâli in order to dispatch viceregal forces by land and sea, in October 1831, under Ibrahim Paşa, to lay siege to Acre.

By mid-1832, the Egyptian army captured Acre and the Palestinian districts, and with the assistance of the Amir of Lebanon Bashir II [q.v.], took Sidon, Beirut, Tripoli and Damascus. In December of the same year, the Ottoman-Egyptians defeated the Ottoman army near Konya, taking the Grand Vizier prisoner. Although Ibrâhîm would later make a further advance on Kutâyba, the situation had already ceased to be an internal Ottoman matter. Having already declared Muhammad ‘Ali a rebel early in the campaign, Mâmûd II engaged the Russians in a high official spread rumours of the wâli’s death and tried to take over the government. However, Muhammad ‘Ali’s loyal deputy defeated the rebel and secured the throne. Muhammad ‘Ali then extended his prolonged absence from Egypt without much fear. Absorbed as he later became in laying the foundations for his regional empire, he would not venture to leave Egypt very often in the remainder of his reign.

3. Ruling a regional empire (1828-41).

This period, which marked the height of Muhammad ‘Ali’s career, began with the excitement of a rising power and ended with the anguish of a frustrated dream. The 1830s were full of contradictions, witnessing some of the greatest successes the wâli had known but also the beginning of the collapse of some of his most ambitious programmes. During those years, Egypt attained regional hegemony which enabled its ruler to exert a measure of control over parts of a vast territory and to tap its economic resources. Externally, that very might won the Paşa a determined rival—the reforming and able sultan Mâmûd II. It also unleashed European opposition to his expansionism which, ultimately, caused the downfall of his empire. Internally, economic problems and administrative difficulties combined to jeopardise the strong state organisation which he had so diligently deployed to realise his grand design.

The third period began with the return from the Morea of Ibrâhîm’s expeditionary force, for ever since that point, all efforts were directed at the reconstruction of the army and navy in preparation for a major campaign. As his peaceful request to receive the government of Syria, in reward for his services during the Greek war, had been denied in 1827, the Paşa resolved to gain it by force. Considering the Syrian vilayets as lying within Egypt’s strategic and historical sphere, Muhammad ‘Ali had closely followed developments in those regions and struck alliances with local leaders. When his land and sea forces were sufficiently ready to advance northward, he looked for a pretext to launch the offensive. The governor of Acre ‘Abd Allâh Pasha, a former ally, was said to have refused a contribution to Muhammad ‘Ali’s war effort. He was also alleged to have harboured several thousand Egyptian fugitives evading the draft. This was used by the wâli in order to dispatch viceregal forces by land and sea, in October 1831, under Ibrahim Paşa, to lay siege to Acre.

By mid-1832, the Egyptian army captured Acre and the Palestinian districts, and with the assistance of the Amir of Lebanon Bashir II [q.v.], took Sidon, Beirut, Tripoli and Damascus. In December of the same year, the Ottoman-Egyptians defeated the Ottoman army near Konya, taking the Grand Vizier prisoner. Although Ibrâhîm would later make a further advance on Kutâyba, the situation had already ceased to be an internal Ottoman matter. Having already declared Muhammad ‘Ali a rebel early in the campaign, Mâmûd II engaged the Russians in a defensive alliance and solicited their military presence in the vicinity of Istanbul. This, in turn, moved Britian and France, in varying degrees of enthusiasm, to intercede in Cairo with the aim of restraining Muhammad ‘Ali’s expansionism. In the several
rounds of Ottoman-Egyptian negotiations that fol-
lowed, the Pasha and his son extracted from the sultan
military sciences and civil professions brought to
the forefront the question of education and training on
all levels. The lack of a modern school system had
been sorely felt already during the second period of
Muhammad ʿAli's reign. The first path to Western
education lay in the missions of Egyptian students
sent by Muhammad ʿAli to Europe to acquire a pro-
fession. Between 1809 and 1848, close to 350 students
were sent abroad. From the mid-1820s onwards, the
Pasha devoted greater attention to providing educa-
tion at home, working from top to bottom to meet the
most pressing needs first. That is, he began to
establish higher, professional schools, and only later
moved to create a primary and secondary school
system. During the first phase, he had to enrol in his
schools graduates of the Islamic school system. The
1825-1836 period was marked by the creation of a
lower and middle level network in the provinces.

Between 1825 and 1836, the government founded
the following schools: military naval institutions for
training officers and soldiers in the various military
professions (infantry, cavalry, artillery); a medical
school; a school for veterinarians; a school of phar-
macy; a school for applied chemistry; a school for
nursing and school for nurses; a school for arts
and crafts; a school for civil engineering; a school
for administration; and a school for languages and
translation. Other schools of minor importance and
shorter duration were also established, not only in
Cairo, but also in Alexandria and the provinces.

From 1836 onwards, the government attempted to
unite, rationalise and reform the system under a
school authority, which later became the ministry of
education. However, the reform was only partially
successful. With the retreatment of the 1840s and
contracting needs, schools were merged or closed
down, though a few new ones were also founded.

The newly-emerging system was clearly not
oriented towards mass education, which the wali did
not support, but towards elite formation, with special
emphasis on the military professions. According to
one estimate, adult literacy increased from 1% in
1830 to 3% in 1850. The Būlāk Press was founded in
1820 and commenced printing in 1822 [see MAB\'A\.1.
In the Arab world]. Eight additional printing
presses were established in the following years. In
1828, an official gazette in Turkish and Arabic,
Wek\[d\]i P\[d\]rw Walj\[d\]l al-W\[d\]k\[d\], began publica-
tion. The opening of a school for translation in 1833,
and a bureau of translation in 1841, yielded during
the remainder of Muhammad ʿAli's reign the transla-
tion from European languages into Arabic of hun-
dreds of manuals and textbooks. This was largely car-
ried out under the supervision of Rifā\[a\] al-Tahtawi
[ q.v. ], one of the most important Egyptian
intellectuals of the 19th century.

During the height of the imperial period in the
1830s, a new architectural style began to dot the
Egyptian urban scenery. The Mamlūk and earlier
Ottoman styles were being replaced by a mixture of
Greek, Italian and Spanish elements, often seen along
the eastern Mediterranean coast. This Ottoman-
Mediterranean style was called in Arabic Rāmī, in
European languages Constantinopolitan. By the
1840s, Mamlūk wooden lattice windows (māqāmat
[ q.v. ]) were being replaced by European windows with
rectangular framed panes and wooden shades. Con-
struction for public use was carried out on a large
scale, including barracks for the army, dockyards for
the navy, offices buildings for the bureaucracy,
schools, hospitals, palaces for the viceroyal family and
mansions for elite grandees. The Māmūdîyya canal
was dug, the Nile barrages were being laid at the fork
of the Delta and the great mosque was rising up at the
Citadel. Country roads were improved to facilitate
transport of produce, and some urban streets, mainly
in Cairo, were being widened to enable more conven-
ient passage of carriages and carts.

But it was not enough to educate and train the army
and bureaucracy; it was also necessary to care for
their health. In this area, Muhammad ʿAli Pasha
reacted to crises rather than planned ahead to
anticipate trouble. The French physician Clot [Bey]
was charged with organising a military medical corps,
following the Pasha's growing concern about the poor
health of his troops and the high mortality among
them. The Board of Health and the quarantine service
came into being as a result of the cholera pandemic of
1830-2. The Mamlūk code of Alexandria was abolished in
the wake of a plague outbreak in 1841. A vaccination
service was set up in Upper Egypt to cater to the
students and instructors in the government schools
(1836), and hospitals were established in all provinces
where government factories were in operation (1846).

Except for smallpox immunisation, the health services
were intended for the benefit of government person-
nel, military and civilians, with minimal spill-over to
the population at large.

However, in spite of its achievements, Muhammad
ʿAli's regional empire was not to enjoy internal peace,
nor would it be allowed to outlive the decade. Trouble
began at home, but was greatly exacerbated by an
over-extended and unpopular imperial administration of
the conquered territories, especially in Syria. In
preparation for the Syrian campaign, the Pasha had
exploited the resources of Egypt to the very limit, if
not beyond, leaving an oppressed and fatigued
population. Droughts and cholera in the early 1830s
and severe plague in 1835 took a heavy toll on the
folk, adding to their misery and the troubles of the
fisc. Presiding over an extended state apparatus,
Muhammad ʿAli still insisted on a highly centralised
mode of government. His attempts to rationalise the
system produced an organic law in 1837, which
abolished all councils and reorganised existing depart-
ments. It also created new departments in a move
towards government via ministries, though this was
not fully accomplished. At the root of the problem lay
the wali's reluctance to forego the personal advantage
that direct disposal of power afforded him.

Egypt's incorporation into the world economy, a
process much accelerated by Muhammad ʿAli's
policies, exposed the country to fluctuations on inter-
national markets. A crisis in the international
monetary system in 1836-7 brought cotton prices
down and dried up the Pasha's credit sources in Alex-
andria. To these were added mounting difficulties in
the government of Syria. The Egyptian administra-
tion there was growing increasingly unpopular as a
result of attempts to apply the policies vouchsafed to
Egypt. Increased taxation (including a poll-tax on
Muslims), introduction of a tight system of monopolies,
a 'gun control' policy, the imposition of corvée, and,
finally, conscription brought the popula-
tion to unrest and a series of sporadic revolts. Although Egypt had full access to the resources of Syria, the maintenance of a huge army was weighing heavily on the treasury. The cost of empire was becoming prohibitive.

The lack of natural, technical, and managerial resources combined with the overly centralised system to defeat the network of factories. These gradually fell into disrepair, so that by the late 1830s, little was left working of the few dozen plants established during the second period of Muhammad `Ali's reign. Not only were the factories bogged down, but also the rest of the economic management system was clogged up. Villages were being deserted and their revenues lost to the state. Land-tax arrears amounted to several years, with little hope of recovery.

Faced with an economic crisis and the mounting displeasure of an exhausted population, the Pasha began to reverse his initial policy of direct administration. This was most evident in agriculture. From 1838 onwards, he granted sizeable tracts of land to members of his family, thus creating the basis for large landed estates (çiftliks [q.v.]). About the same time, he established the 'ahda system, distributing to the members of the Ottoman-Egyptian elite middle-size estates comprising villages whose taxes had not been paid. These office holders were obliged to settle and rear families on the land and post the arrears of tax to the state. Land-tax arrears amounted to several years, with little hope of recovery.

In spite of all his internal and imperial problems, Muhammad `Ali refused to trim his ambitions of independence and regional hegemony. In mid-1838, he informed the European powers of his intention to declare independence. Although the international reaction was quite negative, he nevertheless did not withdraw his statement of intent. Mahmid II, much constrained, the new sultan, had eradicat during the 1810s.

Mohammad `Ali's career marks the last phase of his reign: it also forms the first part of a new period in 19th-century Egyptian history, namely the period between the fall of the regional empire and the rise of Isma'il Pasha's power in the mid-1860s. Thus the middle decades span the last phase of Muhammad `Ali's rule, the reigns of `Abbâs (1848-54) and Sa'îd (1854-63) and the first phase of Isma'il's rule. In those years, Egypt was gradually recovering from the harsh consequences of Muhammad `Ali's imperial wars and aggressive reforms. No more a focal point of international politics, its rulers turned to economic activity and scaled-down development, less taxing on the country's resources and population. The change of pace and mood began to set in already during the early 1840s.

The settlement of the “Egyptian Question” removed Egypt from the international agenda, thereby enabling the Pasha to alter the nature of his dealings with the European powers and to redefine his relations with the sultan. As the threat of Egyptian independence and dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire was defused, Muhammad `Ali could enjoy improved relations with Istanbul, receive honours and even travel to the capital, as he did in 1846. Although still in possession of a large measure of autonomy, he was also back in the Ottoman orbit. Simultaneously, he would now trade with Europe, quibble with European consuls over the monopolies, and use European expertise to further develop Egypt. In 1844, he allowed England—the power that contributed more than others to his downfall—to establish a regular line of communication between Britain and India, using the overland route from Alexandria to Suez. Later, he even contemplated a visit to England, which never materialised.

Many of the processes that matured in the fourth period of Muhammad `Ali's reign originated in the third, imperial period. The apex of the Pasha's political and military power coincided with the breakdown of his economic and administrative centralisation. The decentralising tendency that began to access to the Straits. France had supported Muhammad `Ali, but realising the direction of the tide, joined the allied action. The terms of the settlement were presented to Muhammad `Ali as a graduated ultimatum, backed by the deployment of joint naval forces ready to enforce them. Late in 1840, since the Pasha would not budge, Beirut was taken up by sea and land operations. An insurrection in Lebanon followed; several coastal towns were taken by the allied forces and British naval units appeared before Alexandria. All these produced the evacuation of Ibrahim's army from Syria and the virtual surrender of Muhammad `Ali to the will of the powers. The Ottoman fleet was allowed to return home, and the sultan agreed to confirm the Pasha as hereditary governor of Egypt in a firman issued in June 1841.

The sultanic edict that ended Muhammad `Ali's regional empire limited the size of his army, stipulated that Ottoman legislation would apply in Egypt and required the Pasha to obtain Ottoman consent before concluding international agreements. It thus sought to impose upon the Egyptians not only territorial constraints but also internal restrictions. Compliance with Ottoman demands was incomplete and the size of the army was kept well above the specified 18,000 level. But meaningful changes did occur, reflecting the re-arranged priorities and the transformed world view of the Pasha. The army's take of security in the first years of his empire.

4. Realism and retreatment (1847-8)

The fourth period of Muhammad `Ali's career marks the last phase of his reign: it also forms the first part of a new period in 19th-century Egyptian history, namely the period between the fall of the regional empire and the rise of Isma`il Pasha's power in the mid-1860s. Thus the middle decades span the last phase of Muhammad `Ali's rule, the reigns of `Abbâs (1848-54) and Sa'îd (1854-63) and the first phase of Isma'il's rule. In those years, Egypt was gradually recovering from the harsh consequences of Muhammad `Ali's imperial wars and aggressive reforms. No more a focal point of international politics, its rulers turned to economic activity and scaled-down development, less taxing on the country's resources and population. The change of pace and mood began to set in already during the early 1840s.

The settlement of the “Egyptian Question” removed Egypt from the international agenda, thereby enabling the Pasha to alter the nature of his dealings with the European powers and to redefine his relations with the sultan. As the threat of Egyptian independence and dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire was defused, Muhammad `Ali could enjoy improved relations with Istanbul, receive honours and even travel to the capital, as he did in 1846. Although still in possession of a large measure of autonomy, he was also back in the Ottoman orbit. Simultaneously, he would now trade with Europe, quibble with European consuls over the monopolies, and use European expertise to further develop Egypt. In 1844, he allowed England—the power that contributed more than others to his downfall—to establish a regular line of communication between Britain and India, using the overland route from Alexandria to Suez. Later, he even contemplated a visit to England, which never materialised.

Many of the processes that matured in the fourth period of Muhammad `Ali's reign originated in the third, imperial period. The apex of the Pasha's political and military power coincided with the breakdown of his economic and administrative centralisation. The decentralising tendency that began to
manifest itself in the late 1830s was considerably re-
inforced during the 1840s. In land-tenure, large 
estates continued to be distributed to members of the 
viceregal family, the granting of uncultivated, but 
estates continued to be distributed to members of the 
hereditary rule of Muhammad 

This tendency was accelerated in the early 1840s 
owing to a combination of bad harvests, a cholera 
epidemic and a devastating cattle murrain, which 
increased tax-arrears to a fraction below 20%, against 
the backdrop of a growing national debt. The transfer 
of land to çiftlik and şubbas was expected to settle these 
arrears, increase further revenue and, not least, 
make the Pasha to circumvent European pressures to 
abolish the monopolies. It was believed that through 
the transfer of direct control to a loyal elite, the 
government would be able to continue to appropriate 
the rural surplus, fix the prices and maximise profits 
on export. But the idea was self-defeating in many 
ways, since estate holders realised that much profit 
could be made by breaking government control of the 
market and dealing directly with buyers. Internal con-
flicts also broke out in the mid-1840s among the vari-
ous types of estateholders and village şerâfs who 
had access to faulişin labour and state support for land 

All this amounted to the gradual disintegration of 
the monopolies and the collapse of the Pasha’s system 
of rural control. Consequently, further reduction in 
state revenues and penetration of foreign merchants 
into the agricultural interior occurred. Simulta-
neously, the factory system was grinding to a halt. 
This was, in large measure, the outcome of machinery 
failure due to wear-and-tear, poor maintenance and 
scurvy of technical skills. Shortage of power supply 
resulted from engines falling into disrepair and water 
buffaloes perishing in the murrain mentioned above. 
The cut in the size of the army further reduced the 
volume and buying power of the home market. This 
contributed to a decline in the demand for the pro-
ducts of the Pasha’s factories. In the face of a dwindl-
ing market, there was little sense, as Muhammad ʿAlī 
realised, in undertaking the enormous cost of renew-
ing the equipment of his factories. The contraction of 
the army, the factory system, and the schools network 
caused also the decline of the health service, which 
had to care for a diminishing clientele.

To these major reasons for the breakdown of rural 
economic control and the collapse of the industrial 
experiment were added the growing effects of the 1838 
Balta Limanı treaty. This Anglo-Ottoman com-
cial agreement improved trading terms for British 
merchants in the Ottoman Empire. It abrogated the 
monopoly system and reformed customs regulations. 
In effect, it threw the Ottoman dominions open to 
foreign competition, weakened the resistance of local 
manufacturers to foreign products and further incor-
porated the Ottoman economy into the European-
dominated world economy. Muhammad ʿAlī attempted 
as much as he could to avert the application of the 
treaty in Egypt but had to succumb in the mid-1840s. 
However, local crafts developed various methods of 
minimising the damage, though the Pasha’s earlier 
creation of his factory system weakened their ability to 
cope with the open home market.

The delegation of some economic functions to an 
emerging intermediary élite was not accompanied by 
any weakening of viceregal hold over the government. 
Locally served by a highly dependent military and 
administrative structure, Muhammad ʿAlī continued 
to rest securely on his throne. Indeed, the formation 
of his Ottoman-Egyptian élite was one of the most 
important achievements of his reign. This group of 
military commanders and high office holders emerged 
out of the ʿulâmi’s household, providing him with the 
assistance needed to govern the country. He carefully 
selected them from among his family members, 
Kavala compatriots, Ottoman officials sent from 
Istanbul, Muhammad ʿAlī’s own Cairene ʿulâmis and 
those of the old regime, Coptic scribes, Armenian interpreter-aides and Egyptian rural notables. One might add to these 
the group of European advisers, placed by the Pasha 
in high executive positions, some of whom also 
embraced Islam.

The first generation of the Ottoman-Egyptian élite 
acquired some of its basic features already in the 
second period of Muhammad ʿAlī’s reign, but 
matured during the last two decades of his rule. Heirs 
to Ottoman élite culture, governing traditions and 
local government, members of this group were, above 
all, loyal to the Pasha, the Egyptian service and the 
spirits of an Egyptian regional empire. The once 
influential urban notability was conspicuously absent 
from the ranks of this governing élite. Arabic-
speaking and at home in Ottoman élite culture, leading 
ʿulâmis and merchants were relegated to an 
ancillary position in Egyptian politics. During the first 
decade of his reign, Muhammad ʿAlī had dealt a 
major blow to their semi-independent sources of 
income by taxing ʿulâmā’ lands, revoking ʿulâmā’
and monopolising commerce.

The demise of ʿUmar Makram’s power in 1809 
proved to the urban notability that their traditional 
models of operation were becoming obsolete. Refusing 
accepting them as mediators between people and 
government, Muhammad ʿAlī squeezed them out of 
the political power game. Subsequently, the Azhar 
ceased to serve as the focus of popular protest and, as 
in other spheres of life, the Pasha dealt with his sub-
jects directly through guild and neighbourhood 
shyâbs and his trusted agents. By 1840, the govern-
ment had also completed the incorporation of the Shiʿi 
orders into its control system, organising them under the ʿâlimī of the Bakriyya. How subservient and co-
 opted the urban notability had become can be 
deduced from the fact that during the same year, and 
amidst public unrest, Muhammad ʿAlī felt confident 
enough to appoint two ʿulâmis and a merchant to raise 
from among the population of Cairo, and then to 
command, eight auxiliary regiments to assist in the 
maintenance of order.

In the fourth period, the most prominent figures in 
the governing élite, the ʿulâmis’s son İbrahim and his 
grandson ʿAbbās, were being groomed to take over 
the reins of government. In 1847, the old Pasha, as 
he was then known, became mentally incapacitated and 
was gently removed from actual power. Reasons for 
his condition were said to be either his old-age senility 
or the effects of silver nitrate, which had been 
administered to treat his dysentery. İbrahim, afflicted 
with tuberculosis, undertook the daily running of 
government. In July 1848, he was officially invested 
with the government of Egypt, only to die less than 
four months later.

İbrahim was succeeded by ʿAbbās Pasha [see 
ʿAbbâs ʿAlī Pasha], whose reign proved to be of pivotal 
importance in the middle decades of the 19th century. 
It was he who, in a tough confrontation with the 
Porte, consolidated the hereditary rule of Muhammad
'Ali's family in Egypt. 'Abbas turned into an overt and deliberate state policy the scaled-down, trimmed, modest reform programme which began to manifest itself in a necessary evil during the last phase of Muhammad 'Ali's reign and the beginning of Isma'il's. The old Pasha died in Alexandria on 2 August 1849, not realising the change that was taking place around him. He was buried in the Citadel mosque, which he had begun to build and which 'Abbas completed. Muhammad 'Ali's reforms and regional empire.

Until the last phase of his rule, that which followed the withdrawal from Syria in 1840, there was hardly a time at which Egypt was not engaged in some military effort, usually a major one. In the period of consolidation, the military effort was first directed internally, against domestic rivals, and then externally, against the Wahhabis in Arabia. The foray into the Sudan followed the victory in the Hijaz, only to be succeeded by the Greek campaigns and the two Syrian wars, with the revolts that were sandwiched between them. The purpose of all this was to establish Egypt as a major regional power with considerable freedom of action in both internal and external matters. However, it is unclear whether in the late 1830s Muhammad ‘Ali was truly pushing for full independence or was merely putting forth a tactical demand in order to secure hereditary rule over the whole of his regional empire under Ottoman suzerainty.

Indeed, not before the collapse of the Pagha's schemes in 1841, was there rest for the weary soldiery of Egypt. But the army was not the only beleaguered sector of the population, since large segments of Egyptian society and economy were harnessed to the war machine of the Pagha. The fallāshīn viewed conscription as a major evil. Indeed, coercion and violence were needed in order to enforce the draft. In the process, many rural families suffered want and disruption. When absconding, self-maiming, bribery and trickery failed, their ablest youths were carried off in chains to serve in faraway lands and to realise the grand design of their ambitious ruler. These men were then wanting on the family plot or when the village had to supply its quota for the corpsē.

Once assembled, the army had to be clothed, regularly fed, equipped, trained, transported, medically cared for, and, of course, paid. To defray the enormous cost of all this, a major, and partially successful, effort was launched by the Pagha to alter the economic base of the country. Again, this disrupted rural and urban life even further. Changes in crop production, higher taxes, increased corpsē for irrigation projects and the creation of large estates, imposed new burdens. Naturally, the squeeze intensified whenever the Pagha was preparing for battle. If the commercialisation of agriculture was intended to finance the campaigns, the industrial experiment was intended to clothe and equip the army, and to provide import substitution. In not a few of the Pagha's factories, public works and construction sites, the labour was involuntary, and the pay rather low and irregular.

Whereas the social cost of these economic changes was borne by the rural and urban lower strata, the benefits accrued at the top of the socio-economic ladder. A small military-administrative elite colluded with an indigenous commercial notability and a growing, though still limited, group of European merchants, to maximise profits. In return for their total loyalty to the Pagha and for the services to him, these men were allowed to accumulate wealth and improve their position in society. Even the health services were oriented towards the Ottoman-Egyptian élite, with minimal spill-over to the rest of the population. Greater advantage to the latter was derived from the new educational system. Although members of the élite had easier access to the student missions and the new schools, this was still the most effective channel of upward mobility for gifted members of the middle and lower strata of Egyptian society. But here, too, gains were realised only in the long term, well beyond the reign of the Pagha himself.

Thus the balance sheet of Muhammad ‘Ali's reforms is rather mixed. Markedly slowed down by the draconian restrictions in the imperial army. Muhammad ‘Ali's reforms were having a rapidly diminishing impact on the lower strata. Perpetuated by ‘Abbas and Sa'id, this trend was reversed only by Isma'il Pasha's resumption of large-scale development, which also brought the process to broader segments of the population. The middle decades of the 19th century only indicate the limited effect and real price of Muhammad ‘Ali's modernisation thrust. With the exception of Egypt's assistance to the Ottoman forces in the Crimean War (1853-6), those were peaceful years for the inhabitants of the Nile Valley. Heroism and the enormous sacrifices which it required gave way to blissful dullness. Conscription and the corpsē were limited, the population prospered, and basic socio-economic patterns resurfaced on all levels of society.

Few men in modern Egyptian history were idolised as much as Muhammad ‘Ali Pasha. Fascination with strong, charismatic leaders, perceived to have changed the course of history, is not a new phenomenon. Although far from it, his militant separatism and defiance of Ottoman authority were sometimes seen from a 20th-century perspective as precursors of Egyptian nationalism. He was thus embraced by Egyptian writers and glorified as a national hero. At the same time, his desire to adopt European know-how and technology in order to create a modern army and a strong economic base won him in Europe the reputation of a progressive, enlightened moderniser. Of his attributes, that of 'Founder of Modern Egypt'—which combines all—seems to have had an almost magic grip on Western and Eastern minds alike.

Myths aside, Muhammad ‘Ali Pasha was an Ottoman officer who, owing to his talents, ambition, determination and vision, dominated the government of Egypt for more than four decades. He managed to carve out of the sultan's dominions a patrimony which his progeny governed until 1952. Culturally, he remained an Ottoman gentleman, whose language was Turkish, whose world view was 19th-century Ottoman. In fact, he spoke neither Arabic nor French or English. But he made Egypt his abode, the seat of his government, the centre of his attention, where all his energies were invested. He also created the new Ottoman-Egyptian élite and established the two most effective channels of mobility in modern Egyptian society, sc. the conscript army and the modern system of education and higher learning. Both needed much longer to mature as the prime agents of Egyptianisation, but it was Muhammad ‘Ali who pointed the direction and set the example. It was he, too, who gave Egypt a strong, centralised state organisation: an indispensable tool in the modern world.

In his personality, Muhammad ‘Ali combined the gifted general with the able administrator. This special breed of Ottoman Paghas, often self-made men like him, was becoming rare, though still extant, in the sultan's service. To these heirs of the Ottoman
military-administrative heritage, the importance of a sound economic base as the mainstay of government was not a novelty. Indeed, the interdependence of military strength, economic prosperity and civil order was the subject of Ottoman law and Ildiri thought. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Pasha invested all his energies to create both a military might and a sound economic base in order to achieve regional hegemony.

Muhammad 'Ali's powerful personality and broad range of activities dominate the historiography of his period. The literature tends to identify the reign of Muhammad 'Ali with the man. Until recently, historians have mostly stressed his character, his actions, his conquests, his reforms, his ideas; they have paid less attention to structural considerations, the constraints of the domestic and global economies or the social repercussions of his policies, mainly for the fallahin and the urban lower strata. The yardstick by which his life-work has been measured is the extent to which it laid the ground for the modern Egyptian nation-state. However, recent studies attempt to examine his reign from a broader social perspective, attenuating the superlatives and dimming some of the glory in the process.


MUHAMMAD ‘ALI SHAH KÂDÎR, the sixth ruler of the dynasty. He was born at Tabriz on 21 June 1872, the eldest son of Muizzulf al-Dîn Şâh [q. v.] by a Kâdîr wife, Umm al-Kâshân. She was the daughter of Muhammad ‘Ali Na‘tuq and the sister of Ilavarbâbâ Kâbi [q. e. in Suppl.] and ‘Izzat al-Dawla, a sister of Nâṣîr al-Dîn Şâh [q. v.]. Muhammad ‘Ali received
the title Ictidad al-Saltana in 1882 and ten years later he was made Sardar of the troops in Agharbāyjān. In 1893, after an earlier marriage to a concubine, he married Shāhīn Khānum, the daughter of Kāmrān Mīrzā, the favourite son of Nāṣr-Ādīn. The first son of this union, Sūlān Ahmad, was born in Tabrīz on 21 January 1898 and succeeded to the throne after his father’s abdication in 1909 (see below). Muḥammad ʿAlī also made a number of other marriages and had at least five more sons and four daughters.

After the succession of his father in 1896, Muḥammad ʿAlī was proclaimed uṣūlātād. His governorship of Agharbāyjān from then until the year 1900 was marked by a measure of greed and rapacity and by the growth of Russian political influence at Tabrīz. During his father’s visit to Europe in 1905 Muḥammad ʿAlī acted as Regent in Tehran, and this brought him into contact with those Persians who were beginning to seek administrative and political change. The crown prince was strongly opposed to any reduction in the powers of the monarchy and even before he became Shāh, following his father’s death on 8 January 1907, his resolve to exercise royal authority was manifest. He was deeply distrusted by those who had gained political reforms from Muẓaffar al-/basha during the final six months of that ailing ruler’s reign, and within the first ten months of his rule Muḥammad ʿAlī was obliged to swear solemn allegiance to the new Constitution, which was less than two years old.

This, however, did not prevent him and a group of close associates—including his two half-brothers, Shuʿūṭā al-Saltana and Sālār al-Dawl— from plotting to cause the downfall of those who supported the reforms and to restore the power of the royal family. Persian politics at the time were chaotic and turbulent. The state treasury was practically empty, members of the newly-created national assembly lacked both the experience and skilled leadership necessary to tackle the country’s growing problems, and several remote provinces were no longer under the control of central government. On 31 August 1907 the prime minister Amin al-Solṭān was murdered in Tehran, and the Shāh became even more suspicious of the intentions of his political opponents. Those fears were not unfounded, for in February 1908 there was an abortive attempt on his life. This occurred two months after the Shāh had ordered the arrest of the new prime minister Nāṣir al-Mulk. But this royal coup d’état failed, and relations between the crown and supporters of the Constitution quickly deteriorated as Muḥammad ʿAlī ordered the suppression of a number of the secret societies which sought further political change. Their newspapers and journals were also banned. Disorders in the provinces, some of which were actively fomented by the Shāh and his supporters, increased, and the Shāh finally declared martial law in Tehran in June, making the colonel of the Russian Cossack Brigade the military governor of the capital. This act served to confirm the suspicion of many Persians that the monarch was planning to allow Russia to control the entire country. On 23 June, Cossack troops bombarded the National Assembly and several people were killed. The following day, two of the most prominent political opponents of the Shāh were found strangled in the grounds of a royal palace, and on 27 June the Shāh declared the Assembly dissolved and the Constitution abolished as it was contrary to Islamic law.

Anti-royalist feeling grew in several regions, notably in Agharbāyjān, and Russian troops occupied Tashkurgan in April 1909, provoking Constitutional tribal forces then converged on Tehran, and on 13 July Muḥammad ʿAlī sought refuge in the summer residence of the Russian Minister. On 16 July he was compelled to abdicate in favour of his son Sultan Ahmad. As he was a minor, his uncle Abu ʿl-Fadl Mīrzā was appointed Regent. Russian diplomats then negotiated the details of the former Shāh’s pension arrangements with the Persian government, and Muḥammad ʿAlī left Tehran for Russia on 9 September 1909.

His first place of residence in exile was Odessa, and there he and his supporters quickly began to plot their return to Persia. Money was spent on recruiting support among disaffected tribal and brigand groups in the northern provinces of the country, as well as in the Russian Caucasus and Transcaspia. In November 1910 the former Shāh travelled to Vienna, where he held meetings with his supporters, including Sālār al-Dawl. Although the Russian archives on these activities have not been made available, there is evidence to suggest that Muḥammad ʿAlī’s plans were made with the knowledge, and the connivance, of that government.

Muḥammad ʿAlī returned to Persia, with his half-brother Shuʿūṭā al-Saltana and a quantity of arms, in a chartered Russian steamer, landing near Astarābād on 17 July 1911. That town quickly surrendered to him. Sālār al-Dawl had meanwhile raised a revolt in Kurdistan. The government in Tehran had very few military forces at its disposal to meet the challenge, and the Bakhtiyāri leaders who had marched on the capital in 1909 showed little sign of wishing to fight against their former monarch. Supporters of the Constitution, however, knew that if Muḥammad ʿAlī succeeded in regaining the throne, his thirst for revenge was likely to be considerable, and an irregular military force was rapidly raised to take the field against him. A battle took place near Varāmīn on 5 September 1911, when Muḥammad ʿAlī’s forces were defeated, and one of his chief supporters, Arqād al-Dawl, was captured and promptly executed.

Muḥammad ʿAlī had prudently remained near Astarābād, and he lingered there until he was forced to sail to Russia for a second and permanent period of exile in February 1912. He had by now become something of an embarrassment to the Russian government, which had established great influence in Tehran, and the British government had decided that his restoration to power was not desirable. There were many rumours of another attempt being planned to regain the throne in the summer of 1912, but these proved to be groundless. Muḥammad ʿAlī died at San Remo on 5 April 1925, and later that year Ahmad Shāh was deposed by the National Assembly, thus bringing the Kāḏār dynasty to an end.

Bibliography: See the works cited in the entries for DUSTūR, I. Iran; HUKūMA, ii. Persia; and KĀḏĀR. (R. M. BURRELL)
brief work entirely theoretical in conception and devoid of any historical anecdotes, hence adding little to our knowledge of either Indo-Muslim political thought or history.

Bibliography: The Maw'īza is now edited and translated into English by Sajida Sultana Alvi, Advice on the art of governance ... an Indo-Islamic Mirror for Princes, Albany, N.Y. 1989, which contains a bibliographical introduction on the author and an analysis of his work.

MUHAMMAD AL-BAKIR, Abu Da'far [see MUHAMMAD AL-BAKIR AL-MADJILISI [see AL-MADJILIS]].

MUHAMMAD BAYRAM AL-KHAMIS, Tunisian reformer and man of letters, born in Tunis in Muharram 1256/March 1840.

He belonged to the Bayram family whose eponymous ancestor, at the head of a contingent of Ottoman soldiers, had taken part in the capture of Tunis by Sinan Pasha in 981/1573. Later, the Bayrams preferred a religious career. In 1140/1727 Muhammad Bayram I (died 1800) became bash-mufti of the Hanaïf, a post that was also occupied by Muhammad Bayram II (d. 1831), Muhammad Bayram III (d. 1843) and Muhammad Bayram IV (d. 1861). The latter was the first to hold the title of shaikh al-Islam. The Bayrams were related to the beylical family.

The father of Muhammad Bayram al-Khamis, Mustafâ (d. 1863), younger brother of Muhammad Bayram IV, preferred the administration of his lands to a religious career. At the request of Muhammad Bey, he occupied himself with the management of the akwdf. He left his son a large fortune.

Muhammad Bayram al-Khamis received a traditional education in the Qa'im al-Zaytuna, where his teachers include the best scholars of the age. Thanks to them and to his reading in the family library, he obtained a profound knowledge of traditional sciences and history; however, he did not know any foreign language.

On the death of his uncle, Muhammad Bayram IV, he was chosen to follow the example of his forebears, he preferred an administrative career. As a student, he was interested in the reforms introduced since the proclamation of the 'Abd al-amin [see purṣūr, i] in 1857. Convinced of their usefulness and necessity, he did not change his opinion when the rebellion of 1864 erupted. He was associated with Khayr al-Din Pasha [q.v.] and in 1868 wrote a eulogy in the official journal al-Râ'd al-tûnisî of the latter's book 2. After his nomination to the post of mu'tasir akhar on 21 October 1873, Khayr al-Din found in Muhammad Bayram al-Khamis a valuable collaborator for his policy of recovery. Already in al-Râ'd al-tûnisî of 28 November 1873, he undertook the defence of Khayr al-Din against the hostile articles published in certain European journals and inspired by his predecessor Mustafâ Khaznadar [q.v.].

The first task that Khayr al-Din entrusted to him was the presidency of the gamîyat al-akwdf founded on 19 March 1874. This was to centralise the administration of the akwdf and control the management of them in a country where practically all the public
monuments, buildings and institutions were financed by their revenues. Helped among others by Muhammad al-Sanusi, he drew up a list of 3,680 buildings maintained by the wakf and recovered numerous lands and houses that had been diverted from their intended purpose of wakf. Thanks to his activities, the revenues of the dijm-iyyat al-a'wakf rose from 1,200,000 piastres in 1874 to more than 1,700,000 in 1876, and to more than 2,150,000 in 1878. With this rise, it was possible to pay regularly the salaries of the religious authorities, professors of the Dhimmî al-Zaytuna and members of the tribunals of the shari'a in Tunis and in the provinces. The dijm-iyyat al-a'wakf also caused to be restored a large number of mosques, houses and town walls.

On 1 July 1875 followed his nomination as a member of a commission entrusted with occupying itself with teaching. His efforts resulted in two regulations for the Dhimmî al-Zaytuna, the first of which, on 19 July 1875, fixed the subjects and the works for study, the examinations and the work of the inspectors. The second, on 22 January 1876, created a better control of the establishment's services.

The same commission had decided on the creation of the Madrasa al-Sadîkiyya (the Sadîki College) founded on 13 January 1875. Alongside of the traditional sciences were taught French, Italian and Turkish, mathematics, chemistry and other sciences. Its first 150 pupils included a son of Muhammad Bayram al-Khâmis. Another activity of this commission was the creation, on 18 May 1875, of a public library with a reading room and catalogue, al-Maktaba al-Sadîkiyya.

He also took charge of al-Râdî al-tünisi. On 14 July 1875, he was entrusted with the directorate of the official press. With the help of Muhammad al-Sanusi and the Egyptian Hamza Fath Allâh, he made this journal the defender of Khayr al-Dîn's policy and the reformers' ideas. During these years, twenty-four books were published, notably some scholarly books for the Sadîki College and studies by contemporary Tunisian scholars. In 1877, when war broke out between the Ottoman Empire and Russia, he helped to organise the sending of horses, mules and money to Macedonia.

On 21 July 1877, Khayr al-Dîn was dismissed from his post. Muhammad Bayram al-Khâmis preferred to remain, however. In the two years that followed, he was a member of a commission that had to give its opinion on the right of the French concessionary of the railway line between Tunis and Jendouba to connect this line with the Algerian network. Although the majority of this commission found in favour of the French company, Muhammad Bayram limited himself to a "yes-but". He also took part in a mixed commission which had to find a solution in the affair of the estate of Sidi Thabit, in which the Tunisian government found itself in opposition to a French subject. As president of the dijm-iyyat al-a'wakf, he played an important role in the creation of the Sadîki Hospital, better known by the name of Mustâphisî Asâsâ 'Ugâmâna.

He was also a member of the madjlis al-shurâ set up on 1 July 1879. Following serious difficulties between the grand vizier Mustâfa b. Ismâîl and the shari'a tribunal of the capital, the 'ulama had called for a real parliament, but the result had been only a consultative council. Muhammad Bayram al-Khâmis was one of the instigators of this demand.

At the beginning of August 1879, a rupture occurred between Muhammad Bayram and the Tunisian government. In the month of July, Mustâfa b. Ismâîl had entrusted him with the secret mission of requesting from the government in Paris the recall of Roustan, the all-powerful French consul in Tunis. The consul, however, frustrated the intrigues of Mustâfa b. Ismâîl, who immediately changed his decision; the envoy was now suspected of seeking the downfall of Muhammad al-Sadîk Bey and the return of Khayr al-Dîn. He returned to Tunis, but because of the chicanery of the grand vizier, he requested and obtained authorisation to go on Pilgrimage. On 13 October 1879, he left Tunis never to return.

Suffering from a nervous illness, Muhammad Bayram visited Italy, France, England and Algeria. On his way to the Holy Places he went via Cairo, where he was received by the Khedive Tawfîk. After accomplishing the Pilgrimage, he left by sea for Istanbul, embarking at Beirut where he met Midhat Pasha [q.v.]. On arriving in Istanbul, he rejoined Khayr al-Dîn and other Tunisian exiles.

When France established itself in Tunisia in 1881, he drafted a report for the Ottoman government in which he exhorted it to occupy itself actively with this part of the Empire. As soon as it became clear that Tunisia would from then on be a French protectorate, he travelled to Leghorn, arranged for his family to join him and organised the sale of his goods (June-November 1881). Returning to Istanbul, he collaborated on the weekly al-Tadîd, founded in 1883 with an all-powerful French consul in Tunis, Roustan, the all-powerful French consul in Tunis. His first book was published in 1885 in French. It was a task fit for his abilities; besides, he did not feel at ease in the Ottoman capital where Abd al-Hamid II [q.v.] had made an atmosphere of distrust prevail.

At the beginning of October 1884, he left Istanbul for Cairo, where liberal ideas could more easily be expressed. He made contact with Muhammad ʿAbd al-Hamid, was received once more by the Khedive Tawfîk and met Lord Cromer, the English Consul-General. On 13 January 1885, he published the first issue of al-Flâm, a political and scientific journal and a mouthpiece for his reforming ideas. The last issue appeared on 3 December 1889, a little before his death. In 1887 he made a last journey in Europe. On his return, he was named judge of the first rank in Cairo, but he died in Hâwan of pleurisy on 18 December 1889. He had married a daughter of his uncle Muhammad Bayram IV, who bore him at least three sons.

A prolific author, he favoured a progressive interpretation of the shari'a. Notable among his risâlas are:

- Risâla kad ihtawat al-ahkâm al-shari'îyya (Cairo 1885) in which he called for the respect of all believers for the true descendants of the Prophet;
- Tuhfat al-khâmisî fi hilliy yaduqul al-raṣâî (Cairo 1886); according to the shari'a, the flesh of game killed with firearms is licit;
- al-Tabîbî fi mas'alât al-raṣîk (in manuscript), a study on the view of the shari'a concerning slavery among the Muslims. He explains the motives for slavery and the rules which regulate it, and concludes that the slaves sold in our days are free men and that the governments which forbid the sale of them are acting in conformity with the shari'a.

In a fourth risâla, he explains that men are permitted to wear their hair long.

A fifth one states that it is permitted to buy up the deeds and titles of loans made by a Muslim government so that Muslim money does not leave the country; such an operation has no usurious character.

But he also wrote an essay on the obligatory use of the Arabic language in teaching, even in modern sciences, and composed a treatise on prosody.

In 1881 he wrote in Istanbul some Malâbâsât siyâsîyya ʿan al-tanzimât al-lâzîma li ʿl-dawla al-ʿalîyya.
 MUHAMMAD BAYRAM AL-KHAMIS — MUHAMMAD BELLO

In this study on the political situation in the Ottoman Empire, he shows himself to be a partisan of the Young Ottomans by supporting the introduction of ministerial responsibility and the election of an assembly of representatives duly chosen. But at the same time, he is opposed to a pure and simple imitation of the European parliamentary system; the political system of the Empire was to be adapted to its specific needs and to the requirements of Islam.

His principal work is _Saheeh al-Tibr bi-musta‘aands al-ansaar wa l-akhbar_ (Cairo 1889-93; 2nd ed. Ali Chenoufi, Tunis 1989), whose first two volumes were composed in Istanbul and the last two in Cairo; death prevented him from completing it. After an introduction in which he explains that it is permitted for Muslims to visit Europe, he begins in the first two volumes an outline of all the countries of the world and of Tunisia and its contemporary history. The third volume contains an account of his journey in 1875 in Italy and France, and the fourth consists of his observations on England, Algeria and Egypt. The Hijâj occupies the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth volume, which also contains his observations on the Ottoman Empire. The book was to have finished with a systematic exposition of his political ideas, but it now contains the biography of the author written by his son Muhammad.

The personal impressions of the author on the debates in the Italian parliament, England’s policy in India and the insecurity in Paris, are mixed with observations on the civil and political liberty of various countries, the absolutism of governments and the influence of the political system on the economy. For Muslims the fruits of good government.

His principal work is _al-Wadêl ad-dawla_ (1232/1817), which he succeeded in 1232/1817 as amir al-mu’mimn dawla Uthman b. FudI [q.v.], whom he succeeded in 1232/1817 as amir al-mu’mimn dawla Uthman b. FudI [q.v.].

Abd Allah during his brother’s caliphate and the establishment of lasting administrative structures. Nevertheless marked a period of consolidation for the state’s new capital Sokoto, and over the next two years assumed much of the burden of correspondence in the ideological debate with Shaykh Muhammad al-Amin al-Kânimi of Bornu whose subjects Shaykh ‘Uthman had inherited as abdomen (abd Allah), was the successor Abu Bakr al-Aswad, who, when Shaykh ‘Uthman’s death was announced, hastened to the capital only to find the gates shut in his face. Civil war was averted when ‘Abd Allah retired to Gwandu, from which city he continued to administer the western provinces, but he and his nephew were not fully reconciled until after the battle of Kalembara (1256/1840-1) when Bello came to ‘Abd Allah’s aid to defeat the rebel ‘Abd al-Salâm (see R. Oxenwald, _Das Sokoto-Kalifat und seine ethnischen Grundlagen_. Eine Untersuchung zum Aufstand des ‘Abd as-Salâm, Wiesbaden 1986). Bello’s twenty-year reign, though punctuated by internal revolts and external attacks (notably from Bornu in 1240-21825-7 and by a coalition of Tuareg and irredentist Gobirawa and Katsinawa who were defeated at the battle of Gwakuke in 1251/1836), nevertheless marked a period of consolidation for the caliphate and the establishment of lasting administrative structures. The office of wazir, though informally held by ‘Abd Allah during his brother’s lifetime, became formalised under Bello with the appointment of ‘Uthman b. ‘Abd Bakr (more commonly known under the Hausa form of his name, Giidago dan Laima), who also served under Bello’s successor ‘Abd Bakr al-Atik (reigned 1253-8/1837-42) and whose name has been kept up to the present day. It was the wazir who handled routine relations with the emirates, corresponding with

individual amirs and receiving their tribute; he and his descendants were also the historians of the dynasty, leaving for posterity a valuable body of writings. Bello himself dealt with major policy matters regarding the emirates. He intervened in Zaria in 1821 and 1834 and in Kano in 1829 to decide the dynastic succession. He also carved out new emirates: Missau in 1831 and Jama’are in 1835. As part of his policy for containing the as yet unreconciled Zamfara and Gobirawa, he built a line of ribats along the Kwarar and Sokoto valley, which he also introduced the so-called koja, or ‘gate’ system, under which territorial chiefs in the heartlands of the caliphate kept a resident in Sokoto who represented their interests with Bello and who, in turn, were responsible for collecting and checking tribute from those territories. He also created a series of new titles, some with territorial responsibilities and some entailing administrative duties at the centre, appointing to them men from families which had played a significant role in the distib. Many of these reflected older Hausa titles, a move which may have been conciliatory to the conquered Hausa (though the title-holders were mainly Fulani), but which flew in the face of his father’s dictum that such “pagan titles” (aikād ahl al-kufr) should be abandoned in favour of Islamic (i.e. Arabic) titles (see M. Hiskett, in BOAO, xx (1963), 71-89).

Pragmatic and forceful as a ruler, valiant and skilful as an army commander, Bello was nonetheless a dedicated scholar and a devout Sufi. Like his father, he had a primary affiliation to the Kadiriyya order, but had also received the Arabisation and dedicated scholar and a devout Sufi. Like his father, he had a primary affiliation to the Kadiriyya order, but had also received the Arabisation and had complicated at leisure. Affairs thus continued to conduct the management of the public funds which he had become, over the years, clumsy and anarchical. Bello’s own works are listed by H. Johnstone, in The Fulani Empire of Sokoto, London 1967; M. F. Delafosse, Traditions musulmanes relatives à l’origine des Peuls, in RMM, xx (1912), 242-67. No full-length study of Bello’s life exists, but the following works deal with aspects of his career: D.M. Last, The Sokoto Caliphate, London 1967; H.A.S. Johnstone, The Fulani Empire of Sokoto, London 1967; M. F. Delafosse, The Sword of Truth: The Sokoto Caliphate, unpub. doctoral diss., Univ. of London 1982; O. Bello, The political thought of Muhammad Bello (1781-1837) as revealed in his Arabic writings, unpub. doctoral diss., Univ. of London 1983.

MUHAMMAD BEY, eleventh bey of the Husaynid dynasty in Tunisia. His short reign (1855-9) was important because of certain decisions that he took and whose repercussions appeared after his death and much later. When he succeeded his cousin Ahmad Bey [q.v.], of whose internal and external policy he did not always approve, he abrogated some decrees of his predecessor, reduced, for reasons of economy, the number of soldiers and made the effects of his hostility felt towards some favourites of the deceased bey; but contrary to the hopes of some, he retained in his post the former bey’s principal minister Mustafa Khaznadār [q.v.]. The latter had succeeded in conciliating the closest adviser to the new bey, his brother-in-law Ismail b. Suqā, and had persuaded the prince that he alone was capable of conducting the management of the public funds which he had complicated at leisure. Affairs thus continued to be directed by the same group of officials and dignitaries, mostly of Mamlūk parentage or clients of Khaznadār.

However, Muhammad Bey’s first decisions sought to suppress abuses and to lighten a fiscal system which had become, over the years, clumsy and anachronistic. The Kuršānī’s “tithe” (suqar) on corn barley was maintained, as was the tax in kind (kānūn) on olive-trees and palm-trees. The other taxes were replaced by a uniform per capita tax of 36 piasters a year, which was called “help” (‘ašā) and presented as a temporary due; the population, who called it maghāba (“contribution”), do not seem to have greeted it favourably; its doubling, some years later, triggered the serious revolt of 1864.

In June 1857, the execution, ordered in haste, of a Jewish coachman accused of blasphemy incurred the intervention of France and Great Britain, who demanded the creation of mixed tribunals and
judiciary guarantees as well as freedom of trade for their nations; this period of tension led to the solemnation of the Fundamental Pact which guaranteed equality and security or nationality, freedom to trade and own property in the country.

The constitution which derived from the Fundamental Pact was only completed in 1861, in the reign of his brother and successor, Muhammad al-Sadik Bey [q.v.], as well as the institutions it created, the Great Council and tribunals, which disappeared after the revolt of 1864. Nevertheless, the Fundamental Pact was to be for the Tunisian reformers and patriots and for the nationalist movements, before and after the Protectorate, an important point of reference which would justify the demand, essential in their eyes, for a Parliament and a Constitution (dustur [q.v.]).


MUHAMMAD BEY — MUHAMMAD BEY 'UTHMÂN Dжалал

Egyptian writer (born ca. 1242/1826-7, died 1898), was the son of a court clerk, named Yusuf al-Husayni. When a boy he learned English, French and Turkish at the school of languages (Madrasat al-Aslan) and when only 16 was given an appointment in the government translation bureau (Kalâm al-tarjama). His patron, the director of the bey, had him appointed to the Conseil de Médecine (Madjîs al-tibbî) in 1273/1856-7. After a succession of posts, in 1280/1863-4 he entered the War Ministry (divân nizîrat 'umûm al-dîghâhîyya) and five years later the Ministry of the Interior (divân al-dîghîhîyya); some of his translations of military manuals have been published. In Cairo he published in 3 vols., 1287/1869, the short-lived newspaper Nuzhat al-akhîrî. In 1879 the Khedive Tawfik Pasha [q.v.] appointed him as translator to his court (ma'nîya) and several times took him to accompany him on journeys in Upper and Lower Egypt. After the death of the Khedive he was appointed a judge in the Mixed Courts in Alexandria and also in Cairo. In 1895 he was pensioned and he devoted himself to literary work, translating, amongst other works, Boileau's mock-heroic poem Le Lutrin and his didactic poem L'Art poétique, the plays of Corneille Le Cid and Les Trois Horaces and the three Curtius into the vernacular, and Racine's Athalie.

He published a sketch of the history of Muhammad 'All [q.v.] in collaboration with Clot Bey, an elementary grammar in verse of the Arabic and French languages and also a description in rhyme of his journey with the Khedive Tawfik. He devoted much of his time to translation of poetry: first of the fables of La Fontaine, the romance of Bernardin de Saint-Pierre Paul et Virginie, and of Racine's tragedies Alexandre le Grand, Esther and Iphigenie (al-Riwa'iyat al-mafâdî fi 'ilm al-tâdrîjîdî, [Iskandar al-akbar, I tâdrîjîdî al-yahudîyya, and I'îghîyya], Cairo 1311/1893-4). He translated Paul et Virginie into an entire volume, and a translation of the Italian opera employing zadrâl in his translations of La Fontaine and Racine. In 1870 his translation of Rossini's opera Il Barbieri di Siviglia as Muzayyn Şkhâwiî, together with another opera, possibly Donizetti's La Favorite, had been published in Cairo. But his real importance lies in his endeavours to translate Molière's comedies into the modern Arabic vernacular of Egypt, freely adapting them to Arab conditions.

(4) Tartuffe under the title al-Shaykh Matîfî, Cairo 1290/1873, which Vollers edited under the title El ild Matîfî (cf. ZMDG, xlvi, 36 ff. and thereon Socin, in ibid., xlvi, 330 f.); (b) Madrasat al-aswâdî (l'Ecole des maris), translated and published by M. Sobernheim, Berlin 1896; (c) al-Nisâ'î al-sâlimî (les Femmes savantes), transcribed and translated by A. Rayt, Beirut 1964; (d) Matâsa to the rab bi-âkhdr mulûk Tunis wa-âhîd al-amâd, published in part in the Cairo fortnightly magazine, Rojavaï al-madîrîsî al-mîrjîyya, 2, 3 (Friday, 15 Safar 1288/[5 May 1871]), 1-4; 5 (Saturday, 15 Rabî' I[3 June 1871]), 5-7; 8 (Monday, 15 Rabî' II[4 July 1871]), 9-12. His own play on Egyptian domestic life, in the vernacular, al-Khadddâmîn wa l-mukhaddâmîn was published posthumously in Cairo, 1322/1904. The first four plays, published as al-Abîs' riwa'iyat min nukhâb al-tîsyyarî, Cairo 1307/1890, were republished by Muhammed Yusuf Na'mîn, al-Masrah al-arabi, divâdî wa-nussî 4. Muhammed 'Uthmân Djalâl—al-khûmâydiyya, Beirut 1964, with Riwa'iyat al-mukhâddâmîn and Riwa'iyat al-ûkhalîdî. Though two of his collections of poetry, a divân in honour of Tawfik and another on the last Russo-Turkish war, were not published, his popular poems were lithographed: Himî zadrâl mu'rûbâbî ghaflî wa-nasâyîsî wa-tântîsî, n. p., n. d.; Himîlay zadrâl. Ahâdâmîhî fi 'l-akhir wa l-thânî fi l-ma'kalîtî, Cairo n.d.; Himîlay zadrâl fi l-makâyifîsî, n. p., n. d., and Himîlay zadrâl. Ahâdâmîhî fi 'l-ghîr wa l-âsadîbî bida'îsî wa-fâsîdî sâ'âdîshî wa l-akhir fi wa l-ûfûdî, Cairo n.d.

These publications, together with his plays, were all initially published anonymously under the initials M. 'D.'

His adaptations of Molière may have been first-per-
formed in Egypt in the early 1870s by the troupe of the pioneering Egyptian dramatist Ya'qub Sanûd [see M. SOBERNHEIM—P.C. SADGROVE]). Some were presented after their publication with the active encouragement of the Khedive 'Abd al-Hamîd II [q.v.] and then from time to time until there was a revived interest in their production in the 1950s and 1960s. These plays were for a time successful, but the audiences later cooled in their response to them, because lacking songs they gave no opportunity for the leading actor-singer of the era Salâma Hûdjâzî to show off his musical talents. 'Respectable' circles were not much attracted by these productions translated as they were into the vernacular; to them this language did not appear cultured enough.


(M. SOBERNHEIM—P.C. SADGROVE) MUHAMMAD DAWûD KHÁN (1909-78) first president of Afghanistan.

His father was Sâdîr Muhammad 'Azerî, the half-brother of Muhammad 'Abbâd Shâh. Dâwûd was educated at Amâniyya School, Kâbul, and in France. In 1931 he entered the army, was created major-general in 1932 and from then until 1974 held various military commands and provincial governorships. In 1947 he became minister of defence in the government of his uncle, Shâh Mahmûd, resigned and returned as minister of the interior, 1949-50. From 20 September 1955 until 9 March 1964 he served as prime minister. During this period he pushed a policy of economic development (first five-year plan, 1956), notably road construction, and of social change (unveiling of women, 1959). He ruthlessly suppressed tribal opposition in Khošt [q.v.] and religious hostility in Kandahâr [q.v.]. In foreign affairs he followed a non-aligned policy, supported the Pakistanistân campaign which led to friction with Pakistan, and inaugurated closer relations with the USSR, Bulgaria and Khurschhev visited Kâbul in December 1955 and substantial Soviet economic and military aid commenced in 1956. The dispute with Pakistan led to the closure of the frontier and economic difficulty for Afghanistan; the export of fruit and nuts was obstructed and attempt to use the Soviet route only partially successful. Economic discontents and resentment of his autocratic style contributed to his resignation under stress from the King and to the ouster of the members of the Muhammadiy family. For the next ten years he lived in retirement.

Dâwûd returned to power following an almost bloodless coup on 17 July 1973. The monarchy was abolished in favour of a republic and Zâhir Shâh's holiday in Italy turned into exile. The coup was the consequence of the difficulties of the constitutional régime, inaugurated in 1965, caused by deadlock between the bureaucratic reformers and the maqâlîs, the dissatisfaction of the growing numbers of students, graduates and army officers, and the economic problems caused by a three-year drought. Dâwûd launched a very ambitious economic programme in 1965, but could find no other state willing to finance it in full. He did, however, develop closer relations with Persia and the Gulf states, and after an early period of friction with Pakistan over the Pashtunistân question he improved relations with that country. Dâwûd established a single party (the National Revolutionary Party, 1975), selecting all members of the central committee himself. On 30 January 1977 a Loya Dîrjâ [see M. SOBERNHEIM—P.C. SADGROVE] approved a new constitution which established a one-party presidential system. Dâwûd was chosen president for six years. Dâwûd's régime was run by his friends and close relatives. At the outset, Dâwûd had some support from members of the Parâmân faction of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA), but he dismissed them in 1974. Opposition to his government came from fundamentalist Muslims, who launched an unsuccessful armed uprising in 1975. Dâwûd was eventually overthrown by a military coup on 27 April 1978 in which he and his family and close confidants were killed. His régime was succeeded by the rule of the PDPA.


(M.E. YAPP) MUHAMMAD DIAJâFAR KARADJÀ-DAGHÌ, Mîrzâ, Munshî of the Kajdar prince Djalîl al-Dîn Mîrzâ and translator into Russian of the famous comedies of the Adhârâyâdîgân playwright Mîrzâ Fath 'Ali Akgündâzõ [q.v.]. After they had been published (1859), Mîrzâ Fath 'Ali sent a copy of his plays to the above-mentioned Kajdar prince in the hope that he would take notice of it. But the book lay unheeded for years in the prince's library until Muhammad Diajfar opened it by chance. The mûnjâr, delighted with the plays, at once decided to translate them into Persian. As no-one would help him, he was forced to print the translation at his own expense, which brought him into considerable financial difficulties. The translation appeared in lithograph in Tehran in 1874 under the title Tâmbîlî. When the work was finished, Muhammad Diajfar corresponded with the author and found out that they were related. The Persian translation is of the greatest importance for the history of Persian theatre, as it gave the stimulus to the composition of original works. The influence of Akgündzdæ on the work of Malkôm Khân [q.v.] and even on more recent dramatists, such as Mâhûndî, is quite apparent.
Adharbaydjanisms. It is remarkable that European orientalists first became acquainted with Adhundzade’s works in their Persian dress and published a considerable number of these translations (see Bibliography) as translations of the Adharbaydjanian Persian, although, in view of their linguistic defects, the translations cannot by any means be regarded as models of the living Persian language.


MUHAMMAD AL-DJAWFDI [see DJAWFDI, Muhammad]

MUHAMMAD DJAYASI [see Malik Muhammad DJAYASI]

MUHAMMAD FARID BEY v. AHMAD FARID PASHA (1824-1338/1867-1919), Egyptian nationalist politician, active in the first two decades of the 20th century.

Of aristocratic Turkish birth, he had a career as a lawyer in the Ad 설정 courts and then as a supporter of Mustafazâ Kamîl Pasha [q.v.], leader of the nationalist opposition to the British protectorate over Egypt and founder in 1907 of the National Party (al-Hizb al-Watan). [see Hz. i. In the Arab lands]. When Mustafazâ Kamîl died at the beginning of 1908, Muhammad Farid succeeded him as leader of the party, but being by temperament averse from the rough-and-tumble of politics, effective leadership in the party passed to a demagogue, Shavkh âbd al-’Aziz al-Shâhîw or al-Djâwîsh, a former inspector in the Ministry of Public Instruction and one-time lecturer in Arabic at Oxford University. Al-Shâhîw made the nationalist organ al-La’id [see al-Najjara, i. Arabic language press. A. Middle East] a strident mouthpiece for Fan-Islamism. He wished to get rid of Coptic elements in the nationalist movement and make it purely Islamic, taking a prominent role in the communal strife between Muslims and Copts in 1910-11. It was not surprising therefore that by 1914 the prestige of the party had been lowered in the eyes of its more responsible supporters and much of the goodwill from its founder, Mustafazâ Kamîl, dissolved. Positive achievements, however, of Muhammad Farid were seen in his efforts to rally left-wing support for his cause outside Egypt, especially in Britain, and his carrying of the movement to the urban proletariat of Egypt; he recognised the future importance of trade unions and encouraged the formation of a union of railway workers in 1909 and one of manual workers in industry in 1911.

During the First World War, Muhammad Farid, still the official leader of the Nationalist Party, was an exile in Europe, principally in Geneva and Berlin, thus lowering the party’s standing as a force in the movement for independence after the War, whose leader was in fact be Sa’d Zaghûl Pasha [q.v.], associated rather with the Umma Party of moderate and secular reform. Muhammad Farid himself died in 1919 in Berlin.

Muhammad Farid was also an adîb, the author of historical works on the Khedivial house, the Ottoman empire and the Romans, and of a book on his travels 1901-4 in North Africa, Italy, etc. (see Sarkis, Mu’âjam al-ma’âli‘i, ii, cols. 1685-6).


MUHAMMAD GHAWTH WADJI (1875-1954), unusually fertile Egyptian author, including of a ten-volume encyclopedia, Dar’at ma’ârîf al-karn ar-râhi’s ’asâhir al-Sîhrîn, “The encyclopaedia of the 14th/20th century”. As the title of this work indicates, Farid Wadji aspired to integrate modern knowledge into the classical system of Islam.

The same motive lies behind his Kur’an commentary, Râm z al-ikhâds al-Mushaf, “the Kur’an interpreted”. This commentary, printed in the margin of the text of the Kur’an, is divided into two parts. The first part, ta’fîr al-al-faza, contains what is usually called a commentary: simple explanations of rare words, analyses of syntactically complicated phrases, etc. The second part, ta’fîr al-ma’ârîn, paraphrases the meaning of the verse and contains expositions like “In this verse you read an unam- biguous prediction of things invented in the nineteenth and twentieth century!”, or “Modern science confirms this literally!”.

Wadji’s Kur’an commentary appears to be the first commentary in which exegetical preoccupation with modern natural history is just one aspect of Kur’an interpretation. His commentary is not deviated exclusively to ta’fîr ‘ilm al-râm z, but many earlier works like, e.g., those by Tantawi DjawharT (1870-1940), or later ones like those by, e.g., Hanafi Ahmad (ca. 1968).

For nearly twenty years (1933-52) Wadji was the editor-in-chief of the official journal of the Azhar University. W.C. Smith gives a classical analysis of the apologetic nature of the modernism of Wadji’s writings for this journal, and contrasts this modernism with the more traditional piety which is rep- resented by al-Sayyid Muhammad al-Khidr Husayn, who preceded Wadji as editor of the Azhar journal.

In his lifetime, Wadji took part extensively in the many debates that went on concerning the issues that were thought to be of great relevance to the defence of Islam: the authenticity of pre-Islamic poetry, the Kur’an interpretation of the Koran in modern Egypt, Leiden 1974, 46-7; Âbd al-Halîm Mahmûd, al-Hamdu li’llâhi hâdidî hâdîhî hayâtî, Cairo, Dîr al-Ma’ârîf [1976], 11-12; Muhammad Tahir al-Hasjîrî, Muhammad Farid Wadji, hayâtulu wa-‘l-‘âthdru, 6, Cairo 1970. (J.J.G. Jansen)

MUHAMMAD GHAWTH GWÂLÌYÂRÎ, Indian Sâfi saint. He was a descendant of the

(Bibliography: In addition to the references given in the article, see Sarkis, 1451; Brockelmann, S III, 324-5; W.C. Smith, Islam in modern history, Princeton 1957, 122-55; J.J.G. Jansen, The inter- pretation of the Koran in modern Egypt, Leiden 1974, 46-7; âbd al-Halîm Mahmûd, al-Hamdu li’llâhi hâdidî hâdîhî hayâtî, Cairo, Dîr al-Ma’ârîf [1976], 111-12; Muhammad Tahir al-Hasjîrî, Muhammad Farid Wadji, hayâtulu wa-‘l-‘âthdru, 6, Cairo 1970. (J.J.G. Jansen)

MUHAMMAD GHAWTH GWÂLÌYÂRÎ, Indian Sâfi saint. He was a descendant of the
famous Shaykh Farid al-Din 'At'ār [q. v.], his full name being Abu 'l-Mu'ayyad Muhammad b. Khāṭir al-Din b. La'if b. Mu'in al-Dīn Khāṭir al-Din b. Bāyazīd b. Farid al-Dīn 'At'ār. Some say that his great-grandfather Mu'in al-Dīn Kāttī came to India and died at Dāwpūr. One of his brothers, Shaykh Bahīlū, who was attached to the service of the Mughal emperor Humāyūn, fell in battle and lies buried at the gate of the fort in Bāyānā. According to his own statement, Muhammad Ghawth was born in 969/1562. He was a pupil of Shaykh Zuhūr al-Dīn Khāṭir al-Dīn b. Bāyazīd b. Farid al-Dīn. Some say that he inspired a great many literary undertakings (e.g. the printing of the Kur'ān with an interlinear Persian translation, concordance and index; the foundation of a press for printing in Roman characters; the establishment of the Mughārīya school; encouragement of the daily press, etc.) although after the appearance at Bombay of a satirical work by Shaykh Haṣhamī Shīrāzī, the censorship was established on the suggestion of Muhammad Ḥasan Khān.

The fact is that the number of works—often very useful—bearing the name of Muhammad Ḥasan Khān is very large. Without the help of "secretaries", some of these books could not have been undertaken. To Muhammad Ḥasan Khān is in any case due the honour of having suggested them. His principal works deal with the history and geography of Persia and are often in the form of almanacs. They are MirĀt al-buldān, i. two editions (1293, 1294, a dictionary of geography: letters a-lf-ā'; ii. 1295 (history of the first fifteen years of the reign of Nāṣir al-Dīn and calendar); iii. (years 16-32 of the reign of Nāṣir al-Dīn and calendar); iv. 1296 (geography: letters bā-l-dīn) and history of 1296). In the geographical portions we find quotations from Yākūt and European travellers, along with notes specially prepared by the local authorities (an extract from the MirĀt al-buldān. Ta'rīkh-i Bādāl wa al-ābādāl [history of the first and second centuries of the Hijra]). Subsequently, he returned to Gwālīyār where he died and was buried in 970/1562. Humāyūn is also said to have been a faithful follower of Muhammad Ghawth.

He was the author of several Sūfī works, the most popular of which is al-Qawsūqār al-khamsa in Arabic, which he completed in 956/1549 (see Brockelmann, II, 7), and of which he subsequently rendered into Persian with additional improvements. His other works are Kitāb-i maḥāzān, Bahār al-bayāt, and Mi'rāj-dāna. It is related that his ecstatic sayings in the Mi'rāj-dāna were condemned by the 'ulāmā of Gūjārāt, who passed orders for his execution, but that he was saved by the timely intervention of the above-mentioned Shaykh Wadhīh al-Dīn Shattārī.
Shīrāzī [see nā], who soon announced his own claim to be Raḵtī's successor and the bab al-imām. Acknowledging Shīrāzī's claim, Bushrūʾī was himself designated bab al-bāb and "the return of Muhammad". When Shīrāzī later (1848) assumed the title of kāʾīm, that of Bāb was transferred to Bushrūʾī. Bushrūʾī soon established an important centre for Bābis in Mashhad. During this period he regularly acted on Shīrāzī's behalf, and was widely regarded as his leading disciple.

Following trouble with the authorities, he and a band of armed followers left Mashhad in Shabābān 1264/July 1848. Their original intention may have been to rescue the Bāb from prison in Aḏharbāyjān, but by September they were forced to barricade themselves in the shrine of Shaykh Ābū ʿAli al-Fadl Taḥarṣī in Māzandarān province. Here Bushrūʾī led a spirited defence against provincial and state troops, ending with the surrender of the remaining Bābis in May 1849. He himself was killed in the course of a sortie on 9 Rabīʿ I 1265/2 February 1849. Few of his writings are extant.


MUHAMMAD HUSAYN HAYKAL (b 20 August 1888, d. December 1956), Egyptian writer of the first rank. He participated, with several of his contemporaries (al-ʿAkkād, al-Māzīnī, Tāhā Husayn, etc.) in the formation in his country of a liberal way of thought and a modern literature marked by attachment to Muslim values, the influence of Europe and consciousness of an Egyptian specificity.

Having graduated in law from Cairo in 1909, he won a scholarship to France, and in 1913 presented his thesis in law on "The Egyptian Debt". On his return from Cairo, he published in 1914 his first novel, Zyana, which he had written in France and which was to remain his masterpiece. Having become a barrister and professor in the Faculty of Law, he also practised journalism. At first he contributed to al-Siyāsa, then edited this newspaper in 1922, and founded the weekly al-Siyāsa al-ubahriyya (1926).

As a member of the party of al-Aḥrār al-dustūrīyān ("the constitutional liberals") he came to play a political role. He was to become minister (1937) and President of the Senate (from 1945 to 1950). He recounts this part of his activity and his concerns in his memoirs: Mudhakkirāt fi l-siyāsa al-мisriyya (2 vols., 1951-3). But above all he was an intellectual, a writer whose production is of interest in two fields: literature, with which he was involved as a practitioner and critic; and Muslim religion, of which he speaks as a convinced believer and as a modern man.

To the first category belong the thesis on Jean-Jacques Rousseau which he presented to the University of Cairo (1st ed. vol. i, 1921, vol. ii, 1923), and his collection of essays Fi awkāt al-faraj (1925), which was to be followed by a more systematic exposé, revised and corrected, of his literary ideas under the title of Thavrat al-adab (1933). Nor should one forget his second novel Hākdhā ḥawlikat ("She is thus") which appeared a few months before his death (1956).

In the second category must be cited his Hayāt Muhammad Ḥādī (1944), a life of the Prophet of Islam which is respectful of the most reliable Muslim tradition and at the same time conforms with the requirements of modern learning—notably echoing La vie de Mahomet of E. Dermenghem, Paris 1929, and The Life of Muhammad of Sir William Muir, Edinburgh 1923 (see A. Wessels, A modern biography of Muhammad, Leiden 1972). After having dealt with the site of the founder of Islam, Haykal also applied himself as an historian to the biographies of its first three so-called "Orthodox" caliphs: Ābū Bakr (1942), ʿUmar (1945), and ʿUṯmān (only to be published in 1964, after Haykal's death). Finally, let us mention the account of his own pilgrimage which he wrote in 1937, Fi mondī al-faraj al-wāḥid (1938).

In all his work, Haykal appears as a man endowed with a great capacity for work and assimilation, capable of constantly starting afresh. As a good student of Renan, he begins by doubting the creative capacities of the Semites in literary matters and keeps his distance from Arabism; like Lutfī al-Sayyid [q.v.], he extols an "Egyptian national literature"; the excavations of Upper Egypt demonstrate the importance of Pharaonic civilisation, the revolution of 1919 revealed a people to itself, what need is there to dissolve in a larger Arab-Islamic group? But his Life of Muhammad, matched by the prefaces of its first two editions and the two essays which serve as its conclusion (Muslim civilisation as it appears from the Kurʿān and Orientalists and Muslim civilisation), asserts that he has chosen his camp, Islam and Arabism, but without sectarianism and with the conviction that the project of the whole of humanity can come only from Islam. He also changes his master in European thought. Neither Renan nor Taine suit him any more; only Bergson can bring him this spiritualism, so familiar to Islam, that the West, positivist and materialist, ignores almost completely.

Rousseau seems to have retained all his old prestige in his eyes. Does he not recognise in him an exceptional stature in the thesis which he devotes to him, by making of him a kind of prophet of modern times? And above all, does Zaynāb not originate from La nouvelle Hélène placed in a different setting? This double denunciation of the misery of the peasant and the distress of the woman constitutes a promising start for the Arab novel, of which it is the first real manifestation. Despite all its faults, the novel actually keeps today all its value, but remains without posterity in Haykal's work. The second and final novel that he wrote, a short time before his death, does not excite our pity for the fate of an oppressed woman, but arouses our indignation against a dominating woman who does exactly what she wants, subjugates and buries her two successive husbands and maintains excellent relations with God. So here things have completely changed. This does not owe so much to Rousseau as one might think, but more to Nietzsche.

Furthermore, between these two works, which, more than forty years apart, form the whole production of Haykal, the difference of technique is also evident. If Zaynāb is characterised by the peasant stamp, the multiplicity of the poles (the author, the hero, the two heroines) and by the attempt to impose the Egyptian "national" dialect as the language of the dialogue, Hākdhā ḥawlikat, on the contrary, is from beginning to end the monologue of a modern woman narrator who expresses herself in a fushā which, in the event, perfectly suits the suggested settings: a manered and affected woman's boudoir, a psycho-analyst's couch and a mystic's oratory.

MUHAMMAD HUSAYN HAYKAL — MUHAMMAD 'IZZAT DARWAZA

Fadjr al-kissa al-misriyya, Cairo n.d.; A. Hourani, Arabic thought ... of
Palestine. Al-Tafsir al-hadith (Cairo 1962, 12 volumes), arranged in chronological order of revelation of the

The inscriptions on the masajids to have been written by him were finished in India. That he spent the remainder of his life in India is evi-
cdent from the fact that most of the manuscripts known are said to have been his masterpieces, but unfor-
tunately they have been almost entirely destroyed by earthquakes. After completing these inscriptions, he made the obligatory pilgrimage to Mecca and on his return devoted himself exclusively to copying the masterpieces of Persian poetry. A Dilawir of the Persian poet Amir Shāh from his pen is in the Cam-
bridge University Library.

Bibliography: Cl. Huart, Les calligraphes et les miniaturistes de l’orient musulman, Paris 1908, 237;
E.G. Browne, A Catalogue of the Persian manuscripts in the Library of the University of Cambridge, 1899, no.
265, p. 353; Mīrzā Ḥabīb, Kočhū tāshkīčān, Isfahān 1306; Ta’līqī, ‘Alamdarī-yi Ḥabīb, Tehran 1314, 126; Ch. Rieu, Catalogue of the Persian manuscripts in the British Museum, 1872a, 783a, 785a.

MUHAMMAD IBN AL-KISHID [see ibn al-
KHISHID].

MUHAMMAD ISMA‘īL b. ĀBD AL-QĀNĪ AL-
SHARĪ‘Ī, Mawlānā, religious leader of Muḥalim
India, was born on 28 Shawwal 1196/6 October
1782, of a Dihl family that traced its origin to the caliph ʻUmar. He was a nephew of the famous Mawlānā ʻAbd al-Alżīz (d. 1239/1823-4). Having lost his father early, he was brought up by his uncle Mawlānā ʻAbd al-Kaḍīr (d. 1242/1826-7). In childhood he was inattentive to his studies and fond of swimming in the Djamna, but thanks to a retentive memory and a keen intellect he later on became a learned man.

Being shocked at the ḥarż or idiotarous trends then prevailing among Indian Muslims, he zealously preached the purified and reformed doctrines of Islam. Impressed by the religious sanctity of Sayyid ʻAbd al-Brāwī [q.v.] al-Muṭṭaḍidd, he became his disciple and his constant companion. In 1236/1821 they went to Mecca and then to Istanbul, where they were received with marked consideration. Six years later, on their return to Dihl, they gained many followers. In 1243/1827 they with many disciples went to Peshāwar and declared a religious war against the Sikhs. But owing to some innovations introduced into the usages of the Afghāns, their power declined and during a retreat they perished in a skirmish with the Sikhs in 1247/1831. He is the author of the following works:
1. Rissāla fī Usūl al-fikh, a treatise on the principles of Islamic law according to the Hanafi school;
2. Manṣūb-i imām, a Persian treatise on the imāmate;
3. Tahātta, an Urdu treatise on theology (printed 1295, Eng. tr. Mir Shahamat Khan, C. Rieu, JRAS, xiii, 316);
4. Shal al-mustakīm, a treatise in Persian on the doctrines of Islam.

Bibliography: Siddīk Hasan, Ībād al-nubūd‘al, 416; Sayyid ʻAbd al-Khān, Ābār al-sandād, ii, 97;
JRAS, xiii, 310. (M. HIDsAYET HOSSAIN)

MUHAMMAD ISMĀ‘ĪL SHAHID [see Ismā‘īl
SHAHI].

MUHAMMAD 'IZZAT DARWAZA (OF DAR-
WAZA), an advocate of Arab nationalism and a prominent figure in Palestinian national struggle during the British Mandate (1917-48), was born in Nābulus in 1305/1888 to a middle-class mercantile family.

The family name is derived from darwa, “to sew, stitch”, because his forefathers were tailors and braid weavers. In 1905, having graduated from high school, he joined the Ottoman post office. Having become disillusioned with the Young Turk Revolution of 1908, he became an active supporter of Arabism and Arab nationalism; he joined radical political groups, such as the Party for Decentralisation (hīz bīl-lā tarkashayya) and the Arab Youth Society (qam‘yya al-fatā‘al-arabīyya, often called al-ʻatīq), and at times supported militant ideology. From May 1919 to March 1920, he served the central body of al-ʻatīq, which was for all practical purposes the official party and backbone of Amir Faysal b. Šarīf Husayn’s [q.v.] provisional government in Damascus (1918-20), as its secretary. When the latter was deposed by the French, Darwaṣa went back to Nābulus and played a major role in the Arab national movement against the British mandate and Jewish immigration. He was a close associate of the Muftī al-Hāḏīq Amin al-Husaynī [q.v.], the chairman of the Supreme Muslim Council (al-maglis al-islāmiyya al-šarī‘iyya), and served him first as the head of Nābulus awkad and later as the manager of the Palestinian awkad. He also administered the Nadjah National School in Nābulus since its inception in 1922 as its principal, where he taught Arab history and wrote a number of history textbooks. Following the Palestinian unrest of 1936 while he was in Damascus, the British declared the Arab Higher Committee (al-lāğna‘ al-ʻarabīyya al-ʻalā‘), and stripped the Muftī of his chairmanship of the Supreme Muslim Council; hence Darwaṣa was barred from returning to Palestine. From 3 June 1939 to November 1940, he was imprisoned by the French military authorities on the pretext of inciting people against the British. After he was released by the Syrian forces, but unable to return to his country, he left for Turkey and resided there until the end of 1945. Still barred from entering Palestine, he lived in Damascus until his death on 28 Shawwāl 1404/26 July 1984.

He was a prolific author and wrote more than thirty books, a number of them in several volumes, ranging from Arabism, Arab history, Arab nationalism, biography of the Prophet, ta’ṣīf, socio-economic and political problems of the Arabs, to the question of Palestine. Al-Taṣīr al-hadith (Cairo 1962, 12 volumes), arranged in chronological order of revelation of the
chapters, is his major work. It was preceded by al-Kur^dn ... was chief. He captured several places, but as he did not know the roads, Chatursal, with the help of Peshwa BadajT Rao,

chapters, is his major work. It was preceded by al-Kur^dn ... introduction to the former wherein Darwaza has outlined what he calls, "The exemplary method for understanding the Kur..."

is a remarkable educational background, the tafsir are highly acclaimed studies based primarily on the Kur^dn. He is also rightly regarded as a historian and his Haewa al-harakat al-arabiyya al-badhitija (Sidon n.d., or the revised and enlarged edition of its first volume as Nash^at al-harakat al-arabiyya al-badhitija, Sidon 1971), is a valuable work with first-hand information.

Bibliography: All the works, except his autobiography entitled Tis^ama 'im'm 1-fihay^at: 1888-1978, are published. The above biographical sketch is based on personal references found in his own works and information given by the writer by his son Zuhayr.

(1.K. POONAWALA) MUHAMMAD AL-KAD^IM, the twelfth imam according to the Ihna^a Ashar^iyya [q. v.] or Twelver Shi^a.

During the first period of occultation (al-ghayba al-kubra) that will last till the reappearance of the twelfth imam in eschatological times. Concerning the name of the twelfth imam, some sources claim that he was given the name of the Prophet, Abu 1-K^am Muhammad. According to other sources, however, the followers of al-Hasan b. 'Ali al-`Askari were explicitly forbidden to ask after the name of his son. Hence the established tradition in Shi^i literature to refer to the twelfth imam not by his proper name, but with the titles al-hujjat [q. v.] and sadh al-amr or sadih al-amam, highlighting his authority over the Shi^i community, or the titles al-mahdi and al-ka^im (al Muhammed), reflecting his eschatological function.


Muhammad Kazim himself became munshi to AwrangZeb [q. v.], and was entrusted with the compilation, and with this task. The history which he composed is known as 'Alamgir-nama; it begins with the departure of AwrangZeb from AwrangZabad in 1668/1675 and is brought up to 1678/1667. It was printed in the Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta 1865-8.

Bibliography: Khat^ Khan, Muntakhab al-bahub, ii, 210; Elliot and Dowson, History of India, vii, 174-180 (translated extracts from the al-Mas^udi's Kitab al-muqaddima); Nassau Lees, in JRAS, N.S., iii, 464; Ricu, Cat. of the Persian manuscripts Br. Mus., ii, 267a; Storey, I, 585, 1317. (M. Hidayet Hosain) MUHAMMAD AL-KHA^IR B AL-HUSAYN [see AL-KHA^IR, MUHAMMAD B. AL-HUSAYN].

MUHAMMAD KHAN BANGASH KARLANI, NAWWAB, styled Ghadafan Dar, was an Afghan chief of the tribe of Bangash. The city of Farrukhabad [q. v.] in what is now Uttar Pradesh, was founded by him in the name of his patron, the Mughal emperor FarrukhSiyyar. When Muhammad Shah [q. v.] became emperor of DihlI, he appointed him governor of Malwa in 1143/1730, but as he could not stop the repeated attacks of the Marah^ahs [q. v.], he was removed in 1145/1732 and appointed governor of Allahabad. Muhammad KhAN intended to reduce the Bundelas, of whom R^ajji ChautSRL was chief. He captured several places, but as he did not know the roads, ChautSRL, with the help of P^ehva B^ajji R^ao,
surrounded him suddenly with an army. The Nawwab took refuge in the fortress of Djaytgafh, whereupon his son, Kāsim Djang, having collected an army of Afghāns, marched to Djaytgafh and escorted his father in safety to Allāhhād. The imperial ministers then removed him from the governorship. He died in 1156/1743.


(M. Hidayet Hosain)

MUHAMMAD LĀRĪ [see LĀRĪ].

MUHAMMAD MĀDI [see Abu ‘l-‘Azāzīm, in Suppl.].

MUHAMMAD MAHDI KĀN [see Mahdī Kān Astārābādī].

MUHAMMAD MŪ‘AZZAM BAḤĀDUR SHAḤ [see Bahādur Shaḥ 1].

MUHAMMAD MUḤSIN AL-ḤĀDĪJJĪ. Son of Ḥādījjī Fayd Allāh, son of Āghā Faḍl Allāh, a rich merchant of Persia who came to India in the early part of the 12th/16th century, was born at Hūglī (Hooghly) in Bengal in 1143/1730. For a time, the Āghā resided at Murshidābād [g.v.] and carried on there an extensive mercantile business, but finding the rising port of Hūglī a more convenient centre, he finally settled there with his son Ḥādījjī Fayd Allāh.

Already settled at Hūglī was one Āghā Muḥtājhar, who, coming originally from Persia like Āghā Faḍl Allāh, had won his way at the court of Awrangzīb [g.v.]. That monarch had conferred upon him extensive dominions in Djīsdahr and other places in Bengal, and made him to bring order to the northern town of Sa[d]a and its region against Yu firids, local rebels and in the San[a] region. From 284/977 onwards Muhammad on several occasions faced a new enemy in ‘Abbāsid agents, and in Raqjab 290/June 903 he was captured by a Yu firird and imprisoned for several months. From 293/956 onwards Muhammad on several occasions faced a new enemy in ‘All b. Faḍl, the junior of two Ismā‘īlīsī Fāṣīdīs or agents who had been in Yemen since 268/881 but who only in 291/94 sought to expand into central Yemen [see al-Karmāṭī and Ismā‘īlyyya].

After his father died on 20 Dhu ‘l-Hijjad 298/19 August 911, Muhammad was chosen his successor on 1 Muharram 299/29 August 911 with the title al-Murtadā li-Dīn Allāh. However, frustrated by his great wealth which greatly helped his co-religionists in Bengal in the pursuit of education, he had never married and the death of his half-sister left him without near relatives. He was anxious that his great wealth should be put to good use after his death and consequently on 7 Safar 1221/26 April 1806 he signed a Deed of Trust, setting apart the whole of his income for charitable purposes in perpetuity. Ḥādījjī Muhammad Muḥsīn lived for six years after making this noble disposition of his property. For his own personal use, he had reserved only so much property as would bring him in about one hundred rupees a month. In 1227/1812 he died at the age of about eighty-two and was buried in the garden adjoining the Imāmābārdā which he had so splendidly endowed.


(M. Hidayet Hosain)

MUHAMMAD, Mu‘izz al-Dīn [see Muhammad b. Sam].


The year 278/891-2, that is given in an early source (al-Ifđda) as that of his birth, hardly accords with the chronology by his adult life (cf. Van Arendonk, Les Débuts, 140 n. 6). In 284/977 he accompanied his father on the latter’s second journey from his native Hīdżāz to Yemen, whence a delegation had invited him to bring order to the northern town of Sa[d]a and to establish his imamate there. Commencing the following year, Muhammad’s name appears frequently in the accounts of his father’s expanding political and religious authority. He was involved mainly in the San[a] region against Yu firīds, local rebels and ‘Abbāsid agents, and in Raqjab 290/June 903 he was captured by a Yu firīrd and imprisoned for several months. From 293/956 onwards Muhammad on several occasions faced a new enemy in ‘All b. Faḍl, the junior of two Ismā‘īlī Fāṣīdīs or agents who had been in Yemen since 268/881 but who only in 291/944 sought to expand into central Yemen [see al-Karmāṭī and Ismā‘īlyyya].

After his father died on 20 Dhu ‘l-Hijjad 298/19 August 911, Muhammad was chosen his successor on 1 Muharram 299/29 August 911 with the title al-Murtadā li-Dīn Allāh. However, frustrated by his great wealth which greatly helped his co-religionists in Bengal in the pursuit of education, he had never married and the death of his half-sister left him without near relatives. He was anxious that his great wealth should be put to good use after his death and consequently on 7 Safar 1221/26 April 1806 he signed a Deed of Trust, setting apart the whole of his income for charitable purposes in perpetuity. Ḥādījjī Muhammad Muḥsīn lived for six years after making this noble disposition of his property. For his own personal use, he had reserved only so much property as would bring him in about one hundred rupees a month. In 1227/1812 he died at the age of about eighty-two and was buried in the garden adjoining the Imāmābārdā which he had so splendidly endowed.


(M. Hidayet Hosain)

MUHAMMAD MURTADA B. MUHAMMAD B. 'Abd al-Razzāk Al-Husayni al-Zabidi Al-Hanafi, Abu '1-Fayd, Arabic scholar

Following the year 1191/1777 he drew a pension from the Kāmūs, in which, in addition to explaining words he devotes special attention to establishing traditions quoted by al-Kāmūs, it was printed at Fas in 1301-4 in 13 vols., and his fame spread to the Sudan and even to India. From the year 1191/1777 he drew a pension from the Kāmūs.

During this period, Nasser was cleverly manoeuvred to take over supreme power as soon as possible. Although prime mover of the RCC, he had allowed the limelight to fall on Nadjib, who was showing signs of independent action. He was popular with the Egyptians and certain that it was the result of the political situation in Egypt was ripe for revolution.

Nasser now came to the fore as a leader of maturity and was used by Nasser for a time but was never the real power in the movement. It was he who was appointed commander of two infantry brigades fighting in Palestine against the recently founded Israeli state. The Egyptian army was ill-trained and poorly-equipped, and was unable to put up much resistance against the Haganah. Two Egyptian soldiers did distinguish themselves in the fighting, however, the young 'Abd al-Nāṣir [q. v. in Suppl.] (Nasser) and the older Muhammad Nadjib. In December 1948 the latter went to the Arab Liberation front in Syria, and Nadjib's popularity rose. He was for a time pronounced dead until emergency measures saved him. He returned from Palestine bitter at the defeat of the Egyptians and certain that it was the result of government corruption and inefficiency. Younger officers began to visit him in an attempt to bring him into their plans for a coup against the discredit régime. Although Nasser was the obvious leader of these men, the support of Nadjib was sought as an older figurehead. In 1949 the Committee of the Free Officers’ Movement was constituted with Nasser as chairman and with Nadjib joining them later. By 1951 the political situation in Egypt was ripe for revolution and the Free Officers were planning their coup, which they carried out on 26 July 1952. This move caused demonstrations of the political situation in Egypt was ripe for revolution and the Free Officers were planning their coup, which they carried out on 26 July 1952.

The Free Officers had come to power with no very clear idea of their political goals. Nadjib first favoured the return of the army to the barracks and the appointment of civilian politicians, but when these latter failed to co-operate he himself became prime minister, war minister, commander-in-chief and chairman of the Revolutionary Command Council. In June 1953 the monarchy was abolished and Nadjib became prime president and prime minister, with Nasser as his deputy.

During this period, Nasser was cleverly manoeuvred to take over supreme power as soon as possible. Although prime mover of the RCC, he had allowed the limelight to fall on Nadjib, who was showing signs of independent action. He was popular with the people but did not have a wide power base. Nasser and most of the Free Officers forced him to resign in February 1954. This move caused demonstrations of the Popular Support for Nadjib and the threat of a split in the army. Nasser had acted too soon and the support of his own position. Consequently, he had to allow Nadjib to return temporarily as prime minister until April, when Nasser finally demonstrated his
abilities by mobilising both country and army behind him. Nadjib was thus outmanoeuvred, dismissed again and placed under house arrest 1954-71. He was released by Sadat after Nasser's death and lived his life quietly in Cairo until he died in 1984.


**MUHAMMAD PANAH.** Mír, a second cousin of Gházi 'l-Dín Khan, Firúz Djang (II), was the eldest son of Nizám al-Mulk 'Asaf Díjáh I and a grandson of Gházi 'l-Dín Khan, Firúz Djang I, Indo-Muslim noble of the late Mughal period. He grew up at the court of Muhammad Sháh [q.v.], the Moghal emperor of Díhlí and on attaining his majority was married to a daughter of the minister, Píntád al-Dawlá Kámár al-Dín Khán (not to be confused with Cín Kál Khan, Nizám al-Mulk [q.v.], who also bore the same name). He started his official career as Bakhtáshí of the Ahabídís and on his father's departure for the Deccán in 1153/1740 to reduce to obediency and submission his second son, Mír Aḥmad Khán Násír Djang, who had been acting as deputy viceroy of the Deccán during the absence of Nizám al-Mulk at Díhlí, and had raised a revolt, he was left behind at Díhlí as Nizám al-Mulk's representative at the imperial court as Mír Bakhtáshí of the empire. Soon afterwards he was invested with the titles of Gházi 'l-Dín Khán, Firúz Djang, once held by his grandfather. In 1164/1750, the title of Amir al-Umára, which had been conferred on Sádár Khán Díjáh 'l-Fakár Djang on the death of Nizám al-Mulk (1161/1749), was also conferred on him. On his brother Násír Djang's assumption of the viceregency of the Deccán, in supersession to his claim as the eldest son of Nizám al-Mulk, he joined hands with the Márāthá Pégwá Bálághí Bádúí Ráíî for dispossessing his brother. Having failed to persuade the king of Díhlí to assign him the disputed viceregency, he decided to settle the issue by force and after having promised to pay the Maráthás six million rupees for their help, started from Díhlí in 1165/1752. His plans were, however, nipped in the bud as he was poisoned to death by his stepmother soon after his arrival in Awarángábád. His dead body was carried to Díhlí where it was interred in the mausoleum of his grandfather. He was a mild person with a scholarly bent of mind; an unambitious man, he lacked the qualities of a good military commander or a statesman.


**MUHAMMAD RIDÁ ʿISHKI [see ʿISHKI, in Suppl.].**

**MUHAMMAD RIDÁ (RIZA) SHAH PAHLAWÍ, son of Rídá Khán [q.v.] and Tádí al-Mulk, daughter of Tímúr Khán mír-pánjí ("brigadier"); born 1919, died 27 July 1980, second and last sháh of the Pahláwí [q.v.] dynasty of Iran. At the coronation of his father on 25 April 1926, Muhammad Ridá was formally invested as Crown Prince. After primary education at a school established by his father then minister of government officials and military officers, he was sent in 1931 to a private school in Lausanne; the following year, he was transferred to Le Rosey boarding school at Rolle, Switzerland, and in 1936 he returned to Tehran, where he spent two years at the Military College. On 27 May 1938 the betrothal was announced of Muhammad Ridá and Fawziyya, daughter of Fuʿád I of Egypt (see Fauʿād al-awlewí); the marriage was formalised in Tehran on 25 April 1939.

On 25 August 1941 British and Soviet forces invaded Iran, and on 16 September Ridá Sháh abdicated; the same day, Muhammad Ridá took the oath to the Constitution, and was recognised as sháh by the British and Soviet governments on 19 September. Muhammad Ridá's pledge of cooperation with the Allied Powers removed the threat of direct rule of Iran by the latter, and the Sháh and his Prime Minister, Muhammad ʿAṭí Forúghi, worked to achieve the regularisation of the status of the occupying powers. Their efforts led to the signature on 29 January 1942 of the Tripartite Treaty of Alliance; this was followed on 1 December 1943 by the Tripartite Declaration signed by Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin, which changed the status of Iran from that of a neutral to that of an ally.

I. Domestic policies

During the Allied occupation (1941-6), the Sháh's "leverage was limited" (Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, *Answer to history*, Toronto and Vancouver 1980, 69) in the face of serious political and economic problems: first, the occupation had caused severe disruption to the Iranian economy; second, from the outset the Russians treated the five provinces in the Soviet zone as annexed rather than occupied; third, there was insecurity and disorder in the tribal regions of the country; fourth, the ʿulamá, whose activities had been restricted by Ridá Sháh, regained much of their political power, particularly, after 1947, under their populist leader Abu ʿl-Kásím Káshání [q.v.]; fifth, the Persian economy, reflected in the titter in 1941 under the name "Tudeh Party", soon became a force to be reckoned with; sixth, in the more liberal political climate after the abdication of Ridá Sháh, the Maglis (maglis-i shura-yi milli, "National Consultative Assembly") [see dyar. irán. v.] was torn by factionalism and frequently rendered impotent by lack of a quorum. Many parliamentary deputies "lacked sufficient understanding of... the meaning of parliamentarism" (Fakhreddin Azimi, *Iran: the crisis of democracy 1941-1953*, London 1989, 11). Governments were ephemeral (between August 1941 and June 1947, the longest term of office held by any Prime Minister was thirteen months; the shortest was two days).

Muhammad Ridá Sháh, both by virtue of his Swiss education and his personal inclination, initially favoured the development of constitutional democracy in Iran. However, the Persian Constitution of 1906-7 had not "adequately clarified the position of the executive within the body politic" (Azími, 13), and, faced with the "largely self-inflicted paralysis of the parliamentary system" (Azími, 119), the Sháh considered increasing his own executive powers. Before he had acted, the first of many attempts on his life was made on 4 February 1949. The would-be assassin, Fákhr Ārāī, was killed by the Sháh's security services, and the incident on which the Sháh banned as a result. Later, it became clear that Fákhr Ārāī's links with an extremist
religious group were of greater significance. Though few realised it at the time, the assassination attempt on Muhammad Rida Shah by the law of 11 July 1949,[q.v.] had been confiscated from private owners by Rida Shah. Ownership of these lands had been conferred by the landlords and their allies. On 9 May 1961 the Shah dissolved the Madjlis. Under the 1949 amendment to Article 48 of the 1906 Fundamental Law, the Shah was bound simultaneously to order new elections to be held as soon as the practical possibility would allow it. Under Article 43 but never convened. Of the sixty senators, half were to be nominated by the Shah (Articule 46). He had no formal body for the first time on 9 February 1950.

The years 1949-53 were marked by a continuing struggle for power between the Shah and the Madjlis, now dominated by Muhammad Musaddik [q.v.]. In 1950, the Shah established the Imperial Organisation for Social Services and transferred to it, for distribution to the peasants, some of the crown lands which had been confiscated from private owners by Rida Shah. Ownership of these lands had been conferred on Muhammad Rida Shah by the law of 11 July 1949, but on 9 May 1953 Prime Minister Musaddik compelled the Shah to return them to the state (Azimi, 325). These years were also marked by political violence. The extremist religious group Fida'iyân-i Islâm [q.v.] carried out a number of political assassinations; their victims included 'Abd al-Husayn Maghîrî, the minister of Court (November 1949), and the Prime Minister, General 'Ali Razmârâ (4 March 1951). Before his death, Razmârâ had signed on 19 October 1950 the first agreement concluded under President Truman’s Point Four Plan to provide technical aid to underdeveloped countries. Musaddik’s nationalisation of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company in 1951 plunged Iran into a political and economic crisis. By the middle of 1953, much of Musaddik’s support had eroded, and on 16 August the Shah served Musaddik with an imperial farman dismissing him from office and appointing General Fadl Allah Zâhidî Prime Minister. Musaddik arrested the officer who delivered the farman, and the Shah and the Empress Thurayyâ left the country, going first to Baghdad and then to Rome. Fighting broke out in the streets of Tehran between supporters of the National Front (a coalition of political parties led by Musaddik), the Tudeh Party, and the Shah. Musaddik went ahead with plans for the formation of a Council of Regency and the proclamation of a republic. On 19 August, pro-Shah supporters led by Zâhidî, and assisted financially by agents of the American Central Intelligence Agency (see K. Roosevelt, Counterguerrilla: the struggle for the control of Iran, New York, etc. 1979), restored order in the streets, and the Shah returned to Tehran on 22 August. Musaddik was placed under arrest; martial law was imposed; army officers who had joined the Tudeh Party were purged; and many prominent members of the National Front were arrested. Most of the last-named were released in 1954, and some formed the nucleus of the National Resistance Movement (Nahdat-i Mū'âvamat-i Millî).

The resolution of the oil dispute in November 1954 through the formation of a Consortium of British, Dutch, French and American oil companies enabled the Shah to adopt a policy of “positive nationalism” in contrast to the policies of Musaddik, which he perceived as essentially negative. This new policy he defined as “a policy of maximum political and economic independence consistent with the interests” of Iran (Mission, 125). The First Economic Development Plan of 1949, which had been aborted due to the lack of oil revenue after oil nationalisation, again went into high gear, and during the period of the Second Development Plan (1956-62) a number of major infrastructural projects were begun, including the hydro-electric facility of Keivâr. In April 1949, a specially convened Constituent Assembly revised Article 48 of the Fundamental Law of 1906 to empower the Shah to dissolve the Madjlis, and in May, the Madjlis passed a bill to establish an upper house, the Senate, which had been provided for under Article 43 but never convened. Of the sixty senators, half were to be nominated by the Shah (Articule 46). He had no formal body for the first time on 9 February 1950.

By 1957, the Shah considered that internal conditions had so far returned to normal that a limited degree of political activity was possible. Martial law was abolished, and a new organisation named Sâzanîn-i Ittildât wa Amniyyat-i Kishwar (“State Intelligence and Security Organisation”), SAVAK assumed responsibility for internal security. The Shah renewed his attempts to establish a Western-style parliamentary system; he created two artificial political parties, a “Government” Party (Millîyyân, “Nationalists”), and a “Loyal Opposition” (Mardum, “People’s Party”), but the plan predictably failed. The Shah was aware of the artificiality of the experiment, but believed that it “conceivably could prosper” (Hafez F. Farmayan, Politics during the sixties: a historical analysis, in Ehsan Yar-Shater (ed.), Iran faces the seventies, New York, Washington and London 1971, 91). However, the elections to the 20th Majlîs in the summer of 1960 and the winter of 1960-1 were more than usually subject to factionalism and fraught with electoral irregularities. In May 1961 the Shah, who had been critical of the conduct of the elections, appointed to the post of Prime Minister ‘Ali Aminî, an aristocrat (his mother was a Kâdîrî princess) and a former minister in the Musaddik government. The sceptics among the intelligentsia remained unconvinced about the Shah’s commitment to constitutional democracy. Aminî at once requested the Shah to dissolve the 20th Majlîs, on the ground that it had no credibility among the people and that no land reform would be possible while the Majlîs continued to be dominated by the landlords and their allies. On 9 May 1961 the Shah dissolved the Majlîs. Under the 1949 amendment to Article 48 of the 1906 Fundamental Law, the Shah was bound simultaneously to order new elec-
Elections to the 21st Majlis were finally held in September 1963; they were boycotted by the National Front, by the Tudeh Party, and by the Hisb-i Zuhnaqashgan ("Toilers Party"), a breakaway group from the National Front. In contrast to earlier parliaments, in which the landlord class had held anything from 66 to 90% of the seats, almost 70% of the deputies in the 21st Majlis were drawn from the new professional or bureaucratic middle class. Even more revolutionary was the fact that, for the first time since parliament was created in 1906, women voted in a general election, and six women were elected to the Majlis. On 15 December 1963, Hasan 'Ali Mansur, the leader of a group of young intellectuals and technocrats calling themselves the "Progressive Club" (Kumain-i Tarakhi), announced the formation of a new political party, the "New Iran Party" (Hisb-i Irani-i Nuvin). Since the Mardam Party was still in existence, a two-party political system appeared to be a real possibility. On 7 March 1964 the Shah appointed Mansur Prime Minister. The average age of Mansur's Cabinet was thirty-five years and, for the first time since 1947, a Prime Minister had the support of a majority of the members of parliament. On 21 January 1965 Mansur was shot and mortally wounded on the orders of Khomeini (Amir Taheri, Holy terror, 1974, 6th edn, 1987, p. 172). The process which accelerated the movement away from the land which had begun in 1946 (in that year, 75% of the work force was still engaged in agriculture; by 1966, the figure had dropped to 46%). Agricultural labourers, known as kushnai mudjhadin, displaced from the land by Phase III, and lured to Tehran by the hopes of higher wages, created a disgruntled urban proletariat which Khomeini and his followers could organise and use effectively. As principles added to the White Revolution programme between 1964 and 1967 included the formation of a Health Corps to provide basic health care in rural areas; five more were added between September and December 1975.

Opposition to the Shah's reform programme came from two powerful groups: the National Front, and the religious classes and their allies in the bazaar. The National Front heralded the Shah's proclamation of 11 November 1961, inaugurating the White Revolution, as a "return to despotism", and declared that the Throne and the Executive Power do not have the right of enacting laws (P.W. Avery, The Shah's proclamation on reform, in MEJ, xvi, 90). The "ulama" were averse to any extension of the Shah's executive power, and were fundamentally opposed both to land reform and to the enfranchisement of women. In February 1960, the leading muqaddas Muhammad Husayn Burujirdi had declared that "any step limiting the size of landed estates would be contrary to Islam" (A.K.S. Lambton, Land reform and the rural co-operative societies, in Ya-Sharer (ed.), Iran faces the seventies, 16); in particular, the "ulama" opposed the application of the land reform legislation to wakf lands under their control. On 26 January 1963, more than a quarter of a million women cast their votes in a referendum on the White Revolution, and the right to vote was formally granted to women by a Cabinet decree of 2 March 1963. On Ashura ['see Muham-ram; (AL)-Husayn b. Ali Abi Tali], 3 June 1963, the "ulama" organised violent demonstrations in Tehran which were suppressed by the security forces. One of the religious leaders arrested was Ribollah Mousawi Khomeyni [q.v.], who was sent into exile, first to Turkey, then to 'Irak; it was from the Shii centre at Najaf [q.v.] that Khomeyni began to plan the Islamic Revolution which was to overthrow the Shah in 1979.

Neutral policy

Muhammad Ridâ Shah falls into the category of world leaders who excel either in domestic politics or in foreign affairs, but not both. On foreign affairs and military matters, he was "remarkably well informed"
The announcement by the British Government in 1968 that it intended to withdraw all its forces from the Persian Gulf (1970). The Shah had created a powerful army in the region and from 1969 onwards the Shah was determined to strengthen Iran's regional security position by cultivating better relations with the "non-revolutionary" Arab states in the Gulf. The dispute over al-Bahrayn, a perpetual irritant in Iran-Arab relations, was resolved by the Shah in 1969; continental-shipment agreements were signed with Katar (1969) and Iraq (1970). Diplomatic relations with Egypt, broken off by President Nāsir in 1969, were resumed in 1970. The success of these policies was demonstrated in 1971. On 30 November Iran occupied three small but strategically important islands at the mouth of the Persian Gulf (Abū Mūšā and the Greater and Lesser Tumb, to which Iran and two of the Trucial Emirates laid claim), but the Arab League did not support 'Irāk's subsequent call for the severance of diplomatic relations with Iran.

The Shah's perception was that the assumption by Iran of a major part of Britain's former role as a "policeman in the Gulf" necessitated the build-up of Iran's armed forces. The failure of CENTO to come to the aid of Pakistan in its two wars with India in 1965 and 1971 convinced the Shah that Iran needed a "security perimeter" in the region. The 1972 Soviet-Irākī Treaty seriously alarmed the Shah, who therefore welcomed President Nixon's announcement the same year that the United States would rely on the "two pillars" of Iran and Saudi Arabia to maintain regional security in the Persian Gulf. The Shah's expenditure on arms during the 1970s intensified the opposition to him both within and without Iran. It should be noted, however, that there was a close relationship between the Shah's perception of the threats to Iran's security in the region and the military forces required to deal with them (for example, the Shah was not satisfied until he obtained from the United States an aircraft which was superior to the MIG 23s supplied to 'Irāk by the Soviet Union); that other Middle Eastern countries ('Irāk, Syria, Turkey, Israel) kept a proportionately larger number of men under arms; and that the US-Gulf Co-operation Council was devoted a far higher proportion of their GNP to defence spending. Above all, the Shah was determined to keep open Iran's economic lifeline through the Straits of Hormuz [see BAHR PARIS], and this concern led him to send troops in 1973 to aid the ruler of Umnān, who was battling against the Soviet- and Chinese-supported guerrillas of the "Popular Front for the Liberation of the Arab Gulf" in the province of Zufār. At the head of the Persian Gulf, control of the vital Shatt al-'Arab waterway, long a cause for dispute between Iran and 'Irāk (and for four centuries prior to the establishment of the British mandate over 'Irāk in 1920, between the Persians and the Ottomans), appeared to have been decided by the Algeris agreement of 5 March 1973. 'Irāk accepted the thalweg (the deepest channel of the river) as the new international boundary; in return, the Shah renounced his support for Kurdish nationalists in 'Irāk.

III. The failure of a dream

Muhammad Rida Shāh had staked the whole of his personal prestige, and indeed the institution of the monarchy itself, on the attempt to raise Iran from the ranks of under-developed nations to the status of newly-important rising regions of Asia such as South Korea, and to move Iran along the road to being a "Great Civilisation", a phrase he invented in 1972. Economic development was to be the key to this pro-
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cess. Plan III (1962-8), and Plan IV (1968-73) had achieved much, but Iran still had not reached the point of economic “take-off” (1963-72), the GNP had quadrupled; standards of health had risen dramatically, but, as a result, the population was growing at an alarming 3% per annum, and Iran was no longer able to produce all the food it required. In 1967 Dean Rusk announced the formal termination of U.S. economic aid; between 1953 and 1967 Iran had received $605 million in economic aid and another $112 million in food shipments under the “Food for Peace” programme. In 1967, the year in which the Shah considered his régime stable enough to permit his belated coronation, Khumayni, in an open letter to Prime Minister Huwaydāy, called upon the ‘ulamā’, students and members of bazaar guilds to “recognise their duty” to oppose the régime. In 1971, the Shah celebrated the achievements of the first decade of the White Revolution with ceremonies at Persepolis and Pasargadā. The Western media accused the Shah of “folie de grandeur”, and Mihdī Bāzārgān, who became Iran’s first Prime Minister after the 1979 Revolution, attacked his philosophy of “God-Shah-Country”, and insisted that religion and politics were indivisible (Nikki Keddie, *Roots of revolution: an interpretive history of modern Iran*, New Haven and London 1978, 214).

The Shah’s chance to achieve an economic breakthrough came in 1973, with the decision by OPEC (in which the Shah had played a major part) to quadruple the price of oil. Iran’s oil income, and thus the funds available for Plan V (1973-8), increased tenfold (see R.B. Stobaugh, *The evolution of oil policy, 1925-1975*, in G. Lenczowski (ed.), *Iran under the Pahlavīs, Stanford 1978*, 24 per cent, and income doubled in the three years 1974-7. The fall in demand for oil in mid-1975 caused economic upheaval in Iran. The flight of capital abroad began. The main beneficiaries of the Shah’s reforms had been the peasants and tribesmen, the armed forces and technocrats, industrialists, bankers, entrepreneurs, executives, government officials and middle-men (Parsons, 14-5). The economic downturn and soaring inflation between 1975-7 caused widespread discontent and disappointed popular expectations of steadily growing prosperity. The government’s measures in early 1978 designed to cool down a badly overheated economy came too late. At the same time, three important groups, the intelligentsia, the bazaar and the ‘ulamā”—the same groups which had brought over the priceless “ulamā”—the same groups which had brought victory, he repeatedly used the phrase: “When we assume power” (Parviz Radji, *In the service of the Peacock Throne*, London 1983, 177). By September 1978, the Shah had lost the initiative to the opposition, consisting of “rioting students, recalcitrant clerics, critical intellectuals, jealous aristocrats, provincial landlords, corrupt family members [frequent accusations of corruption were levelled against members of the royal family, but the Shah himself was untainted by corruption] and liberal democrats seeking reform” (J.A. Bill, *The Eagle and the Lion: the tragedy of American-Iranian relations*, New Haven and London 1988, 194). The death of Asad Allāh ‘Alam in 1978 had deprived the Shah of the last of the trusted advisers on whom he had relied so heavily (Manūčehr Ikhbāl had died in November 1977). By September 1978, too, the cancer which, it is now known, was first diagnosed in 1973, was far advanced. Parsons noted that the Shah’s “face was yellow, and he moved slowly. He seemed exhausted and drained of effort” (71). The climax came with the advent of Muharram 1399/December 1978. The Shah consistently refused to countenance the use of military force against the demonstrators, and so the morale of the army crumbled, as the Huysel mission, sent by President Carter, arrived in Tehran to dissuade the generals from carrying out a military coup. Four successive prime ministers and nine different ministers of information (1973-79) (Djamshīd Amūzgar, Shahīf-Imām, Aza‘ir and Bakhṭīyār), had no hope of controlling the situation, and on 16 January 1979 the Shah and the
Empress Farah left Iran for Egypt, where they were given sanctuary by President Sadat. On 22 September the Shah was admitted to the United States for surgery; on 15 December he and the Empress were moved to Panama, and on 23 March 1980 to Cairo, where the Shah underwent further surgery. He died there on 27 July 1980.

The overthrow of Muhammad Rida Shah meant not only the end of the Pahlawi dynasty but the rejection of that dynasty's policies of Westernisation and secularisation. It was Rida Shah who had created a secular educational and legal system; had taken the first steps toward the emancipation of women; had laid the foundations of an industrialised nation; and had created a rudimentary public health system. Muhammad Rida Shah continued and developed these policies, by combating illiteracy and providing health and educational services in rural areas; by enfranchising women; by liberating the peasants from an ancient tenurial system not far removed from serfdom, and by bringing into being a new professional middle class of technocrats and bureaucrats, most of whom had received their university education in the West. In regard to social policy, the Shah was a revolutionary, but the more revolutionary his policies, the stronger the opposition from the ulamad and other vested interests. The Shah rightly perceived the ulamad as the main obstacle to his plans for the development of the country, but fatally underestimated their ability to mobilise the masses politically against a ruler whom they branded as an enemy of Islam. Moreover, political reform lagged behind social reform, and the Shah's increasingly autocratic style of government alienated the intellectuals of the National Front, who disregarded the social and economic progress being achieved, and made the return to a more liberal and constitutional style of government, and the abandonment of the Shah's pro-Western stance, the conditions for their support of the regime. Their hand was strengthened by the support of university students within Iran (in 1941 there was only one university in Iran, the University of Tehran, founded in 1935; by the 1974-5 academic year there were 97 universities with an enrolment of some 55,000 students), and of the large numbers of Iranian students abroad, mainly on generous government grants. The students studied revolutionary movements in Algeria, China, Cuba and elsewhere, and read avidly the works of 'Ali Shari'ati, who fused Marxism and Islam into a revolutionary ideology. In November 1978 the leader of the National Front, Karim Sangiji, met Khomeini in Paris and accepted his terms. The resulting alliance between the intelligentsia, the students and the militant ulamad made the fall of the Shah inevitable.

In the final analysis, the Shah failed to achieve his dream of a prosperous, modernised Iran because he failed to carry his people with him. He allowed himself to become isolated from his people, and this isolation damaged and eventually destroyed the myth of the Shah's union with his people based on the mystique of the monarchy. A romantic, "he became the victim of his own public relations and believed his own romanticizing" (D. Harney, Some explanations for the Iranian Revolution, in Asian Affairs, 11 [O.S. No. 67, 1980], 141). When confronted by the Western media, his personal insecurity often made him seem arrogant and didactic, a weakness which his opponents exploited to the full. Yet he was sincere in his desire to see his country evolve, to cross the threshold from the Third World and enter into modern civilisation.

famine. The summer of 1867 brought cholera, and the following winter, an epidemic of typhus. The attempt at revolt by a brother of the bey led, in October 1867, to the execution of two elderly dignitaries without further ado, the constitutional guarantees having been suspended since the events of 1864. The prince who had revolted himself died in prison during the same month, probably poisoned, almost at the same time as 'Ali b. Ghidhâhum, the leader of the rebellion of 1864 [see Ibn ghhdm], in Suppl.]. Through these years, Khaznadar pursued his intrigues and financial plans. With successive conversions into more or less disguised new borrowings, the crisis of the Tunisian finances was aggravated from day to day. Long negotiations allowed the setting up in Tunis of an international commission whose tutelage of the Tunisian finances was defined by the decree of 3 July 1869. Khayr al-Din, president of this commission, was moreover charged, from January 1870, with the tasks of “Minister-Director”. He undertook an overhauling of the administration, which he pursued with more efficacy when he occupied the post of first minister of the bey from October 1873 to July 1877. Mustafa Khaznadar, convicted of misappropriating 2,000 bonds of the debt, had, in fact, to resign on 21 October 1873. During the four years of his government, Khayr al-Din attended to the scrupulous honouring of the financial engagements of the Tunisian state, while lightening the weight of the fiscal system. He reorganised the judicial system and fixed the regulation of its auxiliary branches. He defined the relations of landowners and workers in agriculture. He restored the value of the public œufs and organised the management of them within an autonomous administration called “Society” (Qâmîyya). He interested himself in teaching and created “a new school”, which he had named Sadikiyya in honour of the reigning bey, to give a modern training for the future officials of the state.

Nevertheless, he was not spared difficulties which were stirred up by the consuls of the European powers, anxious above all to obtain concessions and privileges for their nationals, and caused also by the intrigues of the bey’s entourage and particularly of his favourite Muṣṭafâ b. Ismâ‘îl. Khayr al-Din had to resign on 21 July 1877. He was replaced by a former official, Muhammad Khaznadar, and then a year later, by Muṣṭafâ b. Ismâ‘îl. The byzantine administration returned to its errors as in the time of Muṣṭafâ Khaznâdîr at the same time as the foreign consuls’ interventions became more pressing in favour of the often unwarranted demands of their nationals. This situation led in 1881, under the pretext of disorders on the Algerian borders, to the occupation of Tunisia by French troops. On 12 May 1881, Muhammad al-Sâdîk had to sign, at Kasser Said, the so-called Bardo treaty, by which he accepted this occupation and the protectorate of France. The resistance that these events aroused obliged the French army to multiply, until the last days of 1881, their expeditions of “pacification”. Contrary to the statements of certain official circles, it was actually a permanent occupation. The term “protectorate” did not appear, however, in the convention of Marsa that the French Minister-Resident, Paul Cambon, made ‘Ali Bey, brother and successor of Muhammad al-Sâdîk, sign on 8 June 1883. Muhammad al-Sâdîk died on 27 October 1892. Bibliography: Ibn Abî ‘l-Dîyâfî, ẖâfîd abî al-zamân bi-akhir mulîk Tunîs wa-‘ād al-amân, Tunis 1963-5, v, vi; Muhammad Bayram, ẖâfeet al-ṣâhîb bi-mustawahâ‘ al-āmîr wa l-‘āfîf, Cairo 1302/1884-5, ii; A. Abdesselem, Les historiens tunisiens, essai d’histoire des lettres, Paris 1973, index; J. Gagnage, Les origines du protectorat français en Tunisie (1861-1881), Paris 1959; M.S. Mzali and J. Pignon, Khâeredène, homme d’état, Tunis 1971; Ph. X. D’Estournelles de Constant, La politique française en Tunisie, le protectorat et ses origines (1854-1891), Paris 1891.

MUHAMMAD SA‘IĐ [see KHALED KHENDI-ZADE; MIR DJUMLA].

MUHAMMAD SA‘IĐ SARMAD, Indo-Muslim poet, mystic and free-thinker of the 11th/17th century, who was executed by the Mughal Emperor Awrangzîb [q.v.] for going about naked and holding heterodox views. Originally he belonged to a Jewish family of Khâdîn but, later, he embraced Islam and received instruction in philosophy from Mullâ Sâdîr Shîrâzî [q. e.] and Mirzâ Abu ‘l-Kâsim Firdowsî [q. v. in Suppl.]. In 1042/1632 he came to Sind as a merchant. In Thatha he fell in love with a Hindu youth and suffered such emotional disturbance that he gave up his vocation, went about stark naked and took to aimless wanderings in jungles. In 1057/1647 the author of the Dabistân-i madîhîh saw him in Haydarâbâd and sought his help in translating some portions of Persian poetry into Persian. He remembered by heart Christian and Jewish scriptures (Mir‘îr al-‘âlam, 594). Later, he reached Dihlî and his views brought him close to Dârâ Shukhî [q. v.]. He is reported to have predicted kingship for Dârâ. After the execution of Dârâ, Awrangzîb turned his attention to him. The kâdî ‘l-kuddî Mullâ ‘Abd al-Kâwî was ordered to enquire into and report about his religious views. He was summoned to the durbar and his free-thinking and his nude posture led the “ulamâ’ to order his execution in 1070/1659. A grave was built at the place of his execution, in front of the Dâmî Masjid of Dihlî.

Two literary works are attributed to Sarmad: (a) a collection of 23 letters, Rukk‘at-i Sarmad (Shâhshâhînî Press, 1926), and (b) Rûdîyyât-i Sarmad (ed. Nawâb ‘Ali Sahîh, Delhi 1928). Dihlî. According to the Dabistân, Sarmad cited Israëlite traditions in support of his nude living. He advocated a life free from physical pleasures and material struggles. He believed in Supreme Reality, rejected denominational approaches and lived a life in absorption in mystic contemplation. There is a ring of genuine sincerity in his verses which are soaked in cosmic emotion and reflect deep poetic sensitivity.


MUHAMMAD SA‘IÎD [see "INAYAT ALLAH KANNU].

MUHAMMAD SHÂH, the third ruler of the Kâjâr dynasty [q. e.], was born on 5 January 1808. He succeeded to the throne in 1834 on the death of his grandfather Fat’h ‘Ali Shâh [q. e.]. He was the eldest
son of 'Abbas Mirzā [q.v.]. His mother was the daughter of Muhammad Khan Beglarbegi Kādar Develu. He had two full brothers, Kāhramān Mirzā and Bahman Mirzā and twenty-three half-brothers. He died on 6 Šawwal 1264/4 September 1848 and was buried at Kum. His chief wife, the mother of Ųāṣir al-Dīn Shāh [q.v.], was Malik Dījamān Kānum, whose father was Muhammad Kāsim Kīān Zahir al-Dawlā b. Sulaymān Kādar Kuuwanlū ('Adud al-Dawlā, Tārīḫ-i 'Adudī, ed. 'Abd al-Husayn Nawāyī, Tehran (ākhbārdātī 1535-7, 244). Mirzā Negār Allāh Sadr al-Mārzā Ardadī, a Sūfī, was for a while tutor to Muhammad Mirzā, as he then was (Mīḥdī Bamdad, Māzāmā, p. 336). Subsequently, 'Abbas Mirzā entrusted the education of Muhammad Mirzā and others of his sons to Ḥādīḏī Mirzā Kākāšī, also a Sūfī, who had studied under 'Abd al-Samād Ḥamādānī and belonged to the Nūr 'Alī Shāh dervish order (Ḥamūt Nāṭīk, Ūstād-ī ṭarābātwī nī farhangī, London 1988, 12-13). The relationship of Muhammad Mirzā to Ḥādīḏī Mirzā Kākāšī continued to exercise great influence over him. Muhammad Mirzā and some of his brothers were taught French by 'Abādī Nāshī, a Frenchman who had been at the court of 'Abd al-ʿAzīz Kādār Kūwānlū (Adud al-Dawla, b. Sulāmān Kādar Kuwanlu (United Kingdom, Public Record Office, F.O.60:34. Henry Bethune to Backhouse, Tabriz, 20 September 1834, pte.).

After the resumption of the Russian war in 1826, Muhammad Mirzā was put in nominal command of part of the Persian forces and 'Abbas Mirzā sent him, with his brother Bahman, his mater of Sārdār, to retake Ḵandji and Ti firī. The force was defeated at Ḵandji; ʿAmīr Sārdār was killed and considerable casualties suffered (Bāmādād, op. cit., ii, 217, v, 179). Muhammad Mirzā held various provincial governments, though he probably had little direct experience of administration himself. At one period he was governor of Muṣīr on behalf of 'Abbas Mirzā (ibid., ii, 374). In 1231/1821 he was made governor of Ḥamadān in the sense that it was made part of his ʿawbedī dārm (the revenue allotted to him for his upkeep). He did not go to Ḥamadān but appointed Muhammad Husayn Kān Kāragozū governor, and on the latter's death in 1240/1824-5 he made his son Rūstām Kān governor (ibid., iii, 257-9).

In the autumn of 1833 'Abbas Mirzā, having put down the disorders in Kūhrāsān, asked Ḵaṭḥ 'Alī Shāh for reinforcements to attack Ḵarāṭ. Ṣaṭḥ 'Alī agreed to the expedition, but appointed Muhammad Mirzā to lead it and recalled 'Abbas Mirzā to the capital. This may have been because Ṭaḥt 'Alī considered it expedient, in view of his failing health, for 'Abbas Mirzā to be in, or near, Tehran. Muhammad Mirzā invested ʿArāt, but raised the siege on the death of 'Abbas Mirzā en route for Tehran in Ḵaghduh in November 1833 and returned to Ḵaghduh. Ṣaṭḥ 'Alī summoned him to Tehran, gave him command of 'Abbas Mirzā's troops and governments but did not immediately appoint him waʿfī 'ahd. He feared that such a step would be a sign for civil war between his sons. Meanwhile, Russia declared her readiness to acknowledge Muhammad Mirzā as waʿfī 'ahd and on 20 June 1834 he was duly nominated as waʿfī 'ahd and sent to Tabriz as governor. Adīr Bahbīḏānī with Abu 'l-Kāsim Kīān Kāʿīm Mākām as his pīḡār or finance minister. His full brother Kāhramān Mirzā was appointed governor of Kūhrāsān ('Adud al-Dawla, op. cit., 151-3). On 15 August it was rumoured that Russia had made a pre- emptory demand for the payment of the sum still due by Persia under the Treaty of Turkomānchāy and threatened to occupy Gīlān in case of delay over pay- ment. Whether this was so or not, Muhammad Mirzā's situation was critical. He had almost no resources owing to the maladministration of Adīr Bahbīḏānī during the last four years of 'Abbas Mirzā's life. His treasury was empty and burdened by the unpaid part of the indemnity due to Russia. The pay of the army was four years in arrear; more than a third of their arms were unserviceable and the arsenal was almost without stores of any kind. In the south, the Bāḵhtīyārī were in open rebellion. The Mamassānī were plundering up to Shīrāz. The governor of Kūrmān Kāghān was threatening to seize Sūlaymāṇīyya (United Kingdom, Public Record Office, F.O.65:904. Memorandum by Herrelt, Assurances on independence and integrity of Persia, 26 November 1874).

Fath 'Alī set out from Tehran to collect arrears of taxation from Husayn 'Alī Mirzā Farmān-farmā, the governor of Fārs, and to put down various tribal rebellions in Fārs and among the Bāḵhtīyārī and died in Isfāhān on 23 October 1834. Various Kāḏār princes immediately disputed the succession of Muhammad Mirzā, who had received news in Tabriz of Fath 'Alī's death on 7 November. He was without means to march with the capital to assert his claim to the throne. The Russian envoy, Sir John Campbell, meanwhile came forward with funds to enable the troops to march. On 10 November the army set out for the capital under the command of Colonel (later Sir) Henry Lindsay-Bethune, one of the British officers who had served with the Persian army under 'Abbas Mirzā in 1812 and had returned toPersia in 1834. Muhammad Mirzā left Tabriz on 16 November accompanied by the British and Russian envoys. The governor of Tehran, 'Alī Mirzā Zill al-Sūltān, full brother to 'Abbas Mirzā, had proclaimed himself as Shāh, but his army, under the command of his brother Imām Verdi Mirzā, surrendered at Kāzīwān. On 21 December Muhammad Mirzā reached the outskirts of the capital, which he entered on 2 January 1835. His coronation took place on 31 January. In the south Husayn 'Alī Mirzā Farmān-farmā had read the khūba in his own name in Shīrāz and sent a force under his full brother Ḥasan 'Alī Mirzā Shudkī al-Saltāna to take Isfāhān, where Abād Allah Kān Amin al-Dawla, first minister to the late Fath 'Alī Shāh, Sayyid Muhammad Bākīr Shafiī, who had achieved a position of considerable influence in Isfāhān in the lifetime of Fath 'Ali, and Sayyid Muhammad Bākīr supported him. Muhammad Shāh, having established himself in Tehran, sent a force against Husayn 'Alī Mirzā. It took Isfāhān and
then defeated Hasan 'Ali Mirzâ Şuhûdî al-Saltâna at Kumîsha and pushed on to Şhrâz, which fell after a brief siege. Husayn 'Ali Mirzâ surrendered and was sent with his brother Hasan 'Ali Mirzâ to Ardabil, but died en route. Hasan 'Ali Mirzâ was blinded, as were various others of Muhammad Şâh's brothers, including Djâhângîr Mirzâ and Khusrav Mirzâ, whom Muhammad Şâh had imprisoned in Ardabil with two other of their brothers when he was governor of Adharbâyjân. Amin al-Dawla was finally sent to Tehran in Shawwal 1251 (January-February 1836 and eventually to exile in the 'Atâbâh. He died in Nâdir's service in 1847. Rûdâ Kull Mirzâ, Taymûr Mirzâ and Nâdîf Kull Mirzâ, Husayn 'Ali Mirzâ's sons, escaped via the Ottoman Empire to England, whence they returned to the Ottoman Empire in 1836 and spent the rest of their lives there in exile. Various other Kâdhîr princes were seized in due course and kept in captivity in Ardabil. Some others, including Imám Verdi Mirzâ, who had escaped from Ardabil, fearing for their lives, fled to the Ottoman Empire, while others placed themselves under foreign protection.

For some time the country was in a state of disorder. In Khûrâsân, only Masâhid, Nishâpûr and Sabzawâr were in the hands of the şâhid. The khâns of Budnûr and Daragaz and other local chiefs were in rebellion and taxes were withheld. Gradually, Kâhramân Mirzâ restored order in Khûrâsân.

Atâbâh and 'Arabîstân were also in a state of disorder, but were pacified by Bahârâm Mirzâ, who had been made governor of Kirmânsâh. In June 1835 Abu 'l-Kâsim Khân Kâ'îm Makâm, the first minister, to whom much of the current maladministration was attributed, was arrested. He was succeeded by Hadîdjî Mirzâ Akâsî, who held office to the end of Muhammad Şâh's reign. Abu 'l-Kâsim Khân was strangled on 26 June 1835. In the summer of that year, because of the ravages of cholera in the capital and elsewhere, Muhammad Şâh nominated his son Nasîr al-Dîn Mirzâ to Ardabil, but with his brother Hasan 'Ali Mirzâ's attempt to seize the throne on 26 June 1835. In the summer of that year, because of the ravages of cholera in the capital and elsewhere, Muhammad Şâh nominated his son Nasîr al-Dîn [q. v.], a child of four, as his heir. However, the heterodox views of Muhammad Şâh and his minister upset the precarious balance which Fath 'Ali Shah had established between the state and the 'ulamâ'. New developments began to emerge during Muhammad Şâh's reign, which were to become more clearly apparent in the reign of Nâsîr al-Dîn Shah (see further H. Algar, Religion and state in Iran 1785-1906, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1969, 103 ff.).

The fact that from the outset of Muhammad Şâh's reign certain of the 'ulamâ's were associated with movements of sedition led to attempts by the government to exercise greater control over them. Iṣfâhân, in particular, was a centre of religious power and turbulence and of "popular" movements associated with the 'ulamâ'. As stated above, Sâyîd Muhammad Bâkîr Shâhi had supported Fath 'Ali Shah in his attempt to seize the throne on the death of Fath 'Ali Shah. In the winter of 1839-40, repeated disorders of liyâf [q. v.] occurred under the protection of the mullâs. In the summer of 1840 Muhammad Şâh marched on Iṣfâhân, put the disturbances down and temporarily reduced the power of the 'ulamâ'. The leader of the liyâf, Hadîdjî Chulâm, was put to death in the summer of 1840 and the liyâf were exiled to Karbâlã. Mânûlîhr Khân Mu'tamîd al-Dawla was appointed governor of Iṣfâhân, Lûrisûtân and Kûhûzîstân and restored order (Bâmadâd, op. cit., iii, 109-10).

Indirect attacks were also made on the privileges of the 'ulamâ' by attempts to limit rights of sanctuary, since it was admitted that most of the 'ulamâ' were in the service of Fath 'Ali Shah. Muhammad Shah's attempts were resisted by his minister upset the precarious balance which Fath 'Ali Shah had established between the state and the 'ulamâ' that sanctuary was taken. In 1843 Bahman Mirzâ, who had been appointed governor of Adharbâyjân in 1842 on the death of Kâhramân Mirzâ, sought to prevent criminals and bankrupts taking refuge in the 'ulamâ' that sanctuary was taken. In 1843 Bahman Mirzâ, who had been appointed governor of Adharbâyjân in 1842 on the death of Kâhramân Mirzâ, sought to prevent criminals and bankrupts taking sanctuary in the province; and on 24 November of that year the şâhid issued a fârmân abolishing sanctuary except in certain mosques and holy places which had been sanctuaries from ancient times such as the dwellings of religious dignitaries and royal palaces (see further, A. K. S. Lambton, The Persian 'ulamâ' and constitutional reform, in T. Fahd (ed.), Le Shi'âisme imamite, Paris 1970).

In 1841 Hasan 'Ali Shah Âkâ Khân Mahâllatî [see Âkâ Khân], the leader of the Ismâ'îlîs, raised the standard of revolt in Kirmân. He achieved considerable success in the spring of 1842, but was eventually defeated and retired to India, where his presence led to strained relations with the British government because the Persian government thought encouragement was being given by them to the Âkâ Khân to return to Persia to renew his rebellion. His brother Sârdar Khân invaded Persia from Balûchistân in 1844. After holding Bam for a time, he surrendered.

Another heterodox movement, that of the Shaykhîs, spread in the 1840s. Its leader, Kâ'im Rağîl [q. v.], had sent disciples to all parts of Persia in search of the awaited Mahdî, the shî'î shaykh. In
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1844, one of the followers of Karim Khan, who had succeeded Kázím Rashút, declared himself the Báb [q.v.]. His public preaching in Shiráz in 1845 raised opposition. In the following year, under pressure from the ʻulamá, he came to Isfahán, where he was protected by the governor Manúčir Khan. On the latter's death he was summoned to Tehran, but arrested before he arrived in the capital and sent to Málikú, where he was imprisoned.

Persia's foreign relations were dominated during the reign of Muhammad Shah by fear and resentment of both Russia and Britain. The former, who had recently crushed Persia in military conflict and dictated terms of peace, was able to exercise a predominant influence because of her geographical position. The weight of Russian presence on the borders of Adharbáiján, the Russian guarantee to ensure the succession of Muhammad Shah and the fact that part of the indemnity due under the Treaty of Turkmánčây was outstanding, made Muhammad Shah susceptible to Russian pressure. Relations with Britain were in a somewhat undefined state. Fath ʻAli Shah had been desirous of a positive declaration by Britain to uphold the independence of Persia against attacks by European powers to replace the subsidy articles which had been expunged in 1828 from the Treaty of Turkomancay. This had been connected with Persian reliance on British military aid in the event of an emergency, and the British government was not prepared to give a new undertaking. The transfer of control of the British mission from the government in London to the Indian government in 1822 had also caused resentment and given rise to a fear that Britain was less interested in the independence of Persia than formerly. Control was restored to the crown in 1835. Already by 1832 Britain, in view of the perceived advance of Russia towards India, was considering counter measures which involved a reassessment of policy towards Persian and Afghanistan. The British desire to avoid being drawn into hostilities with Russia and a wish to forestall the outbreak of civil war and anarchy in Persia on the death of Fath ʻAli Shah explains in some measure the events surrounding the accession of Muhammad Shah outlined above. In 1838 Russia occupied the island of Åshur ada, an event which attracted little attention at the time, and built there a naval station in 1842.

Various matters arose during the reign of Muhammad Shah to disturb Anglo-Persian relations. Most importantly there was the question of Harášt, for the conquest of which Muhammad Shah had harboured a desire since the raising of the siege on the death of ʻAbbás Mírzá. The consular issue had troubled Persian relations with Russia and Britain since the conclusion of the Treaty of Turkmánčây under which Russia had acquired the right to nominate consuls wherever they were required. The Persian government feared that the establishment of consuls would be a pretext for designs of conquest and occupation. Fath ʻAli Shah successfully resisted the appointment of Russian consuls and was reluctant to enter into a commercial agreement which recognised the right of the British government to appoint consuls in Persia, although the preamble of the Treaty of Tehran of 1814 had contained proviso for the conclusion of a commercial treaty. With the accession of Muhammad Shah, some more permanent arrangement than the ramád issued by ʻAbbás Mírzá in 1832 was sought by which British trade could be carried on with the same privileges as Russian. Muhammad Shah, like Fath ʻAli Shah, was reluctant to conclude a commercial agreement but in 1836 he issued a farnámeh which guaranteed protection and good treatment of British merchants in Persia and declared the duties payable by them would be the same as those to which Russian merchants were liable (text in C.U. Aitchison, A collection of treaties, engagements and sanads..., Calcutta, 1933, xiii, 66). It was not until 1841 that British trade was placed on a more regular legal basis. The question of consular jurisdiction, because of the veiled and sometimes open interference by Russia and Britain with the course of justice did, in fact, give rise to much friction.

Foreign merchants in Tabriz and Tehran were under the nominal charge of the malík al-tádjudjár. In 1843 a farnámeh was issued by Muhammad Shah to Bahman Mírzá, governor of Ağdarbáýdjan, concerning the recovery of pecuniary debts by Russian subjects from Persian subjects and the prevention of fraudulent bankruptcies. A similar farnámeh was issued to Husayn Khan, governor of Yazd, in the following year for the protection of British merchants (text in Aitchison, op. cit., 69-73).

Internal trade during the reign of Muhammad Shah was hampered by insecurity and bad communications. Foreign trade, concentrated on Istanbul and Tabríz, was largely handled by Persian merchants until about 1837, when European merchants began to play a larger part because Russian and British merchants were finding in paying for their purchases abroad. From 1837 onwards, a number of Greek merchants were settled in Tabriz, some of whom carried on business under Russian protection. Commerce between Persia and Russia was in the hands of Georgians, Persians and Armenians and natives of Bákú and Dághistán. The silk trade of Gilán became increasingly important. In 1844 the Persian merchants of Tabriz alleged that their business had been destroyed by the establishment of Greek merchants and petitioned that the importation of European merchandise should be prohibited. In the following year, the traders of Káshán forwarded a memorial to the sháh asking for protection for their manufactures against European merchandise. In neither case was satisfaction given.

Another matter which caused friction between the Persian government and the British government was the slave trade. An approach made to the Persian government in November 1846 to ban the slave trade at Persian ports in the Gulf met with little success. In December, Muhammad Shah told Sir Justin Sheil, the British envoy, that such a ban would be contrary to the precepts of the Kur an and Islam in general. Subsequent approaches also met with refusal. Finally, on 12 June 1848, the sháh agreed to forbid the importation of slaves into Persia by sea, and farnámehs to that effect were sent to the governors-general of Khúzistán and Fárs later that month (see further J.B. Kelly, Britain and the Persian Gulf 1795-1880, Oxford 1968, 593 ff.).

The question of 'protection' was another matter which became increasingly important during the reign of Muhammad Shah. It was closely related to Anglo-Russian relations in Persia and had originated in part in the capitulatory concession of the Treaty of Turkmánčây; but its main cause was the sense of insecurity induced in the sháh's subjects by the arbitrary nature of government in Persia. It also became bound up with the question of succession to the throne, the most notorious case being that of Bahman Mírzá. In February 1842 the state of Muhammad Shah's health gave rise to anxiety. The British and Russian governments, considering what steps they should take in the event of the sháh's death
to forestall disturbances, came to the conclusion that Bahman Mirzā was the one whom the two governments would regard as the immediate successor to the throne if Muhammad Shāh died without having left a direct line. In the summer, he became severely ill but recovered. In 1845 the state of his health again caused alarm. In a despatch dated 14 January 1846 to the Russian envoy in Tehran, Count Vorontsov, stated that as soon as Muhammad Shāh died the British and Russian envoys were to wait on Naṣīr al-Dīn, who had been recognised by the British and Russian ministers as heir apparent, to recognise him as the shah and to urge him, in view of his youth, to entrust the functions of regent to Bahman Mirzā. Once more the ghān recovered.

Bahman Mirzā, in spite of being a successful governor of Aḏharbāyjān, had meanwhile fallen foul of Ḥājj ʿAlī Mirzā ʿAlī Āfšār and in 1847 he renounced his government and solicited the joint aid of the British and Russian ministers in obtaining a guarantee of safety if he returned to private life. The Russian minister Dolgorouki made strong remonstrances to the Persian government in favour of Bahman Mirzā’s reinstatement. On 1 March, the latter, alarmed for his safety, took refuge in Dolgorouki’s residence. This gave rise to great indignation on the part of the shah, and Ḥājj ʿAlī Mirzā ʿAlī Āfšār threatened to use force to expel Bahman Mirzā from the Russian minister’s residence. Dolgorouki referred the matter to the Russian Emperor, who approved his action in granting Bahman Mirzā asylum and henceforth considered Bahman Mirzā as under his special protection, offering him asylum in Russia, which offer Bahman Mirzā accepted. The affair caused a great sensation in Tehran and in Aḏharbāyjān, and the fact that a royal prince should have been forced to take refuge in a foreign mission aroused feelings of humiliation and resentment. At the same time, the established establishment of Bahman Mirzā in Georgia was viewed with some apprehension lest he should, with Russian support, disturb the tranquillity of Aḏharbāyjān. It was feared that disorders on the frontier might give Russia a plausible excuse for interference and even lead eventually to its seizure of the whole of the province or to its cession into an independent principality ruled by Bahman Mirzā under Russian protection.

All these questions, the dispute with Britain over Harat [q. v. and also ʿAḏharbāyjān], consular representation, the slave trade and protection, continued to disturb Persia’s foreign relations under Naṣīr al-Dīn Shāh. Persian-Turkish relations were in a state of tension for much of Muhammad Shāh’s reign. There were perennial difficulties over the conduct of marauding tribes in the frontier district north of Baghdad. In 1837 a Turkish force temporarily occupied and pillaged Muḥammad Marāmūnq. In 1840 a Persian force occupied Sulaymānīyya, and in July of that year the shah made preparations for an attack on Baghdad but was deterred. In the following year, the Persian governor of ʿAḏharbāyjān made an expedition against Fālūḥiya and Muḥammad Marāmūnq. A Turkish force recovered Sulaymānīyya and in 1842 attacked the wall of Ardalān. On this occasion, the Persian government invoked the good offices of the Russian and British ambassadors in Istanbul and warlike preparations were discontinued. Eventually, it was agreed that a joint commission of Turkish and Persian plenipotentiaries, to be assisted by delegates representing Russia and Britain, the mediating powers, should meet at Erzerum to investigate and report on the political and other questions in dispute. They met on 15 May 1843. Their difficulties were aggravated by a massacre of Persians in Karbalā by Turkish troops. At length, on 31 May 1847 the Second Treaty of Erzerum was signed. It provided for the delimitation of the frontier between Persia and Turkey in 1839 to carry out their pilgrimages in Turkey without molestation and the appointment of consuls by either power in the domains of the other (see further, J. G. Lorimer, Gazetteer of the Persian Gulf, ‘Oman and central Arabia, Calcutta 1915, 1. Historical Pt., IB, 1373 ff.).

Towards the end of Muhammad Shāh’s reign, there was some French activity in Persia. Husayn Khan, who had been sent to Europe in 1839 after the withdrawal from Harat, engaged some French officers for the Persian army to take the place of the British military instructors who had been withdrawn as a result of the Persian expedition against Harat in 1837-8. In 1840, or somewhat earlier, the French king Louis Philippe despatched a diplomatic mission to the court of Persia, headed by the Comte de Sercy, charged with the conclusion of a commercial treaty. In this he failed, and the French military officers found difficulty in obtaining their promised pay and allowances. Finally, in 1845 French trade was accorded most favoured nation treatment.

Muhammad Shah was born on 24 Rabii I 1114/7 August 1702, and hailed as emperor by the two Sayyid brothers, Sayyid Ahmad Shah and Sayyid Husayn, after the two brief reigns of Muhammad Shah's cousins Rafi' al-Daradjat and Rafi' al-Dawla (the latter the ephemeral Shah Djahan II), on 25 Dhu 'l-Ka'ada 1131/29 September 1719, to begin a 30 years' reign. The early years of this were dominated by the highly capable Turkish noble Nizam al-Mulk in the Deccan as virtually his father's regent. The incursions into Malwa and Haydarabad. The incursions into Malwa and Haydarabad. The incursions into Malwa [q. v.]

Muhammad Shah I KHALDI, "Ala' al-Din (695-715/1296-1316), was the nephew and son-in-law of Sultan Djalal al-Din Firuz Shah II Khalid'i, and he ascended the throne by treachery in the province of Allahabad, in 695/1295, and ascended the throne of Dihli in the same year. He re-conquered Gudjarat (697/1297), took Citor and temporarily subdued the Raudpats (703/1303). His eunuch general, Malik Kafur [q. v.], seized Deogir and Warangal, and founded a Deccan province of the Dihli kingdom. The empire is said to have flourished during his reign. Among his contemporaries, Amir Khurtraw [q. v.] and Khwaja Hasan held the first rank; Shahyak Nizam al-Din Awdiya [q. v.], one of the greatest saints of India, flourished at the same time. Muhammad Shah died on 6 Shawwal 1131/3 January 1316, and was buried in the tomb which he had constructed in his life-time in Old Dihli. Eventually, he was succeeded by his third son Mumrarak Shah, the last of the Mughal emperors in Dihli to enjoy real power.

Muhammad Shah was succeeded by his third son Mubarak Khan, as Nizam al-Mulk Awliya, one of the greatest saints of India, flourished at the same time.
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MUHAMMAD SHAYBANI [see SHAYBANI KHAN].

MUHAMMAD TAHIR [see BILLAWRI; TAWFIK].

MUHAMMAD Tahir B. Cali Patani was the younger son of Humayun Shah, and succeeded his elder brother, Nizam Shah, on 13 Dhu 'l-Ka'ada 867/30 April 1397, and was succeeded by his elder son, Muhammad Tahir suffered much at the hands of the followers of the Mahdi, and proceeded to the court of Akbar in Akbarabad for redress. On his way at Udjiydan he was murdered by some followers of the pretended Mahdi in 986/1578.

Among his various compositions in Arabic the following may be mentioned:

1. Muqaddimah bihar al-anwar fi ghari'ib al-tasnii wa-lailat al-akhbar, a copious dictionary of the Kur'an and the Traditions, lithographed, Lakhnaw 1248, 1284, 1314;

2. al-Mughni fi asma'-al-ridqil, a dictionary of proper names of traditionists, lithographed on the margin of the Ta'rikh al-Tahdhib by Ibn Hadjar al-'Askalani, Dihli 1290, 1308; and

3. Ta'dkikat al-mawdudat, a treatise on traditions, which has been incorporated in the 'Abad al-jadid, lithographed and translated by the Prophet, Bombay 1345, Cairo 1343.


(M. Hidayat Hosain)

MUHAMMAD TAKI BHAR [see BHAR].

MUHAMMAD TAWFIK [see BILLAWRI; TAWFIK].

MUHAMMAD I (759-76/1358-75), the second king of the Bahmani dynasty of the Deccan was the eldest son of Hasan, ‘Ali al-Din Bahman Shah, usually, but incorrectly, styled Hasan Gangô. On succeeding his father, on 1 Rabî‘ I 759/11 February 1358, he carefully organised the government of the four provinces of the kingdom and the administration of the army. The pertinacity of the Hindus bankers and moneychangers in melting down the gold coinage which he introduced led to a general massacre of the community and the measure involved him in hostilities with the Konkanis and the Muslims of Warangal who rose in rebellion against his cousin Bahrain Khan Mazandaranî, who for some years been in rebellion. On returning to Vidyanagar he was expelled, in 768/1367, and the great mosque at Gulbarga [q.v.], and then turned against his cousin Bahram Khan Muzandarani, who had for some years been in rebellion at Daulatabad, defeated his army and drove its leaders into Gujurat. He died in 776/1375 and was succeeded by his elder son, ‘Ali al-Din Mujahid.

Bibliography: Muhammad Kâsim Firîqûta, Gulshan-i Ilmî Mariûnî, Bombay 1832; Munâqabât al-lubâb, iii, Bibl. Indica edn.; Barhânî’s ma‘âthîr (ms.) and translation by Major J.S. King, The history of the Bahmani dynasty; Ulughkhânî, Zafar al-walîh. An Arabic history of Gujurat, ed. Sir E. Denison Ross, Indian Text Series, London 1910-28; Cambridge history of India, iii, ch. xv; and see Bibl. to BAHMANIS.

MUHAMMAD II (780-99/1378-97), the fifth king of the Bahmani dynasty of the Deccan, was the son of Mahmûd Khân, the youngest son of ‘Ali al-Din Bahman Shah, the founder of the dynasty, and was raised to the throne on 21 Muḥarram 780/20 May 1376, after the assassination of his uncle Dâwud Shah. Firîqûta’s statement that this king’s name was Muhammad has misled all European historians, but is refuted by inscriptions, legends on coins, and other historians.

Muhammad II was a man of peace, devoted to literature and poetry, and his reign was undisturbed by foreign wars. He invited Hâfiz [q.v.] to visit his court, and the great poet set out from Shîraz in response to the invitation, but was so terrified by a storm in the Persian Gulf that he disembarked and returned to Shîrz, whence he sent to Muhammad his excuses in a well-known ode.

Between 789/1387 and 797/1395 the Deccan was visited by a severe famine, and the king’s measures of relief included the free importation of grain, the establishment of schools at which children were taught, fed, and lodged at the public expense, and special allowances to readers of the Kur'an and the blind; but only those of his own faith profited by his benefactions. He died of a fever on 21 Rajab 799/20 April 1397, and was succeeded by his elder son, Ghûyâh al-Din.

Bibliography: See that to MUHAMMAD I and to BAHMANIS; also Haq, in JASB, lxiii/1 (1904).

(T.W. Haq)

MUHAMMAD III, Shams-al-Din Lashkârî (867-87/1463-75), the thirteenth king of the Bahmani dynasty of the Deccan, was the younger son of Humâyûn Shâh, and succeeded his elder brother, Niẓâm Shâh, on 13 Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da 867/30 Nevyak Deva to death, and compelled him to pay heavy indemnities and to surrender the town and district of Golkonda [q.v.]. After this success, he grossly insulted Bukka I of Vidyanagar by paying some dancing girls with a draft drawn by him on Bukka’s treasury. Bukka invaded the Râifur Doab, captured Mudden [q.v.], and massacred its garrison. Muhammad marched against him, attacked him with great impetuousity, defeated him, and recovered Mudden, where he rested during the rainy season. In 768/1367 he met Bukka and Kâwghalî, again defeated him, and carried out an indiscriminate massacre of his subjects. But when this was cowed by the slaughter of 400,000 of their race, and Bukka was compelled to sue for peace. He honoured the draft and paid an indemnity, and received in return a guarantee that non-combatants should be spared in future wars, and the agreement, though sometimes violated, mitigated to some extent the horrors of the long period of intermittent warfare between the two states. On returning from Vidyanagar he completed, in 768/1367, the great mosque at Gulbarga [q.v.], and then turned against his cousin Bahram Khân Muzandarani, who for some years been in rebellion at Daulatabad, defeated his army and drove its leaders into Gujurat. He died in 776/1375 and was succeeded by his elder son, ‘Ali al-Din Mujahid.

Bibliography: Muhammad Kâsim Firîqûta, Gulshan-i Ilmî Mariûnî, Bombay 1832; Munâqabât al-lubâb, iii, Bibl. Indica edn.; Barhânî’s ma‘âthîr (ms.) and translation by Major J.S. King, The history of the Bahmani dynasty; Ulughkhânî, Zafar al-walîh. An Arabic history of Gujurat, ed. Sir E. Denison Ross, Indian Text Series, London 1910-28; Cambridge history of India, iii, ch. xv; and see Bibl. to BAHMANIS. (T.W. Haq)
MUHAMMAD III — MUHAMMADIYYA

July 1463, at the age of nine. His minister was the famous Mahmūd Gāwān, Malik al-Tudjadjar, Khwāja Dājān [q.v.]. After the campaign against Malwā in 871/1467 was unsuccessful, but between 873/1469 and 875/1471 Mahmūd Gāwān conquered the southern Konkan. In 876/1472 Niẓām al-Mulk Malik Hasan Bahār, a Brāhmaṇ who had been captured in Vidīyanagar and educated as a Muslim, led a successful expedition into southern Uṣīfa [q.v.] (Orissa) and was rewarded with the governorship of Telīngāna. In 875/1471 Khwāja Dājān, Fath Allāh ʿImād al-Mulk, another Brāhmaṇ with similar history, was made governor of Berār [q.v.], and Yūṣūf ʿAdil Khān, a Turk, was appointed to Daulatābād [q.v.]. In the same year, Muhammad captured the fortresses of Bankāpūr and Bālgārwā, and his conduct at the siege of the latter earned for him the title of Lashkārī, "the Soldier". In 879/1474 the Dakan suffered severely from a famine which lasted for two years, and in 881/1476 a rebellion in Kondapallī led the king into Telīngāna. He relieved Malik Hasan, who had been besieged in Rāgjadambhīrī, invaded Uṣīfa and punished the ṛāḏī, who had supported the rebels, and on his return, in 883/1478, captured Kondawārī and assumed the title of Ḍārārī. Then he set out to invade the eastern Karnātak, but first divided the great province of Telingāna into two governments, mortally offending Malik Hasan the governor. The partition was part of a scheme, devised by Mahmūd Gāwān, to apply to all the provinces of the kingdom.

Muhammad made Kondapallī, in the Karnātak, his headquarters, and returned thither after carrying out a daring raid to Kāndjewaram. From Kondapallī he issued an edict dividing the other three provinces of his kingdom, Berār, Daulatābād, and Bālgārwā [q.v.] each into two governments. The measure was intensely unpopular, but it was only the vindictive Malik Hasan that actively resented it. He regarded Mahmūd Gāwān as the author of all the unpopular reforms, and by means of a forged letter persuaded the young king that his minister was in league with the foreign enemies of the state. Muhammad, when under the influence of drink, summoned his faithful minister, and on 5 Safar 886/5 April 1481, without any inquiry into the circumstances of the case, caused his head to be struck off. Mahmūd's innocence was argued, against the Imāmi Shīʿīs, that he had been under the influence of drink, from the false testimony of a rival minister, and on 5 Safar 886/5 April 1481, without any inquiry into the circumstances of the case, caused his head to be struck off. Mahmūd's innocence was established immediately after his death, and from the day of his unjust execution may be dated the collapse of the authority of the Bahmānī kings. Of the two parties in the state the former, led by Yūṣūf ʿAdil Khān, who established himself at Bīdūjāpur, and the respectable portion of the Dakanīs, led by Fath Allāh ʿImād al-Mulk of Berār, avoided intercourse with the king, who was thrown into the arms of the assassins, led by Malik Hasan. The amīr accompanied Muhammad to Bīdār [q.v.] and subsequently on an expedition to Bālgārwā, but encamped apart from the royal troops, and the king, being already at a distance, refusing to enter his presence. Muhammad attempted to drown his grief and humiliation in drink, from the effects of which he died at Bīdār on 1 Safar 887/22 March 1482, crying out in his last moments that Mahmūd Gāwān was slaying him. He was succeeded by his son Shīhāb al-Dīn Mahmūd, who was nevertheless a king only in name.

Bibliography: See that to MUHAMMAD I and to BASTI.
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broader sense to denote all ShiSs who held the gnostic
belief that the one, unknown God manifests himself as
a pentad. In their system (as described by Sacd b.
c
Abd Allah al-Kumml) Muhammad is both the
unknown God, and God's only true manifestation on
earth. God first appeared before mankind as a light,
calling upon them to acknowledge his oneness. They
refused, and this was apparently the act of rebellion
that initiated the fall from heaven. God then appeared
in human form so that his creatures might trust him
and not fear him. He appeared (but only to the Arabs,
it would seem) as successive prophets and messengers:
Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses and Jesus; to the nonArabs he appeared as successive kings and rulers of
the world. Mankind still refused to confess his unity,
and so he appeared in the form of a number of Imams,
and was then accepted. Of these Imams, only members
of the ahl al-kisd^ [q. v. ] are mentioned by name. They
are (in addition to Muhammad) CA1I, Fatima (God
can assume the form of a woman), al-Hasan and alHusayn, who together constitute the divine pentad.
The Imams are reincarnations of God; as such they are
mere illusions or "names" concealing the true
"meaning" (ma^na) which is Muhammad. A parallel
structure incorporates other elect members of the
community, all of whom are arranged in a hierarchical fashion. Thus God's only true messenger or
"gate" (bdb) is Salman al-FarisT [<7-fl.], who appears
with Muhammad before Arabs and non-Arabs; other
abwdb, who include various leaders of the Kufan
ghuldt, are reincarnations of Salman. The normal
obligations of Islam (prayer, fasting, etc.) were
imposed as a punishment on those who deny the
truth, and are not incumbent upon believers who have
passed the test (mu^min mumtahan). The spirits of those
who deny the truth transmigrate through both
animate and inanimate bodies (tandsukh), and end up
as minerals or stones. The believer who acknowledges
the truth, in contrast, passes through seven stages,
each lasting 10,000 years, during which he wears
seven different bodies like seven garments (akmisa):
when he outgrows one garment, he puts on another.
After 70,000 years he becomes a gnostic (cdrif) and
attains knowledge of the ultimate (macrtfat al-ghdyd):
the veil is removed and he sees God, that is Muhammad, in his essence and light.
No works of the Muhammadiyya have survived,
but we know the names of at least two authors who
wrote in defence of the sect: al-Fayyad b. CAH b.
Muhammad b. al-Fayyad, whose father was a kdtib for
al-Muctadid (regn. 279-89/892-902), and who was
executed during his caliph's reign; and al-Nahikl
[q. v. ], mentioned as an cdmil (finance officer) of the
Baduraya district of west Baghdad (al-Tanukhl,
Nishwdr al-muhddara, Damascus 1348/1930, 16-18;
Hilal al-SabP, Ta^nkh al-Wuzard\ ed. H.F. Amedroz,
Beirut 1904, 76-7). Both composed works attacking
the K. al-Sirdt of Ishak b. Muhammad al-NakhacI alAhmar al-KufT (d. 286/899). Ishak was one of the
c
Ayniyya (cAlya°iyya), who were among the
upholders of cAH's divinity. Al-Fayyad's work is entitled al-Kistds; the title of al-Nahiki's book is not
recorded. In addition, Muhammad b. Bashir (who
after the death of the seventh Imam Musa al-Kazim
[q.v.] claimed to be his legatee) can also be counted
among the Muhammadiyya (although this is nowhere
explicitly stated), since he taught that Muhammad
was reincarnated in the Imams.
The Muhammadiyya caused concern among the
mainstream Imamiyya, who attempted in their
writings to refute their doctrines. One such work (no
longer extant) was composed by al-Fadl b. Shadhan

al-Naysaburl (d. 260/873-4) under the title K. al-Radd
c
ald 'l-ghdliya al-Muhammadiyya or K. al-Radd cald
'l-ghuldt.
The heresiographers mention several other
unnamed groups who upheld Muhammad's divinity.
One such group maintained that Muhammad was a
demiurge empowered by God (tafwid) to create this
world and to direct its affairs. This belief is typical of
the Mufawwida, who are often mentioned together
with the Mukhammisa.
Bibliography (the numerals in parentheses that
follow each title indicate the type of Muhammadiyya dealt with in the work in question): Ps.Nashi3 (Dja c far b. Harb), Usul al-nihal, ed. J. van
Ess under the title Masd^il al-imdma, in Friihe
muHazilitische Hdresiographie, Beirut 1971, 46 (2);
Nawbakhtl, Firak al-shfa, ed. H. Ritter, Istanbul
1931, 52-4, 70 f., 78 f., 83 f. (2, 3); Sacd b. cAbd
Allah al-Kumml, K. al-Makdldt wa 'l-firak, ed.
Muhammad Djawad Mashkur, Tehran 1963,
47 f, 56-61, 76 f., 91 f., 101, 109 f. (2, 3, 4);
Ashcari, Makdldt al-isldmiyym, ed. Muhammad
Muhyl al-Dm cAbd al-Hamld, Cairo 1389/1969, i,
73 f., 83-8, 98 f., 141 (2,4); Kulim, al-Kdfi, ed. CA1I
Akbar al-Ghaffari, i, Tehran 1381/1961, 325-8 (3);
Muhammad Sadik Bahr al-cUlum, Nadjaf 1382/
1963, 85-7 (1); Kishshi, Riajal, ed. A. al-Husaym,
Nadjaf n.d., 406 (4); Mascudl, Muru&al-dhahab, ed.
Ch. Pellat, Beirut 1966-79, § 1135 (4); MufTd, alIrshdd, Beirut 1979, 335-8, tr. I.K.A. Howard,
London 1981, 507-12 (3); cAbd al-Djabbar, alMughm, xx (part 2), Cairo n.d., 179 (reading alMuhammadiyya for al-Makhzumiyya) (2); Baghdad!.
al-Fark bayn al-firak, Cairo 1367/1948, 36-8, 148 (2);
Nadjashl, Ridjal, ed. al-Zandjani, Kumm 1407,
177, 307 (3, 4); Ibn Hazm, al-Fisal, ed. Muhammad Ibrahim Nasr and cAbd al-Rahman c Umayra,
Beirut 1405/1985, v, 45, 47 f. (2, 4); TusI, Fihrist,
Beirut 1403/1983, 105, 154 (3, 4); idem, K. alGhayba, Nadjaf 1385, 54-6 (3); Isfarayim, al-Tabsir
fi 'l-din, ed. Muhammad Zahid al-Kawtharl,
Baghdad 1374/1955, 39 f, 109 f. (2); al-Hakim alDjushami, Shark ^uyun al-masd^il, ms. Leiden Or.
2584 (2); ShahrastanI, al-Milal wa 'l-nihal, ed. cAbd
al-cAziz M. al-Wakll, Cairo 1387/1968, i, 159, 1758 (2, 4), tr. with introd. and notes by D. Gimaret
and G. Monnot, Livre des religions et des sectes, Louvain 1986, index (2, 3, 4); Samcanl, al-Ansdb,
Leiden-London 1912, fol. 512a-b (1, 2); Nashwan
Mustafa, Cairo 1948, 156, 168-70 (2); Ibn al-Athlr,
al-Lubdb fi tahdhib al-ansdb, Beirut n.d., iii, 175 (1,
2); Safadi, al-Wdfi, iii, ed. S. Dedering, Damascus
1953, 297-300 (2); Ibn clnaba, cUmdat al-tdlib fi
ansdb al Abi Tdlib, Beirut 1390, 84-5, 282-4 (1, 2);
Ibn al-Murtada, al-Munya wa 'l-amal, ed. Muhammad Djawad Mashkur, Beirut 1399/1979, 90 (2);
BayadI, al-Sirdt al-mustakim, ed. Muhammad Bakir
al-Bihbudl, Tehran 1384, ii, 274 f. (4); I.
Friedlaender, The heterodoxies of the Shiites in the presentation of Ibn Hazm, inJAOS, xxviii (1907), 1-80, xxix
(1908), 1-183, index (2, 4); R. Strothmann, Das
Staatsrecht der Zaiditen, Strassburg 1912, 65 (2); S.
Dedering, Ein Kommentar der Tradition uber die 73
Sekten,'mMO, xxv (1931), 35-43 (2); cAbbas Ikbal,
Khanaddn-i Nawbakhtl, Tehran 1311 Sh., 263 (2, 3,
4); L. Massignon, Salman Pdk et les premices spirituelles
de I'lslam iranien, in Soc. d'Et. Iraniennes, Cahier 7
(1934), repr. in Opera minora, ed. Y. Moubarac,
Beirut 1963, i, 443-83 (4); idem, Recherches sur les
Shinties extremistes d Bagdad a la fin du troisieme siecle de


MUHAMMADIYYA — MUHANNA


E. KÖHLMER

AL-MUHAMMADIYYA [see FAIDLÀ].

MUHAMMADZAYS [see ABD T-RAHMÀN KHAJÀ; AFGHANISTÀN, V. HISTORY (3) THE AFGHAN NATIONAL BIBL.]

MUHAMMARA, the former name (in use till 1937) of the Persian town and port on the Hasîr channel to the lower Karun river [q. v.], now known as Khuzistàn. For the history of Muhammara, see KHRUMSAMAHR, and also KHAZ’AL KHAJÀ. To the references given in the Bibl. to these two articles should be added: H. G. Rawlinson, Notes on Moharramah and the Cha’ab Arabs, in Proc. Royal Geogr. Soc., i, 351 ff.; Naval Intelligence Division, Geo-graphical Handbooks, Persia, London 1945, index s.v. Khrumsamahr; M.-A. al-Nadjjar, M. al-Ta’rikhal-siydsili-Khurramshahr; Soc., Cairo 1971; M. Momen, An introduction to Shi’i Islam, London 1945, index s.v. (En.)

ABD AL-MUHAMMIRA [see KHURRAMDINIYYA].

MUHANNA, better known in the sources as the Al Muhanna, an Arab Bedouin branch of the Banu Rabbà, descendants of a minor line of the Qurrah family, who in return belonged to the larger tribe of Tayyî. In genealogical terms, Tayyî was part of Kahtân, and consequently the Banu Muhanna were treated as Yamani in their general allegiance. It is known that Tayyî, who were well-established in southern Bilad al-Sham, formed part of the Karântîma [see KARMAﬁ AT] army, which in 360/971 took over al-Ramla [q. v.] in Palestine. The Tayyî’s power increased to the extent that they were able, in 401/1010-11, to appoint al-Hasan b. Qaisfar al-’Alawi as a caliph under their tutelage, although they had to abandon him two years later due to Fatimid pressure. The Qurrahidhs were never trusted by the Fatimidis, who recognised the political ambitions of the Arab tribes in Syria, a land contested by several political powers of the time.

In 410/1019, the three major Arab tribes of Tayyî, Kalb and Kilîb in Syria formed a political alliance which lasted for one decade. The aim of that alliance, an unprecedented step, was to coordinate their policies in order to control the hadja against any foreign dominance. This growth in the strength of Arab tribes in the affairs of Syria can be explained on the basis of the absence of strong administration there at the time. Such an administration was only realised through the Saljûqids after 1071. Consequently, the power of individual tribes, including the Arab tribes, remained outside political control, and the Tayyî’s tribes and their alliances came to dominate tribal life in the Syrian desert for seven centuries to come. They advanced from their localities in Palestine and Trans-Jordan also to occupy the area stretching from Hawrán, east of Damascus, Hamî, Hamâm and Aleppo, up to the banks of the Euphrates. This power reached its peak whenever they, even expanded the Arab authority inside al-Hijzâj at the expense of other well-established tribes. Contemporary historians explain this on the basis of the competent leadership provided by a number of Tayyî families, in particular the Banu Muhanna, while other tribes were feuding among themselves. Tayyî tribes flourished in Syria when the region was exposed to threats by both the Franks and later the Mongols. Historians have observed that, whenever the administration in Bilad al-Sham was strong, the tribes, including the Banu Muhanna, gave their loyalty to the ruling dynasty. Occasionally, they and their cousins had contacts with the Franks or changed allegiances to the Il-Khâns in Bagdad.

Early references indicate that the Bûrûd governor of Damascus, the Arabeg Tughîtîn (497-522/1103-28) had the support of the leader of the Rabî’s against the Franks. Similar support was lent to the Zangûids, who in return awarded to a number of amîrs of Rabî’s al-’Adî. The Mamlûk sultanate, contrary to the Ayyubids, treated Syria as a frontier province facing the Franks, Mongols and later, the Ottomans. Arab tribes merited special attention from the Mamlûk sultans, who neither needed their manpower as auxiliaries or feared their unstable loyalty.

In 663/1265, al-Zahir Baybars dismissed 5Silá b. Hâdhîqa and appointed 5Isâ b. Muhanna (d. 683/1284) to be amîr over all Arabs. Isâ, who took part with other amîrs against the Mongols in 658/1260, at the battle of Ayn Djalut [q. v.], was also addressed as the King of the Arabs. This regal title did not stop the Mamlûks from granting the title of amîr to other chieftains, specially to the heads of the al-Murr al-Murf [q. v.], a major Tayyî clan dwelling in the region of Hawrán. Isá held the post for twenty years, only interrupted for a few months when he allied himself in 679/1280 with a rebellious Mamluk amîr, Sunkur al-Ashkar. On his death, the position was assigned to his son Muhanna (d. 735/1334), who was given the title of Husâm al-’Adîn and granted the village of Sarmîn in the region of Aleppo as an i’âda. He was the head of a line of Rabî’s under whom the Al or Banî Muhanna came to be known. The relationship between Muhanna and sultan al-’Ashraf Khâlîl was characterised by enmity, to the extreme of Muhanna and a number of his relatives in Radjab.
692/June 1293 were jailed in the citadel of Cairo. On the sultan's death (693/1294), they were released ... reclaimed by the state.

MUHARIB


The Mu‘ahib at the beginning of Islam were hostile to Muhammad; this hostility was perhaps only the continuation of that of which prevailed between the nomad tribes of the 3‘ayna of al-Nadjd and the citizens of Medina. We find, in the early years of the Hijira, that Muhammad sent against them (and against the Qa‘afan) a series of expeditions, of the nature of raids and counterraids rather than regular military enterprises (our sources give 30 or 40 men as the total of the Muslim forces; the details of their fighting are given in Caetani, Annali dell‘Islam, i, 337-8; 2 (A.H., § 6), 596-7; 5 (A.H., § 3), 689-90; 6 (A.H., § 1), 694 (A.H., § 6) with reference to the sources utilised (we may add Ibn Sa‘d’s, ii, 23-4, 43-4, 61-2). One part at least of the tribute must, however, have been attached within the growing sphere of Muslim influence, since we find Mu‘ahibis in the cavalry led by al-Zubayr at the taking of Mecca (Caetani, Annali, ii, 8 A.H., § 390). But it was only in 10 A.H. that the Mu‘ahib sent their ambassadors to Muhammad and gave their formal adhesion to Islam (Ibn Sa‘d’s, ii/2, 43, cf. Caetani, Annali, ii, 340-4, 84-5); even on this occasion they were conspicuous by their uncouthness, quite Bedouin, of which another example is given in the anecdote of the Mu‘ahib (he is said to have been called Suwa‘ b. al-Hārīr or b. Kayā) who dared to doubt the Prophet‘s word in connection with the purchase of a horse (cf. Ibn Sa‘d, iv/2, 90-1, etc., and Caetani, Annali, iv, 627-8).

The Mu‘ahib abandoned Islam during the Ridda but were easily brought back to obedience (Annali, ii, 594, 596, 11 A.H., §§ 115, 118); they took part in the conquest of ‘Trak (Ibn Hadjar, Isbāba, Cairo 1325, iv, 20-1: biography of ‘Abīd b. Sa‘d, who fought at al-Kadisiyya and Dūlah and also, in 36 and 37, at the Battle of the Camel and that of Siffin, where he was slain); they were encamped at Kūfah in the same quarter as the Usād and Qa‘afan, not far from that allotted to the Tamlm (al-Tabarl, i, 2490, 2495). In the period after the conquests, much Mu‘ahibis settled in Syria and thence went with the Syrian troops to Spain.

The contribution of the Mu‘ahib to the politics and literature of Arabia was practically nil; we need only mention the name of Lākīt b. Bukayr b. al-Nadr (d. 190/906), who belonged to a branch of the Banū ‘Ali, and whose name is given in the dictionary to the Mu‘ahib tribe (Caetani, ii, 540), ascetic and historian (Fihrist, 94, and Yākūt, Irshād, ed. Margoliouth, vi, 218-20, give a list of his works, relating mainly to literary history).

Of the other tribes bearing the name of Mu‘ahib,
the best known is the Meccan tribe of the Muharib b. Fhir of the Kuryayh al-Zawahir, to which al-Dahhakah b. Kay's belonged [q. v.]; see Ibn al-Kalbi-Caskel, Tabellen, 4, 34, Register 425. The Muharib lampooned by al-Farazdaq and celebrated by Djarir (Nadak'd, ed. Bevan, 817, l. 4, 1039 l. 2) are difficult to identify; it is not certain, although they are so identified in the index, that they were the Muharib b. Khassafa. Bibliography: Given in the article.

(G. LEVI DELLA VIDA)

AL-MUHARRAK, a town on an island of the same name in the Bahrayn archipelago (where the low-lying, irregular, crescent-shaped island, which covers an area 5 1/2 sq. miles, lies 1 1/2 miles to the north-east of the main island of Bahrayn [q. v.] and it is the second largest in the archipelago. The town, which is on the south-western side of the island, is located at lat. 26° 16' N, long. 52° 37' E. The only other settlement of any size on the island is that of al-Hadd, some three miles to the east. In the past, supplies of drinking water for the island came from a series of offshore, submarine, freshwater springs.

The early history of al-Muharrak is, like that of Bahrayn, obscure. Some sources refer to the island under the name 'Arād. In the 19th century the ruling Al Khali[a] dynasty [q. v.] usually resided at Muharrak for most of the year, moving to Manāma [q. v.] only in the hot summer months. As the capital of the administrative capital, al-Muharrak was then also the major centre of commerce and pearl fishing. According to Lorimer, the total population of the island in 1903 was approximately 38,500. The town contained 20,000 people and there were over 300 stalls in its bazaar. More than 700 local vessels used the harbour, of which nearly 300 were engaged in the pearl trade. The population of al-Hadd was then approximately 8,000 and it had 167 pearling vessels.

In the second decade of the 20th century, Manāma began to grow in importance and it became the capital of the amirate. It was linked by a causeway and a motor road to al-Muharrak in 1942. The fortunes of al-Muharrak had been damaged by the decline in pearl fishing in the 1930s, but the development of air routes between Europe, India and the Far East prompted the construction of landing facilities for both sea-planes and aircraft. In 1971, the runway for the island came from a series of offshore, submarine, freshwater springs.

The early history of al-Muharrak is, like that of Bahrayn, obscure. Some sources refer to the island under the name 'Arād. In the 19th century the ruling Al K[ha][l]t[a] dynasty [q. v.] usually resided at Muharrak for most of the year, moving to Manāma [q. v.] only in the hot summer months. As the capital of the administrative capital, al-Muharrak was then also the major centre of commerce and pearl fishing. According to Lorimer, the total population of the island in 1903 was approximately 38,500. The town contained 20,000 people and there were over 300 stalls in its bazaar. More than 700 local vessels used the harbour, of which nearly 300 were engaged in the pearl trade. The population of al-Hadd was then approximately 8,000 and it had 167 pearling vessels.

In the second decade of the 20th century, Manāma began to grow in importance and it became the capital of the amirate. It was linked by a causeway and a motor road to al-Muharrak in 1942. The fortunes of al-Muharrak had been damaged by the decline in pearl fishing in the 1930s, but the development of air routes between Europe, India and the Far East prompted the construction of landing facilities for both sea-planes and aircraft. In 1971, the runway

AL-MUHARRAM (A.), the first month of the Muslim year. The name is originally not a proper name but an adjective, as the article shows, qualifying Safar. In the pre-Islamic period, the first two months of the old Meccan year were Safar [q. v.] and II, which is reflected in the dual a poturi of al-Safarun for al-Muharram and Safar; in the old Arab year, the first half year consisted of “three months of two months each” (Wellhausen), as the two Safars were followed by two Rabī’s and two Dijumādās. The first of the two Safars, as the one that belonged to the sacred months, was given the adjecial epithet al-muharram which gradually became the name of the month itself. As Dhū l-Hijjādī also belonged to the sacred months, three of the four sacred months came together except in leap year, when the third intercalated to equate the year to the solar year was inserted after Dhu l-Hijjādī and was not sacred. Thus came about that learned Muslims described the intercalation as renaming the Muharram concerned as Safar, i.e. as making Muharram not sacred; they meant that the month after the pilgrimage, which they consider as al-Muharram, following the custom, is not sacred, i.e. is Safar, and the second month, i.e. in their view Safar, is al-Muharram. In doing this they of course overlook the fact that Safar proper now only comes third; but when the intercalary month was abolished in Islam, the proper conception of the state of affairs was lost [see NAS]\(^2\).

In the early period when an attempt was made to equate with the solar year by inserting intercalary months—which was not successful on account of the ignorance of the old Arabs in astronomical matters—al-Muharram introduced the winter half-year, as the names of the first six months show. The Arab year began, like the Jewish one, in autumn. After Muhammād had forbidden the insertion of the intercalary months in sūra IX, 37, 1 Muharram, the beginning of the year, went through all the seasons as the year, which now consisted of 12 lunar months, had always only 354 or 355 days, as it still has. Whether the first month of the year was originally marked by a festival, we do not know. Wellhausen endeavoured to show that the kabīr originally fell in the first month of the year, so that Muharram was kabīr in its quality as Dhū l-Hijjādī. This also suggests that there was originally only one sacred month, but it was observed at different times in different parts of Arabia. The Kurān always speaks of the sacred month (II, 194, 217; V, 2, 97); only in sūra IX, 36, in laying down the method of reckoning time, does it speak of four sacred months, in which it was sought to recognise a later declaration of the equal sanctity of four different sacred months of different districts, which, however illusory, as within Islam the peace of God reigns without this and, according to sūra II, 217, the defence of the faith takes preference over the sacred month. What the sacred month referred to in the Kurān is, we do not know; in sūra V, 2, at any rate, the month of the pilgrimage must be meant, which fits Wellhausen’s theory excellently. The commentators think Rāqib or Dhū l-Ka’dā is meant, at any rate not al-Muharram.

Al-Muharram has 30 days of which, in addition to the first as the beginning of the year, the following are specially noted: the ninth as the fast-day of the Shi‘a, especially to Karbala; the sixteenth as the day of the arrival of the “people of the elephant” (sūra CV [see AL-FIL]), celebrated by pilgrimages to the sacred places of the Shi‘a, especially to Karbala, on which al-Husayn b. Ali b. Abi Talib [q. v.] fell fighting against the caliph Yazid b. Mu‘awiya and therefore the great day of mourning for the Shi‘a (on the significance of 10 Muharram for the Sunnis, see ‘Aṣurū‘ā C[]), celebrated by pilgrimages to the sacred places of the Shi‘a, especially to Karbala [q. v.], in which the passion play, representing the death of Ali’s sons [see TA‘ZIYAH], plays the most important part; also the sixteenth as the day of the selection of Jerusalem as the kibla [q. v.] and the seventeenth as the day of the arrival of the “people of the elephant” (sūra CV [see AL-FIL]) they consider as al-Muharram.”

MUHASABA (A.), literally, "accounting".

1. In mystical theology. Here the term is more precisely muḥāṣaba al-nafs, "inward accounting, spiritual accounting".

The concept is connected both with the Kur'ānic symbolism of commerce and with that of the final end of man. It should be noted that, like all the verbal nouns of the muḥāṣa type, linguistic creations in the fields of the Arab-Islamic sciences and of spirituality, the word muḥāṣaba belongs neither to the lexicon of the Qur'ān nor to that of the Tradition. Kur'ānic vocabulary and the vocabulary of the Tradition only uses verbal nouns derived from form III (fā'ala) of the fīl type, and when a muḥāṣa is a doublet of a fiṣāl, the semantic difference is usually that of the abstract and the concrete, the moral and the physical. But, in both cases, it is a matter of a transitive action, a putting of something into effect, or sometimes an interaction (see the linguistic remarks of al-Kuhyārī with regard to the word muḥāṣada, inward vision, in his Risāla, 43). Muḥāṣaba is the learned doublet of hisāb, the "accounting" of God on the Day of Resurrection, to which allusion is made in the recommendation, generally attributed to 'Umar, "Take account of your souls yourselves (khāṣabu anfusakum) before account is made of them, weigh them before they are weighed (sc. in the Divine Balance, al-Mizān) and prepare yourselves for the supreme examination!" (cf. al-Tirmidhī, Sunan, 38, Book of the Resurrection, ch. 25; the two first phrases are found, reversed, in a ḫutha of 'Allī, Nahj al-balāgha, ed. with Muhammad 'Abdul's commentary, Beirut n.d., i, 159; the first phrase is attributed to the Prophet by Ibn 'Arabī, in ch. 32 of his Fatūḥāt).

It is to al-Ghazālī that we owe the most detailed study of the concept and practice of muḥāṣaba, in Book 38 of his Iḥyā' (iv, 336-61) entitled "On spiritual surveillance (muṣākaha) and inward accounting". He takes it up and develops a certain number of formulations of al-Hārītī b. Asad al-Muhāṣibi, "the man of muḥāṣaba" (in his Rīḍā, ch. 7, 36-43), and of Abū Tālīb al-Makkī (in his Kāl al-Kalāh, i, ch. 23, 114-25).

It is the concept of muṣākaha (a learned doublet of riḥāt, literally, "to mount guard") which is fundamental in al-Ghazālī's exposition, and Book 38 is divided into 6 chapters, corresponding to the six degrees of muṣākaha or "measures of vigilance": muṣākaha, which is simply the anticipatory accounting of the soul (al-muḥāṣaba kabl al-ʿamal) made in the morning every day, and which consists of instructing it in the engagements that it is to fulfill, like a trader who specifies to his associate what he is to do and the responsibilities that are incumbent upon him. The second measure of vigilance is muṣākaha, spiritual surveillance, intervening notably before action and submitting the soul to three questions, sc. why? how? for whom? (cf. al-Makkī, Kāl, i, 121, 155). It is an examination of the motives of the action and the soul's hidden intentions, in order to reject everything that would not serve to satisfy egoism or any passion and that is not performed with a view to God alone. The question "how?" concerns the action's methods, which ought to conform with precise and detailed divine prescriptions, and not surrender to ignorance and individual opinions. The third measure of vigilance is muḥāṣaba al-nafs baʿd al-ʿamal, inward accounting after the action. This examination of conscience, which should take place at the end of each day, is aimed at evaluating "gain" or "loss" of what the soul has "accumulated" in the spiritual level and which may lead in future life to bliss or misfortune. Spiritual "capital" is constituted by the ritual acts of canonical obligation (al-farāʾīd), "gain" being supererogatory works (al-maṣāḥif) and virtues (al-fadūl), whereas "loss" is constituted by transgressions (al-maṣāḥif). This recapitulatory inventory is to thwart the soul's tricks and sift the slightest deeds performed during the day, such as looks, and the smallest fleeting or considered thoughts and even silences. The fourth and fifth measures of vigilance are immediately connected with the accounting of actions and thoughts each day: they are intended to chastise the soul for its inadequacies, muḥāṣaba al-nafs ʿalī takrīrāt, so that it does not perseverate in them. Practically, the penitence to be inflicted will correspond to the organ or member which has sinned or tried to sin. If the examination of conscience reveals a certain negligence in the pursuit of virtues or in the accomplishment of acts of devotion, one must conduct spiritual struggle, al-ṣuṣūr; in order to impose on oneself further efforts and to multiply pious works. The sixth measure will consist of reprimanding and admonishing the soul constantly, taṣūḥ al-nafs wa-muḥāṣabatuhū, for it was created as an "inciter to evil", annāmatun bi ʾi-sāqi. Thus it is proper not to leave it a single moment without reproaching it.

The practice of inward accounting is not the act only of beginners in the spiritual way. It is associated with the greatest saints throughout their life. Here we may cite the testimony of Ibāḍ, Arabī, who confides in ch. 32 of his Fatūḥāt that his master had, after the night prayer, to write down in a notebook all that they had said and all that they had done during the day, and that he himself used to do it for all the thoughts (khawāṣīʿ) that had occurred to him. This testimony is taken up by al-Munāwī [q. e.] in his commentary al-Fayd al-kadīr on al-Suyūṭī's collection of traditions al-Qādāmī al-saghir, with reference to hadīth no. 6468 (v, 67) in which it is stated "The prudent man is he who submits his own soul to judgment and who acts with consideration for what will happen after death".

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(R. DELANDRIÈRE

2. As a financial term in the Ottoman empire.

In Ottoman official usage, this term referred to financial accounting. The Ottomans' chief financial officer was known as the defterdar [q. e.]. Eventually, more than one official bore this title, the highest being the "chief" or baş defterdar; under him developed a number of subordinate treasurers, starting with one for Anatolia (Anadolu defterdarī). In time, the treasurers' staff developed functionally specialised bureaux, most of which performed accounting functions; the term muḥāṣaba appeared in the name of several of the bureaux. For example, a source of 976/1576 lists tārīkh of all muḥāṣebes in the empire, with ten clerks (kātib) each, the Anadolu muḥāṣebes in offices with six clerks each (Uzuncarşılı, 336).

The so-called kūmān-nâme of Mehemmed the Conqueror (1451-81)---actually a compilation including later materials (Oğuz, 14-36)---implies the existence of well-established accounting procedures by reference to the defterdarī annual presentation of accounts of income and expenditure before the sultan (Mehmed 'Arif, ed., Kūmān-nâme: Al-I ʿOğümân, in TOEM, Suppl., 22: yilda bir kere riḥāt-i hâmayununa defterdarları ĭnâd ve mazraflın okeyaları). Distinctive traits of Ottoman accounting practice included records-keeping in a special script (vişnûk) and Persianised language, a formalistic identification of the accounting function with the "kūmān-nâme" concept, the perjury and the assignment of specific revenues (îrâd) to cover specific expenses (mazraf), as opposed to the unification of receipts in a central fund against which
expenses in general could be drawn (Fekete, Siyaqat; Uzuncarsili, 370-3; Aktas and Binark, d’Ohsson, vii, 264). The Chief Accountant’s Office (bash muhasebe ranking and related functions, such as prepar- ing warrants of appointment or decrees, all of these performed accounting functions. Some idea of the offices’ functions, and of the scale of their responsi- bilities, emerges from the following examples.

The Great Daybook Office (Rüznamee-i-eveel kalemı, biyık rüzname kalemı) kept a daily record of treasury operations, in summary, as well as of the operations of the other financial bureaux. Annually or semi-annually, this office drew up a financial summary (ıdznâ) bearing somewhat the character of a retrospective budget for the empire (TPK, D3208; Hammer, SSOR, ii, 145-6; d’Ohsson, vii, 265).

Certain bureaux had responsibilities pertaining to military corps. The Office of the Comptroller for the Cavalry (Siüvârî mühasebeleri kalemı) oversaw the pay of the six palace cavalry regiments and several other categories of palace servants. The Infantry Comptroller’s Bureau (Psûde mühasebe kalemı) kept the rolls and controlled payments for Janissaries, armourers, artillery-men, and cannon wagoneers (psûde â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿â¿¿@-muhsib, Abu Aso ALLAH AL-HARITH (d. 951); Uthman: Tableau general de l’Empire ottoman, 2 voll., Budapest 1955; C.V. Findley, Bureaucratic reform in the Ottoman Empire: the Sublime Porte, 1789-1822, Princeton 1980; J. von Hammer (later Hammer-Purgstall), Staatsverfassung und Staatsverwaltung des osmanischen Reichs, 2 vols., Vienna 1815 (repr. Hildesheim, 1967); A. Heidorn, Manuel de droit public et administratif de l’Empire ottoman, 2 vols., Vienna-Leipzig 1908-12; Ziya Karamursal, Osmanlı maliyi tarihî hakkında tıbbisleri, Ankara 1946, 1959; Mehmed Ârif, ed., Kanuni-cenâme-i Al. 1Uthman in TOEM, Suppl., Istanbul 1300/1912; I. Mouradoglu d’Ohsson, Tableau général de l’Empire ottoman, vii, Paris 1824; Mehmet Zeki Pazali, Millî teşkilât tarihi, 4 vols., Ankara 1977; Ismail Hakki Uzun- carsh, Osmanî devletinin merkez ve bahriye teşkilâtî, Ankara 1948. (C.V. FINDLEY) AL-MUHASIBI, Abu ÂBD ALLAH AL-HARITH (d. 243/857), Mamluk mystic. Amongst these, he is the one whose contemplation is the most psychological; it is marked by attachment to moral values, and not by a more or less extreme...
theological system. In this sense, L. Massignon has legitimately described his mystical doctrine as "more circumspect" (Passion, i, 120). He proceeds from introspection and confines himself to thinking and developing it in its relations with the circumstances of life. It is no doubt this which explains the cognomen of muhsibi, signifying "he who calculates his actions", in other words, one who practises examination of conscience; many Sufis considered this practice dangerous, in that it tends to make the man the judge of his actions. He considers these actions to belong only to God. Al-Muhasibi was furthermore reproached for this practice by Ibn Hanbal (q.v.). It will be observed below how he avoids this danger and this criticism. It should also be noted that he does not confine himself to subjective descriptions of states of conscience, but that he examines them with his reason and with a "concern for precise philosophical definitions", as noted by L. Massignon (Essai, revised ed., 242); furthermore, he always relies on intellectual meditation on texts of the Qur'an and the prophetic tradition. Included among his works is an epistle concerning the quiddity and meaning of intelligence (Risâlat mâkiyyat al-kalâ wa-mu'nâbâ). Thus his thought has evolved into a "science of hearts". It is in this sense that he is opposed to the excessively abstract rationalism of the Mu'tazilis, according the uncreated simplicity of the divine Word while teaching that the letters of the Qur'an are created. Born in Basra, al-Muhasibi came at a very early stage to Baghdad, where he spent the greater part of his life and where he died. Nothing is known of his life other than that he devoted it to teaching. But from 232/846 onward, he was obliged to abandon his teaching, confronted by the blind reaction of the Sunnis who did not understand his use of dialectic in opposing the Mu'tazila. It was at this point that Ibn Hanbal began to attack him. Among his numerous works, listed by L. Massignon in his Essai (243-4), there are two which have been edited and which deserve particular attention. The book of observance of the rights of God (K. al-Ri'sâla li-huwaâk Allah) has been edited by Margaret Smith (London 1941) who writes in her introduction that this book "is his masterpiece, by far the greatest, as it is the longest and most comprehensive of his writings. It is written in the form of counsels, given to a disciple in reply to his questions, to enable believers to find the way of life in which they could render to God the service which is his due" (pp. xvi-xvii). Al-Muhasibi reveals what the soul of a believer should be, to conform with what God wills it to be. It will be noted in particular that he speaks of pious fear (takwâ) and of repentance (tawba). He examines, for example, fear at the level of the members of the body, in order to avoid the offences which they are capable of committing, and fear at the level of the conscience (fi l-ilm), and he shows that fear engenders wu'aâ', which consists in avoiding all that is displeasing to God. The study of the "repentant ones" (al-tawwâbân) is very detailed. In this context, al-Muhasibi distinguishes three degrees in human conduct. First there is the young man who has been brought up well, who inevitably makes some mistakes, but who returns at once to the purity of his heart which God protects because He loves him, since the one who loves (al-huwaâk) is unwilling to lose the one whom he loves (al-muhabbâh). Then there is the case of the man who, from his ignorance, returns to God. God gives him the resolution (al-'azm) to observe His Commandments in the future. But the soul which tends towards evil continues in its efforts. Then God helps the man who persists in his wrong-doing (al-ma'suri fi dhâhadh), and the awareness that he has of the promises of Paradise and the threat of Hell is insufficient to detach him from worldly pleasures. He is in need of something "which unites in his heart the knots of persistence in evil, in such a way that he may return to his Lord in repentance of his offence". This result is to be achieved by fear (khawâf) and by hope (naqîf), which are evidently to be understood here as gifts and blessings of God.

Al-Muhasibi wrote a particularly fine book, the Kitâb al-Tawâbun, which André Roman has translated and which he presents as a "vision of the last things". It could be said that it is a Dies Irae which ends up in an In Paradisum.

In his Essai, Massignon has translated or summarised several passages drawn from manuscripts of al-Muhasibi. In a kind of autobiography, al-Muhasibi shows himself troubled by the divisions which rend the Muslim community. He insists that salvation can only be attained through pious fear, the observation of canonical obligations and wu'aâ'; abstaining from that which God forbids, acting in all things only for God and taking the Prophet as a model. L. Massignon also quotes the opening passage of al-Fasl fi 'l-muhadda, on Love, to which al-Muhasibi responds: "Love comes from God through a kind of anticipatory grace, and this constitutes a response to the criticisms applied to examination of conscience. It is not a man who judges himself but it is God who, in His love, enlightens the hearts of those who love Him and enables them to see their faults and their omissions. Comprehension of the thought of al-Muhasibi is difficult if taken as a whole. J. van Es has studied the intellectual climate in which al-Muhasibi lived, revealing in particular his relations with kalâm. Here there is an important point of view which should serve as a starting-point in any effort to evaluate what is represented by the mystical doctrine of al-Muhasibi. He wielded an immense influence, which Massignon has analysed in detail in his Essai (254). Despite persistent attacks, his "powerful personality" ensured him the respect of his age and of those who followed him. His maternal uncle of Djunayd, was his pupil, and, through him, his teaching affected the nephew. The great mystic al-Ghazâlî willingly acknowledged the authority of al-Muhasibi.


MUHASâSîL (A.), a term used under the Anatolian Sâliûks and Ottomans for various types of revenue collectors (Pakalân, OTD, ii, 569; Ûzun-çaşrâli, pasîmi). It acquired special significance amid extensive Ottoman financial reforms of 1838-9. Citing for European support against Muhammad 'Ali Pâsha of Egypt, the Ottomans began adopting classical liberal doctrine, starting with free trade in the Anglo-Ottoman commercial treaty of Balta Liman (1838; Hurewitz, i, 265-7), and then egalitarianism
with the khatf-i shenf of Gül-khâne (Ramadan 1255/November 1839, Düstür, i, 4-7; Hürriyet, i, 269-71). In didactic terms reflecting the unfamiliarity of the ideas articulated, the khatf proclaimed security of life, honour and property for all Ottoman subjects, as well as regular systems for military conscription and tax assessment. The text further denounces tax-farming (iltizâm [q.v.]) as a “harmful practice ... which never yielded any fruitful results” (dârâ-i tabrî bîdên olub bîl bîr bûctûk tîmemûr-i râyîrât görlûmeyen iltizâmât wîlî mûdrûfsî, Cezar, 282 n. 1; Düstür, i, 5).

Regularising taxation and eliminating tax-farming implied an opportunity to centralise receipts and disbursements in the treasury and to minimise the loss—inevitable under tax-farming—between taxpayer payments and actual government receipts. Realising this benefit required appointing officials as tax collectors (muhassil-i emîdl, muhassil). The collectors would have to be paid salaries, unlike the farmers. Indeed, to carry through fiscal centralisation, the salaries would have to be assigned to government employees in general (Lüftî, Ta'âdâ, v, 121, 132-3, 180-1), to replace the hodgepodge of revenue collection rights that had provided many of them with compensation under the previous system of fiscal decentralisation (Findley, Ottoman civil officialdom, 80-5). The muhassil’s role in tax reform was pivotal, in that the salary system could not be financed without increasing the central government’s revenue receipts. Centralisation would prove impossible, however, if the salary system did not function properly to project increased revenue onto the government’s revenue receipts. Collection rates in different districts proved failures. Collection rates in different districts proved to be inadequate due to the absence of an effective tax-farming system.

The reforms proclaimed in the khatf-i shenf of Gül-khâne were to be introduced on a pilot basis in specific provinces and later extended to others. Appointed basically to the various kadis in those provinces, the muhasses were responsible, not only for tax collection, but for reconstructing the Tazimât in all aspects of financial administration. They were to evaluate the existing tax-burden of their districts, assess the cash value of revenues previously collected in kind, and take charge of the exploitation of all types of revenue sources, replacing historical anomalies and exemptions with a consolidated tax (esgâl-ı vergi) assessed on real estate and “profit” (emîlât ve tîmîrât). They were also to have a small clerical staff selected from the bureaus of the Finance Ministry and to work together with local administrative and police officials. In addition, a local assembly (muhâsîtlik meclisi) was to bring together certain other local officials, local notables, and the religious and communal leaders of the non-Muslim communities with the muhassil and his clerks to decide on the apportionment and collection of taxes and other matters.

These assemblies mark the first step toward the local councils (memleket meclisi) which later became characteristic adjuncts of Ottoman administration (Ortaylı, 13-29; Kaynar, 224-83). Evaluated at just under 130 million kurush for the financial year 1256/1840-1, the revenues which the muhasses were supposed to collect became—at least nominally—the state’s largest single revenue item (Cezar, 292-301). However, the new system proved a failure. Collection rates in different districts proved inconsistent. The local councils became hotbeds of contention and abused their authority. Local opposition led to at least one muhassil’s death. As a result, an important part of the revenues for 1839-40 could not be collected. The leading proponent of the reforms, Mustâfa Reşit Paşa [q.v.] fell from the grand vizierate in Safer 1257/March 1841; conservative interests assumed power; the muhâsîls were abolished; and tax-farming was restored (Lüftî, vii, 35-36; Ortaylı, 29). While the salary system survived a troubled existence, the failure of fiscal centralisation proved quick and final, helping—together with the more free trade—to set off the financial decline that led to bankruptcy and foreign financial control [see Mâliyê].


AL-MUHASSIN b. ‘ALÎ (now pronounced Muhssin), according to Shi‘i tradition, the truth of which is challenged by the Sunnis, the third son of ‘Alî and Fâtimâ, a still-born child whose mother gave birth to him prematurely during the search of the house ordered by the new caliph Abu Bakr, and carried out by ‘Umar and Kûnûfu b. Umayr, who ill-treated her.

In the 4th/10th century a makâm was built in his honour at Aleppo. The Muğhammisa [q.v.], a Shi‘î who includes the Nusayris, has a particular devotion to al-Muhashin. Under their influence the Persian ta’siyat representing the Last Judgment and the resurrection of the ‘Alî martyrs met with the appearance of al-Muhashin covered with blood in the arms of the Prophet; his grandfather raised him towards the heavens to call down divine justice.

Among the extremist Shi‘îs, the triad al-Hasan, al-Husayn and al-Muhashin in the final cycle, are said to have appeared before in the Mosaic cycle as the three sons of Hûrûn, sc. Shabbâr Shubbayr and Mughabbir.

This praenomen, now without ta’sîdî, is particularly common in the feminine form Musînâ and in the theophoric form ‘Abd al-Muhssin (e.g. ‘Abd al-Muhssin Sa’dûn, ‘Irâqî politician and Prime Minister in the later 1920s).

**Bibliography:** M. Sobernheim, in Les origines shi‘ites ... des Banû ’l-Furâtî, in Mélanges Gaudrejoy-Depolmebynes, Paris 1935, 38, nos. 2 and 3. (L. Massignon)
MUHDATHUN [see Suppl.].
MUHIBB AHMED "DIRANAS", Turkish poet and dramatist, born in Sinope in 1699 and died in Ankara in 1880. He worked for a number of newspapers and state institutions. His first poem was published in a magazine in 1926, and several magazines published his poems throughout the years. He wrote three plays,ゴルガー, O bölöye istemmedi and Çiçek, in which he deals with the conflict between reality and fantasy, past and present, fate and free will.

He is one of the important poets of modern Turkish poetry, using new metre and daily language and attempting to create a new language and structure for Turkish poetry; for him, sound, harmony and form are important. But also he talks about what he observes and then probes beyond the obvious; and influenced by Baudelairean symbolism, he portrays the condition of the individual in relation to nature and the universe, showing the infinity of human emotions.

Most of his poems are romantic, but he has written many that are realistic and national and local in treatment. Yet the national and local characteristics in his poems are not there for ideological reasons, since he is one of the important poets of modern Turkish poetry; for him, sound, harmony and form are important. But also he talks about what he observes and then probes beyond the obvious; and influenced by Baudelairean symbolism, he portrays the condition of the individual in relation to nature and the universe, showing the infinity of human emotions.

Most of his poems are romantic, but he has written many that are realistic and national and local in treatment. Yet the national and local characteristics in his poems are not there for ideological reasons, since he is one of the important poets of modern Turkish poetry; for him, sound, harmony and form are important. But also he talks about what he observes and then probes beyond the obvious; and influenced by Baudelairean symbolism, he portrays the condition of the individual in relation to nature and the universe, showing the infinity of human emotions.
AL-MUHIBBI — MUHIMME DEFTERLERİ

preserved in the Brill-Houtsma ms., no. 112, appears to be part of the preliminary work on this collection; the draft of a synopsis is in Berlin (Ahlwardt, no. 9053). A synopsis was prepared by 'Abd al-Hādjī al-Ghazzī al-6Amīrī (d. 1191/1777); Murādī, iii, 215); ms. in Tübingen (Sebald, no. 9). A second great biographical work on celebrities of all ages entitled al-6īlam was to give under each letter al-ālam wa 'l-nisāb wa 'l-kunā wa 'l-abnā wa 'l-nisā waw 'l-ummmahā separately. In the draft in Leipzig (Vollers, no. 683) giving the letter mim, the sources, which from the articles are taken usually word-for-word, are generally quoted. He also wrote a continuation of al-Khafadji's Rayhdnat al-alibbd^ entitled Nafhat al-Rayhāna wa-n-rahat jīlā al-bāna, which survives; see Brockelmann, II', 377-9; S II, 403-4; an anonymous selection from it called Muḥādarat al-Muḥīm (of the Prophet), combatting the *<&rara^a min al-dakhtl and by the *<&rara^a min al-dakhtl and by the

al-Muḥibbi — Muḥimm Defterleri

... (al-Tabāri, ii, 633; cf. also ii, 598-9, 691).

Bibliography: In the given article. (Ed.)

MÜHİMME DEFTERLERİ (t.), a term of Ottoman Turkish administration. This series of "Reports and Accounts" is for the most part kept in the Bağhakanlık Arşivi-Osmanlı Arşivi, İstanbul. Two hundred and sixty-three registers are catalogued as Mühimme Defterleri (MD), but in addition, we find registers and fragments of registers in other series which help fill some of the gaps in the MD series. On the other hands, thirteen registers catalogued as MDs are really appointment registers (ruus defterleri). Two registers in the Kâmil Kepeci section are also MDs, and two others have been located in the Topkapı Sarayı, one in the archives (E 12321) and one in the library (Koğuşlar, 888). The two Topkapı registers constitute the oldest in the series, pertaining to 1544/45 and 1552 respectively. The series was continued until 1805, but the 18th- and 19th-century volumes are reputed to be of limited interest and have rarely been used. Certain registers survive only as fragments; these have been catalogued under the heading Mühimme Zeyli.

From 1059/1649 onward a special series, known as the Şikayet Defteri was instituted, which in 1155/1742 was split up into a number of different series, each bearing the name of the province with which it was concerned. It is often difficult to separate MDs from Şikayet Defterleri, since only a few items are unambiguously characterised as one or the other. However, Şikayet Defterleri rarely if ever contain entries concerning warfare or the pilgrimage to Mecca, while commands relating to penalties and amnesties were also recorded almost exclusively in the MDs. Even though there were need for both the registers and Şikayet Defterleri were prepared in the chancery known as the Beylik Kālemi, affairs recorded in the MDs are of a kind demanding decisions on a fairly high level, while Şikayet Defterleri are concerned with matters of less far-reaching significance. But since the relevant criteria are quite vague, registers are easily misclassified. Thus the register catalogued as MD 92 is in reality a Şikayet Defteri.

MDs contain copies of sultans' rescripts, for the most part addressed to governors and kādūs, but also to foreign rulers. However, not all fermdns found in the foreign archives have been located in the MDs. This may be due to the fact that, because of physical loss and mistaken classification, there are significant lacunae in the MDs. Fermdns addressed to foreign ambassadors and individual heads of states are recorded in a separate series (Erenel Defterleri), which also has been but partially preserved. From 1111/1699 letters to foreign rulers were kept together as a special series: "Nâme-i Humâyûn ile sûret-i 'abde rıskâ defteri". Losses seem to have occurred early, since Grand Viziers on campaign carried a number of registers with them. An entry dated 1151/1738-9 specifies that registers from the last thirty years were to be taken along on a Rumelian campaign. The oldest were to be left in Edirne, while the registers dating from the "middle" decade were to be kept in Nish. Probably in earlier campaigns, registers had been carried all the way to the front, since the Grand Vizier on campaign (and his representative the Kaṁmmâkâm who remained in the capital) could issue commands in the sultan's name, and his chancery probably needed the older registers for purposes of reference; see G. Majer (ed.), "Das osmanische Registerbuch der Beschwerden" (Şikayet Defteri) vom Jahre 1675, i, Vienna 1984, 15-21. It is not clear at which stage the fermdns were entered into the MDs, whether the entries constitute drafts which had not yet reached their final stage of elaboration or whether they are abridged copies of texts which already had been explicated. Practice differed from case to case. In some cases registers are clearly drafts, and show traces of reworking and editing. Moreover, MD 14 and MD 70-5 probably
consist of loose papers on which drafts had been written, and which were later bound together, an assumption confirmed by the often very careless handwriting. Corrections were later added by the ve‘yi al-kudād [q. e.]. Drafts were sometimes reused, particularly in routine affairs (Mübahat Kütüköglü, Muhimme defterlerindeki mudeme kaydının uzerinde, in Tarih Boyunca Palagrafya ve Diplomatik Semineri, Istanbul 1988, 104-6).

In MD entries, the addressee’s honorific titles were usually left out or much abridged. Following the addressee’s name or function, we find the formula mânâyâyız ki or kâğıd-ı-ki. The text then gives an account of the events which led to the promulgation of the fermdn, including, where applicable, queries and complaints from people who had been involved in the events, often but not necessarily officially. This section, which contains most of the evidence of interest to the historian, ends with the formula bayurdum ki, which introduces the measures to be taken. The latter are often comparatively routine; thus a kaâdî may be instructed to deal with a given case, if the latter is not covered by the statute of limitations. We also find the admonition to proceed with fairness and moderation and avoid molestation of the innocent. Two stages can sometimes be discerned in the decision-making process; after instructions had been given by the sultan or Grand Vizier, discussion in the Divân determined the exact words to be used in the fermdn, which were then copied out by the scribes. Fermdns frequently end with a formula of corroboration and promulgation, which the MDs often record in abridged form.

The dating of fermdns recorded in the MDs poses serious problems, since the texts do not indicate at which stage in the often lengthy process of drafting a date was affixed. Not all fermdns are dated, and while most registers follow a more or less chronological sequence, this is not always true because many fragments have been badly misbound. Dates may occur as the heading of an entry and (rarely the 10th/16th century is concerned) as the final section of the text itself. It has been suggested that dates used as headings refer to the times at which the fermdns were entered into the MD, shortly after they had been drafted in the Divân, and that there were inconsistencies within the dates difficult to explain if the fermdn was entered into the register shortly after its composition. Certain notes indicate that fermdns were sometimes entered into the registers a long time after they had been completed (Kütüköglü, op. cit., 101-2).

In certain instances, there is a record of the time at which a fermdn was dispatched. Where the 10th/16th century is concerned, the latter can often be verified by checking the ulak hâkimis. Listed separately at the end of the register, the latter record the messengers sent to different localities within the Empire. (As a result of these problems, catalogues sometimes give misleading dates; cf. Geza David, The Muhimme Defteri as a source for Ottoman-Habsburg rivalry in the 16th century (unpubl. paper) for a new chronology of the 10th/16th century registers.)

Scribes employed in the writing of MDs were known as mümhemmes-nâvis and subject to special rules so as to ensure that the fermdns they wrote out remained secret. Top secret matters were written by the head of the beyyêkî kalemi in person, or under his immediate supervision. Less important matters were dealt with under the supervision of the kisedâr. When multiple copies were needed for despatching to a large number of governors or kaâdîs, the text was divided into a group of scribes. Until 1776 the Divân-ı Hümayün chancery was located in a single chamber. But in

1776, in order to ensure secrecy, the different subsections were housed in separate rooms; the mümhemmes-nâvis were also assigned a chamber of their own.

Due to the wide range of their contents, the MDs have been used for studies of political and diplomatic history, social and economic life, as well as provincial administration. Ottoman policies in the Habsburg, Polish and Persian border areas can be reconstructed on the basis of this evidence. The same thing applies to the relations of the Ottoman central administration with the states bordering the Red Sea. There has been some disagreement among specialists whether we can assume the existence of a coherent Ottoman policy toward the states of the northern steppes; this discussion is based largely upon an interpretation of fermdns recorded in the MDs. Work on the Ottoman Empire’s “Northern” and “Southern” policies has been hampered by the fact that minor Indian principalities, local Yemeni rulers, Ethiopians, and Crimean or Nogay Tatars have not left extensive archives, so that scholars have had to depend almost exclusively on Ottoman records (and in the case of the Indian Ocean region, on Portuguese materials). When dealing with political relations between the Ottoman Empire and the Habsburgs, Iran, Poland and Venice, chronicles and archival documents from the relevant countries are available to supplement information contained in the MDs. In the realm of social and economic history, fermdns contained in the MDs provide information on the history of the pilgrimage to Mecca (although documents of this kind are more abundant in the 10th/16th century than in later periods). There is also a large body of information available on the Djellâli rebellions [q.e. in Suppl.] of the late 10th/16th and early 11th/17th centuries, and on the revolts of impoverished and frustrated madresses students which accompanied them. Repression against the Anatolian Kızılbaş as potential allies of the Shah of Persia is also amply documented. On internal trade and craft production, evidence is less systematic, since disputes concerning such matters were generally resolved in the local kaâdîs’ courts. But then those disputes important enough to be submitted to the sultan’s Divân are often most instructive, even though their context is difficult to reconstruct. With respect to foreign trade, evidence in the MDs is particularly concerned with the enforcement of export prohibitions; these encompassed grain, cotton, certain types of leather and a multitude of other goods. The relevant fermdns can serve as economic indicators, but also reflect the twists and turns of official policy.

Relations between the Ottoman central administration and the provinces are extensively documented in the MDs. Conflicts over taxation, recruitment of auxiliaries for campaigns, repression of robbers, negotiation strategies on the part of provincial notables and official attempts to legitimise the Sultan’s rule have been studied, both by historians whose aim it is to show the integrative policies pursued by the centre and by those whose interest is focussed upon autonomous provincial life. Special MDs dealing with preparation for war have been used for the study of logistics. Thus the MDs with some justification are regarded as one of the most important series in the Ottoman archives.

Bibliography (in addition to items mentioned in the text): Geza David (op. cit.), contains a comprehensive bibliography of published documents and manuscripts built largely around evidence from the MDs. For unedited evidence, Sertoglu, Muhteva bakimidan Basvekalet Arşiosu, Ankara 1955; U. Heyd, Ottoman documents on
Palestine 1551-1615. A study of the Firman according to the Muhimme Defteri, Oxford 1960; Chantal Lemercier-Quelquejay, Une source inédite pour l’histoire de la Russie au XVIIe siècle. Les registres des mühimme defterleri des Archives du Beygiükâlet, in Cahiers du Monde Russe et Sociétée, vii (1967), 335-43; Tevfik Temelkuran, Divan-ı Hümâyûn Mühimme Kâlemi, in Tarîh Ertûstûsû Dergisi, vii (1972), 129-68; W.S. Peachy, Register of copies or collection of drafts? The case of four Mühimme Defters from the Archives of the Prime Ministry in Istanbul, in The Turkish Studies Association Bulletin, x/5 (1986), 79-86; Miheoa Berindei and G. Veinstein, L’Empire ottoman et le Littoral oriental en 1544-1545, Étude et documents, Paris 1987. Some monographs based largely on MDs: Halil Inalcik, Osmanlı-Rusi rekabetinin mensüzi ve Don-Yolça kanalı teşebbüsü, in Bellaten, xii, no. 46 (1948), 349-402; Muhbhat Kütükoğlu, Osmanlı-Iran siyasî münasebetleri, i. 1578-1590, Istanbul 1962; Mustafa Akgâz, Çelebî siyasetleri (1555-1606), Ankara 1963; Lütfü Gücer, XVI-XVII ıştaerde Osmanlı imparatorlukluğu taz tahkîkât ve tuzlalların işleme nizamı, in I. Ü. İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası, xxii/2 (1962-3), 97-143; Cengiz Orhunlu, Osmanlı imparatorlukluğunun gûney siyasîti. Habez eyaleti, Istanbul 1974; Kemal Beydilli, Die polnischen Königsweihungen und Interregnum von 1572 und 1576 im Lichte osmanischer Archivalien. Ein Beitrag zur osmanischen Außenpolitik, Munich 1976; C.H. Imber, The persecution of the Ottoman Skîsîtes according to the mühimme defterleri, in Isl., i/v2 (1979), 245-73; Hulusi Yavuz, Kâbe ve Harimeyen iycen ‘ene OSmanîsî Muhimme Hikâyeleri, (1517-1571), Istanbul 1984; Caroline Finkel, The administration of warfare—the Ottoman military campaigns in Hungary, 2 vols., Vienna 1988; Suraiya Faroqhi, Herrscher über Mehka. Die Geschichte der Seligeafhat, Munich 1990; D. Goffmann, The grand vizier produced the imperial seal on the Divân days for the sâsâvâh-bâshî to seal the bag (kisr) for the registers of the reisãnâmeh and the archives of the Finance Department or mâhiye defterkânîsî, the Treasury (khazîne) and the general Archives (defter-khâne) (MTM, i, 499). The grand vizier also had, like all the viziers or governors of provinces, two other seals, one, a large one, impressed at the top of bayruulm or “ordinances”, and the other, a small and modest one, placed at the foot of letters from the vizier, including official ones (cf. Ahmed Râsim, Othmânîî ta’sî’, iii, 1514).

The use of seals in Turkey (we know very little of those of the Saldîqûx (cf. Reinaud, op. cit., i, 121 n.) was exceedingly widespread. They were used for many purposes: to stamp invariants, to voice the seal the bag (kîsîr), but the name was changed [see KHATAM]. It is only in the early 20th century that under the influence of the West, the muhör has been gradually disappearing. It had at one time reached a high degree of perfection and the artists used to sign their work. These signatures were usually very brief, Miğîlî, Sâî’î, Ahmed, etc. They were written in characters similar to those of the Roman alphabet, and the artists used to sign their work in a particular kind of ink to which salvia was added, as in Persia (cf. Le Père Raphael du Mans, Estat de la Perse en 1660, ed. Ch. Schefer, Paris 1890, 129). In more modern times, the seal was carried in the purse (a cf. by Mehmed ‘Akîf [q.v.] in his poem Sâfî Babâ). It is only in the early 20th century that under the influence of the West, the muhör has been displaced by the signature, receiving its coup de grâce with the adoption of the Roman alphabet in 1928 and of rubber seals.

The industry of seal-engraving has thus been gradually disappearing. It had at one time reached a high degree of perfection and the artists used to sign their work. These signatures were usually very brief, Miğîlî, Sâî’î, Ahmed, etc. They were written in characters similar to those of the Roman alphabet, and the artists used to sign their work in a particular kind of ink to which salvia was added, as in Persia (cf. Le Père Raphael du Mans, Estat de la Perse en 1660, ed. Ch. Schefer, Paris 1890, 129). In more modern times, the seal was carried in the purse (a cf. by Mehmed ‘Akîf [q.v.] in his poem Sâfî Babâ). It is only in the early 20th century that under the influence of the West, the muhör has been displaced by the signature, receiving its coup de grâce with the adoption of the Roman alphabet in 1928 and of rubber seals.

The use of seals in Turkey (we know very little of those of the Saldîqûx (cf. Reinaud, op. cit., i, 121 n.) was exceedingly widespread. They were used for many purposes: to stamp invariants, to voice the seal the bag (kîsîr), but the name was changed [see KHATAM].

The word "muhur" is used for "to muhur almak (cf. ibid., xvii [1861], 13; de Sacy, in JA, in [17x539]was therefore a very important personage. Mir of the seals or better "private secretary" (see below), but the office remained under the monarchy. His salary was the same as that of the chief of the cabinet of the Khedive. The title of a quarter called Mi...
but this 'Abd al-Rahman does not appear to have had a son called Ḥanzala (cf. Ibn al-Kalbi-Caskel, Linguographic character in which it is nevertheless possible to glean some biographical information which appears authentic. Among them we will point out the mention of his pilgrimage to Mecca, the marks of veneration that surrounded him, his strenuous defence of orthodoxy against official Shi‘ism and especially the political role which he played in the time of Ḥammad b. Bulughūn, the eponymous ancestor of the Ḥamāmdīs [q.v.], who rebelled in 405/1015 against his uncle Bāḍī b. al-Ḥanṣūr [q.v.] and in the following year had the Shi‘īs of Tunis massacred, with the encouragement of Muḥriz b. Khalaf; if we are to believe his Manākīb (145, Fr. tr. 313), it was in the latter’s presence that the evidence was given against the “Easterners” (Mashā‘īka [q.v.], i.e. the Shi‘īs), leading to their condemnation to death, when they were not released for lack of sufficient proof. It is no less remarkable that, according to H.R. Idris (Zirides, 119) the Manākīb may be “the only document attesting to the massacre of the Shi‘īs”.

The end of the text of the Manākīb is occupied by a dāhīr (zahi‘ [q.v.]) whose date causes difficulty. This rescript, signed by the Zirid Mu‘izz b. Bāḍī (who ruled from 406 to 454/1016-62 [q.v.]) contains a eulogy in support of Muḥriz and enjoins on all the community, and in particular the authorities, to take care of him, protect him, watch over his entourage, defend his property (fields, gardens, houses) and exempt him from the tithes and hārād. This document is dated 20 Rabi‘ II 417/10 June 1026, although the beneficiary of these privileges died in the odour of sanctity in 413/1022; no doubt 417 should be corrected. We should regard al-Muḥriz as having the right also to recognize his merits and compensate him for his attitude with respect to the Shi‘īs. In addition, the dāhīr would serve to confirm and amplify a sīdīl of Bāḍī b. al-Ḥanṣūr (who ruled from 386 to 406/996-1016), probably before 396/1005; according to the Madārik (iv, 715), the sovereign had granted all the students safeguards and protection and to those of the ḫāḻāq exemption from taxes. If we are to believe Ibn Ṭāfir al-Adlī (K. al-Duwal al-munkāti‘a, apud Ibn Khallākīn (see also al-Kutubl. ‘Uyun al-tawāri‘ī, Fr. tr. Fagnan, Extravits ineditis, Algiers 1924, 257; al-Wāṣir al-Sarrāj, Ḥulal, 874-5), at the time when he was threatening Tunis, the same Bāḍī b. al-Ḥanṣūr, who had aroused resentment against Muḥriz b. Khalaf, perished, slain by his own sword at the call of the latter (in 406/1016). It is not impossible that, seven years later, the Shi‘īs may have exacted revenge for the ḫāḻāq’s hostility, since it is said that he died following a nocturnal attack or by poisoning.

The tomb in Tunis of Sūlī Mahrez has never ceased to be the object of a particular veneration on the part of the community, and in particular the authorities, to take care of him, protect him, watch over his entourage, defend his property (fields, gardens, houses) and exempt him from the tithes and hārād which is held in its house and over which the authorities had no right of inspection. Muḥriz b. Khalaf, who had begun to teach the Kur‘ān, ḥādıṯ and fikh in the outskirts of Tunis before settling in the town, acquired a sound reputation as a Mālikī fākīh, but he certainly had more devotion than knowledge; this renown for piety merited his receiving visits from passing strangers, and he is also cited for example in Andalusian biographical works such as the Sila of Ibn Bashkuwāl (no. 707), the Tūḥfat al-aldbb of Ibn al-Abbār (no. 1671) and also the Naǧ arāt al-ḥār of al-Makāṣir ed. Cairo 1949, iv, 63).

He left behind no book, but a certain number of verses are attributed to him, notably a description of the ruins of Carthage (see H.H. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb, al-Muṣaffāb al-madrusi, 2nd ed., Tunis 1944, 38-60). Among the poems that he inspired one should note the verses on the Sho‘b of al-Sarrāj (Ḥulal, 875-8).

Bibliography: The essential source consists of the Manākīb Muḥriz b. Khalaf of Abu ‘l-Tāhir al-Fārisī, which have been edited, translated and annotated by H.R. Idris, with the Manākīb of al-Djabānīn (Tunis 1957, Ar. text 89-154, followed by various extracts (155-93), Fr. tr. of the whole, 271-344. Among the appendices appears the biography of Muḥriz taken from the Madārik of the kādi ‘Iyād, which is to be found in the chronological work of al-Bakīr, Tarīkh al-Maddūrīk, Beirut n.d., iv, 712-15; an extract of al-Hulal al-sunduqiyt of al-Wāṣir al-Sarrāj, the text of which has since been published by M.M. al-Hīlī, Tunis 1970 (see 624, 853, 873, 874-3). The passage of the Wafājāt of Ibn Khallākīn (Cairo 1310, i, 87) on the death of Bāḍī; the lines of the notice of Yākūt (i, 899) on Tunis concerning the sailors; the passage of the Tūḥfat al-aldbb published and translated by Ferrand (see above). H.R. Idris often cites Muḥriz b. Khalaf in his Berbérie orientale sous les Zirides, Paris 1959 (esp. 119-22); Zayn al-Abīdin al-Tūnisī devoted a monograph to him, Muḥriz b. Khalaf za‘īm al-dhara‘ī dīd al-Shī‘a, Tunis 1981. See also M. Bel Khdija, Taḏa‘īr ma‘ūlum al-tawāfīl fi ‘l-ḥudūd wa-fi ‘l-qāsidāt, Tunis 1358/1939.

(Ch. Pellat)

MUḤṢĀN (a.), a term of Islamic law denoting a certain personal status.

The Kur‘ān’s impersonal uses of the root h-y-n refer to warehousing, shelter, fortification and protection, (XII, 48; XXI, 80; LIX, 2, 14). Used personally by the Virgin Mary (XXI, 91; LXVI, 12), the verb refers to chastity. A cluster of participial derivatives (IV, 24-5; V, 5) relate to the intent underlying the Islamic marriage contract where mawzīna/muḥṣāna are perhaps best understood in terms of the provision of accommodation. The muḥṣāna need not be Muslim (V, 5); if Muslim, she need not be free (IV, 24-5). Muḥṣāniyat are thus marriageable women: free muslimāt or khitābīyat, or Muslim slave women. Muḥṣānāt/muḥṣāniyat are contrasted with muṣallāt/muṣslīthin, i.e. with such as engage in illicit sexual relations. The concept has been extended to female domestic slave women (IV, 24) yet be contrasted with slave women (IV, 25).

The form muḥṣān does not appear in the Kur‘ān, occurring only in fikh discussions and hadīth where it
denotes persons liable, in the event of sexual misconduct, to death by stoning. They may originally have signified persons responsible for the Pilgrimage in 1029/1620 and studied further his studies; within a year he went on to Shiraz to study theology and jurisprudence with Sayyid Madjid. Within a year he went on to Shiraz and jurisprudence with Sayyid Madjid. Returning to Isfahan after continued to produce respected extracts of various lengths, quite a large proportion are given in full. The book is particularly rich in poems by Muṣḥafi (q.v.). Τάθκη, Muḥsin himself and his father Ḥakīkat; needless to say, many little-known poets are included. Whenever a poet is quoted, whether in one or more poems and in any chapter, brief biographical information is given, seldom stretching to more than two lines. This is normally restricted to full name and fatḥah, parentage, place of residence, teacher(s) and pupil(s). Where a poet is the author of a tadhkira, this also is mentioned. This information is repeated verbatim in every chapter in which a poet is quoted, which in some cases may be 20 or more times. Though the information thus given may seem sparse, it was enough to warrant republication of the work several times, minus the poetical extracts, during the last 100 years, quite apart from several new editions of the whole work during the late 19th century.

Muḥsin's arrangement appears to have been imitated only once, sc. by Gōgūl Praghād Rāsā, in his Armuğān Gōgūl Praghād (1299/1882). But although this includes more poets (over 1,100), the poetical extracts are shorter and fewer in number.

Muḥsin also translated—or, more properly, adapted—two of the three sections (tadhkira) of a Persian work by Shāhīwārī, translated for the Indian market before the original Persian work had been used. For accounts of this and other tadhkiras mentioned, see Fardānī Fāṭhpūrī. Urdu ṣukhār ʿaʾer tadhkira nigārī, Lahore 1975, as follows: Sarapā ṣukhān, 376-80; Armuğān Gōgūl Praghād, 569-79; Muḥsin-i-nisāt (original Persian), 121-3; ibid., Muḥsin's Urdu adaptation, 432-40. Muḥsin the poet is mentioned briefly in several tadhkiras, including Nasīkhān, Tadhkira-i-ṣukhārān; Lucknow 1874, 419. For further references, see Fāṭhpūrī, op. cit., particularly the footnotes.


Muḥsin-i Fayd-i Kāshānī, Muhammad b. Murtuza (1007-90/1598-1679), usually called Mullā Muḥsin or simply Fayd, the latter being a tadhkira that was given to him by his teacher Mullā Sadrā (d. 1050/1640 (q.v.)); one of the greatest scholars of Sáfawī Persia.

Life. Fayd was born into a family that has continued to produce respected ʿulamāʾ down to modern times. He studied tafsīr, hadīth, jurisprudence, and related fields with his father and maternal uncle in Kāšān. At the age of twenty, he went to Isfahan to continue his studies, within a year he went on to Shiraz to study hadīth and jurisprudence with Sayyid Ḍājīd Bāhrānī (d. 1028/1619). Returning to Isfahan after some months, he studied hadīth with Bahāʾ al-Dīn ʿAmīlī (d. 1030/1621 (q.v.). Perhaps it was at this time that he studied philosophy with Mīr Dāmdād (d. 1041/1631 (see al-Dāmdād)). Maʿṣūm ʿAll Ṣāḥib claims in his Jārāʾik al-ḥākīmaʾī Tehrān 1319, ii, 143-4) that both ʿAmīlī and Fayd were ʿālifāt of the Nūrshākhī Karākhī ʿabādī Muhammad Muṣīn Sadrī. Fayd left for the pilgrimage in 1029/1620 and studied hadīth in Mecca with Muhammad b. al-Ḥasan b. Zayn al-Dīn al-ʿAmīlī (d. 1030/1621). On returning to Persia, he wandered from teacher to teacher until he found Mullā Sadrā (Ṣadr al-Dīn Shirāzī) in Kum in
works is a selection of texts from Ibn al-`Arabi’s al-Falâbî al-malkiyya. The most important are probably ʿAyn al-yakīn, written in 1036/1626-7, and ʿIlm al-yakīn, written in 1042/1632-3 (published together in Tehran 1303/1885-6). The first is oriented more toward rational philosophy and the second toward mystical philosophy; Fayd warns us that the latter should be kept away (madānî) from those not worthy of it. He wrote an epitome of the first, Usul al-maṣārif (ed. S.A. Aghṭīyānī, Mashhad 1354/1975) in 1089/1679, and an epitome of the second, al-Maṣārif, in 1090/1679.

3. Ethics (10 works, 16%). The longest and most important of these, completed in 1046/1636-7, is al-Maṣārif al-kabīr āf iḥāṣ al-ḥuṣnā (a four-volume critical facsimile edition in the hand of Fayd’s son, the well-known scholar Muhammad ʿAlam al-Hudā, was published by Miḥṣkhāt, Tehran 1339-40/1960-1). In it, Fayd rewrites al-Ghazzalī’s Iḥāṣ al-ḥuṣnā ʿulūm al-dīn, replacing the weak hadāthāh and accounts of the pious forbears with appropriate and reliable reports from Shīʿī sources. He follows the structure of the Iḥāṣ more or less, except that he drops book 7 of volume 2, on ʿamāl, and adds at the end of volume 2 a new book, Akhṭār al-imāmāt wa-ṣādāt al-ḥuṣnā. He wrote an epitome of al-Maṣārif called Kitāb al-Hudā kī ṣādīs al-dīn in 1090/1679.

4. Taṣfīr (4 works, 13%). Fayd’s major taṣfīr, written in 1075/1664-5, is known as al-Sāfī (Tehran 1375/1955-56). It consists mainly of sayings of the twelve Imāms concerning Kurʿānic verses. Most of it sticks to the outward meaning, but, he tells us, it also has “something of esoteric interpretation (thayr) min al-tawbī.”

5. Jurisprudence and its principles (28 works, 8%). Neither of his two major works in this field, Muṣasam al-ḥuṣnā, completed in 1027/1618, and Maḥfīth al-ṣarhā, completed 1042/1632-3, has been published. Maḥfīth is more important and has been the subject of at least eight glosses and fourteen commentaries.

6. Poetry (20 collections, 4%). Several of these works are excerpted from his Diwān, which has been published (Tehran 1338/1960), but without his several mathnawīs.

7. Prayers and supplications (12 works, 3%). These are mostly collections of prayers by the Imāms. Bibliography: S.M. Miḥṣkāt quotes from the standard biographical sources and gathers a great deal of information on the editions and manuscripts of Fayd’s works in the introductions to the four volumes of al-Maṣārif al-kabīr. Fayd’s autobiographical Shārīr-i sadr, partly translated into Arabic by Miḥṣkāt (iv, 5-9), was published in Dīwān (1/8, Bahman 1323, 393-409). Ṭa‘īna-yi gāḥī was translated by W.C. Chittick in A. Arjomand (ed.), Authority and political culture in Shi‘ism, Albany 1988, 269-84. See also H. Corbin, Anthologie des philosophes transes, ii, Tehran 1975, 32-49; S.H. Nasr, The School of Iṣfahan, in M.M. Sharif (ed.), A history of Musli̇m philosophy, ii, Wiesbaden 1966, 926-30.

(W.C. CHITTICK)
Muhammad ascended the throne on 7-8 Shaban 255/21-2 July with the name al-
Mühtadl. His ideal was the Umayyad
Abd Allah had already died at the Samanid court in 340/951-2, and
Aziz b. Muham-
mad b. Muzaffar b. Muhtadj, suc-
cessively governor in Farghana, Tukharistan and
Khusraw in the upper Oxus prin-
cipality of Caghânîyân [q.v.]
only course left for the caliph was to dispose of Musa
Moderate and to rouse him to the power of the Com-
manship of the Faithful. In several provinces there
were risings by 'Alids, real or alleged; but the most
dangerous enemy of the caliph was the Turkish
general Musâ b. Bughâ. When the latter, who was
fighting against the 'Alids in Persia, heard of the accession of al-
Mühtadl, he returned home. Reaching Sâmarrâ in Muharram 256/December 869, he
forced the caliph to take an oath to bring to justice the
Turkish chief Sâlîh b. Wasîf, who had robbed Kâbiha, the mother of the caliph al-
Mutâzz, of all her priceless treasures. When Sâlîh concealed himself,
the Turkish mercenaries mutinied and were intending to
depose al-Mühtadl but were appeased by the
resolute action of the latter. Al-Mühtadl then prom-
ised Sâlîh's followers that he would pardon him; but
as the latter did not appear, they went to Sâmarrâ and began to use it until they were scaled by Musâ.
Sâlîh was soon afterwards discovered and killed by
one of Musâ's men. When Musâ had taken the field against the
Khârîqîs, al-Mühtadl began to incite the people against him and his brother Muhammad b.
Bughâ and accused them of embezzlement. Muham-
mad was brought to trial and put to death, although al-
Mühtadl had expressly guaranteed his pardon. The
only course left for the caliph was to dispose of Musâ if he wished to keep his throne. But his plan was
betrayed; Musâ advanced with superior forces and the caliph suffered a disastrous defeat. As he declined to
abide, he was murdered on Thursday, 18 Radjab 256/June 870, in horrible fashion, and al-
Mutâzîm b. al-Mutâwakkîl [q.v.] raised to the throne
in his place.

During this period of anarchy in Sâmarrâ after al-
Mutâwakkîl's death, the civil administration was
eclipsed by the continued ascendancy of the Turkish
military. For the first half of al-Mühtadl's reign, effec-
tive power in the state was exercised by Sâlîh b. Wasîf, and it does not seem that there was an effective
vizer. In the latter six months of his caliphate, how-
ever, the long-serving and experienced official
Sulaymân b. Wahb [see Wahr, banû] acted as vizier, with
al-Hasan b. Mukhlaš as chief secretary, although
civilian control still remained substantially impaired, with the bureaucracy's main task being to find money
for the avaricious soldiery.
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Manuel, 204; idem, Encycl. Iranica, i, art. 'Ala Mo-
htadj. The Muhtadjids have a minor part in Persian
literary history as patrons of leading poets of the time,
such as Dâkî [q.v.], whilst the Ghaznavid poet Far-
rûkhî Siştânî [q.v.], in early life secured the support of
the prince of Caghânîyân Abu 'l-Mu'azzîr Muhammad,
conceivably a grandson of Abu 'Ali Caghânî,
and composed for him a famous ode at the amir's
branding-ground (cf. E.G. Browne, LHP, ii, 124-9).
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Muhtasham-i Kâshânî, Shams al-
Shârâ' [q.v.] Kamâl al-Dîn, Persian poet of the early
Safavid period, born ca. 1500 in Kâshân. According
to the most reliable sources, he died in 1596/1587-8; a
less likely dating of his death, given by Abū Tālib Isfahānī in Khuṣṣāt al-āfār (see Storey i, 2, 878), is 1008. In Muhammad's time he was a draper (hāzāz) like his father, but he abandoned this trade for the more profitable career of a professional poet. His work was appreciated at the Safavid court at Kāzvin. He seems to have continued, however, to live in Kāzvin. He wrote panegyrics to Shāh Tāmūsh I, his sons Ismāʿīl, Muḥammad Khudābāndā and Hamza and his daughter Pari-Khān Khānum. Muḥtašām also established contacts with the Mughal court and the king of the Deccan through the intermediary of his brother ʿAbd al-Ghānī. Among his Indian patrons were the Emperor Akbar (q.v.) and the Khān-i Khaṇān Mirzā ʿAbd al-Raḥīm (q.v.).

Besides composing these conventional kāṣīdas, Muḥtašām specialised in other genres of court poetry. He became an expert in enigmatic verse and poetical chronograms. In 984/1576 he celebrated the accession of Ismāʿīl II to the throne in six quatrains from which 1,128 different datings of the event could be derived (the poems, together with a chronographic explanation, are to be found in Tāḥīr Naṣrābādī, Tāḍīqā-yi Naṣrābādī, Tehran 1317 š./1938, 473-74; a commentary by the Kādījār poet Wakār was published in Armāngān, xi, 1309 š./1930, 271-352, 4-2-1).

Muḥtašām was also a prolific writer of love poetry. His best known works contain several collections of ghazals; a cycle of 64 ghazals bears the title “Djalāliyya”, after Shāh Tāmūsh’s dancer Djalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Dawām (d.907/1501). He seems to have continued, however, to live in Kāzvin. Muḥtašām expressed this in poems his infatuation with Djalāl (the letters of Djalāl, a grandson of Djamal al-Dīn Mehmend of Akbari). How μuhtasham-i kashani — muhyi ‘d-din mehmend

The Khan-i Waliyyāt, versified chronograms; 7. Shabibīyya, a religious and secular panegyric. His best known poem is a kasida, in which they were disseminated in the east.

In accordance with the last will of the poet, his works were collected by a friend, the anthologist Tāṭī Ḥalīli, who also added a preface to this kālīyyāt. It is divided into seven parts: 1. Shāhīyā, religious and secular panegyrics; 2. Shāhībāy ya and 3. Sābāʾyā, two volumes of ghazals; 4. Djalāliyya and 5. Nākīt-i ‘usākhā, both mixing ghazals with prose; 6. Durrāsiyya, versified chronograms; 7. Mu’ammātā, riddles (Rieu, loc. cit.). However, manuscripts of varying contents and with other arrangements of the poems, some dating from the poet’s lifetime, are also extant.


MUHTASIB [see HISBA].

MUHYI AL-DIN IBN AL-ARABI [see IBN AL-ARABI].

MUHYI AL-DIN LĀRĪ (d. 932/1526-7), Persian writer and author of the famous Fīsāḥ al-Haramayn, a poetical description of the two holy cities, Mecca and Medina, which also contains a full account of all the rites of the obligatory pilgrimage (hajj).

This book, written in 911/1506 and dedicated to Muzaffar b. Mahmūd Shāh of Gūdarj (917-32/1511-26), was for a long time wrongly attributed to the celebrated poet ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Qalāami (q.v.). Muḥyī Lārī was a pupil of the great philosopher Djalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Dawānī (d.907/1501) and made use of his extensive philosophical knowledge in a commentary on the great Kāfīd of Ibn al-Fārīd which is known as al-Tāʾyīya al-kubrā. In this work he endeavoured, following in the footsteps of his teacher, to reconcile the principles of orthodox Islamic mysticism with the teachings of Aristotle in the form in which they were disseminated in the cast.


MUHYI AL-DIN MEHMED b. ʿALĪ AL-DIN ʿALĪ AL-DJAMALĪ, called MOLLĀ ČELEBI, a Turkish theologian and historian of the time of Selim I (918-26/1512-20) and Sulaymān II (926-74/1520-66). His father was the famous maṣfī Zanbūlī ʿAlī al-Djamilī, a grandson of Djamil al-Dīn Mehmend of Ak Seray (here the epithet Djamilī). He received his theological training first from his maternal grandfather Husâm-zāde Efendi, then from his father ʿAlī al-Dīn and later from Muḥyī-yāz-zāde Efendi. He
worked as a mu¿erris in several medreses, in Istanbul at the Mur¿¿ed medrese and at the eight schools of the Fatih mosque and tilled shortly before his death. He died in retirement and was buried at Zeyrek, at the side of his father, in 957/1549. His main importance lies in the fact that he edited the anonymous Ottoman chronicles, the Tecav¿¿z-i A¿-i ³l-³m¿¿an, under the title Ta¿¿¿k¿¿-i A¿-i ³l-³m¿¿an. These chronicles, which run from the beginning of the Ottoman empire, were continued by him down to 962/1555.

Two versions of his Chronicle exist, both of which go back to him: (1) a shorter one, to which corresponds the translation of the Beck manuscript by Gaudier-Spiegel, Chronica oder Acta von der T¿r¿skischen Tyranne herkommen und gefªhrte Kriegen, aus T¿r¿skischer Sprachen verdichtet. Vorhin nie in Druck ausgangen, Frankfurt a/O, 1567; it was also published in Latin and German by Leunclavius, Annales Sultanorum ³l-³m¿¿niarum a Turc¿ siva lingua scripti, Frankfurt 1588, 2nd edition with index and German tr., Neue Chronika T¿r¿skischer Nation von T¿r¿ken selbs geschrieben, Frankfurt a/Main 1590; and (2) a longer version, the so-called Verani¿¿n Chronicle (Codex Verani¿¿esus), edited in Latin and German by Leunclavius, Historiae Musulmanae T®corum de monumentis ipserum exsceptae libri XVIII, Frankfurt 1591. There were 18 books instead of the 30 planned with which the Mamluk sultan, when the Mongols were giving him the port of Sinope which he had taken from the Ilkhan, Abaka in 663/1265 and was officially acknowledged by him. Soon afterwards, Baybars made his triumphant entry into Kayseri, the Parwana—who had retreated to his stronghold at Tokat—did not come to acknowledge him. Soon afterwards, Baybars withdrew to Syria on hearing the news that Abaka himself was on his way to Rûm with a large army.

The Parwana joined Abaka on his visit to the battlefield at Alîbistan and was there blamed for the massacre of the Mongol army. He then accompanied Abaka eastwards, where the ³l-³kh, inflamed by his grieve-stricken female relatives, ordered the Parwana's execution (1 Rabî' I 676/8 August 1277). The Armenian historian, Hayton, is the source of the widespread story that "in accordance with Tartar custom", the Parwana's corpse was cut in half and eaten.

The career of the Parwana represents a key phase in the history of the Rûm Saldjûks as well as shedding light on the wider power struggle between Mamlûks and Mongols. Internally, the Parwana attempted to maintain stability both amongst the Turkish amirs and between them and the ever-increasing number of Mongols resident on Anatolian soil. The Turcomans, especially the Karamânis, were kept under control only with great difficulty (there were rebellions in 659/1261 and 675/1277).

As for the Parwana's relationship with his Mongol overlords, it is clear that at the beginning he was unreservedly on their side and that he cultivated his special links with Abaka by frequent visits to Tabriz. Saldjûk weakness after Kose Dagh allowed talented ministers, such as the Parwana and his friend and rival, Fakhûr al-Dîn ³li, both of whom were of Persian stock and were directly nominated by the Mongols, to exercise semi-independent power within Anatolia. Later on, however, the Parwana co-existed uneasily with Abaka's representatives in Rûm and especially with Adjây, Abaka's brother, whose removal he requested in 672/1273-4. Clearly, the Parwana had begun to resent increasing Mongol encroachment on Saldjûk territory and the Mongols' systematic exploitation of its economic resources.

The Parwana's own role in the documented but confused accounts of the events preceding Baybars' Anatolian expedition remains ambiguous. Certainly,
the myth of Mongol invincibility had been exploded, and it seems likely that the Parwana’s loyalty shifted, for a while at least, to Baybars, whose power was increasing in the 1270s in the face of Mongol disunity and their apparent inactivity against Egypt. It is possible too that the Parwana may have been influenced in his more pro-Mamluk stance by the reproach addressed to him by Djalal al-Din Rumi (Fiki mä fiki, 17) that by making common cause with the Mongols he had ruined the Dür al-Islâm. Once Baybars had reached Rüm, the Parwana seems to have reneged on his arrangement and to have invited Abaka to attack Baybars. Whatever the true motivation of the Parwana’s dangerous double game, he aroused the ire of his wife and invited Abaka to attack both Baybars and Abaka and provided a convenient scapegoat for the Mongol defeat at Albitanz.

The Parwana is said to have enjoyed a close relationship with Rümî. Some of the discourses in Fiki mä fiki are addressed directly to the Parwana. According to Aflaki, it was often in the Parwana’s house that Rümî held spiritual concerts and the Parwana and his wife provided funds for the building of Rümî’s mausoleum (Huart, ii, 80, 92-3, 267). The Parwana also settled the Şī‘a Fakhr al-Din ‘Trâkî [q.v.] near Tokat. He was responsible for the construction of a limited number of religious buildings. An inscription (663/1265) in the name of the Parwana, who has the Mongol title iltîkâr-i nänîn (ibid., 94-5). Its unique occurrence in Anatolian epigraphy demonstrates the Parwana’s close relationship with his Mongol overlords (Rogers, 276).

The demise of the Parwana marked the end of even semi-independent Saltük rule in Anatolia, which was henceforth governed directly by the Mongols. Since they were primarily interested in eastern Anatolia, the Turcomans amirates were able to prosper in the west. They were primarily interested in eastern Anatolia, the Turcomans amirates were able to prosper in the west.


MUCIN AL-DIN YAZDI — AL-MUCIZZ B. BADIS

It may be assumed that Yazdi belonged to that group of religious scholars who mobilized and promoted Shāh Shuḍja’i’s “clericalism”, and so in the end, made this thought hard for Hafiz. This keeping of the “prince of poets” under wraps may thus be seen as a first indication that Hāfiz’s poetry was not considered by his contemporaries as being allegorical or mystical, as has been customarily thought later and up to the present time (see Hartmann, orth. Polemik, 287 ff.).

Yazdi’s main work is his stylistically inflated Maḏḥib-i ildhi (or “Divine gifts”), also known under the title Tārikh-i muzaffarī or Hamdūl dhīn-nāma, the only contemporary account of the Muzaffarids. Rypka says of it that, among the most famous and often written historical works in Persian, it is second only to Wāṣṣāl’s history of the Il-Khānids (Iranische Literaturgeschichte, 302, enlarged Eng. tr. History of Iranian literature, 318 n. 7, 443). Yazdi thus imitated the style of Wāṣṣāl (see the comparison of the two in Ḥaḍḍīj Khāliṣa, Kashf al-zunūn, i, 685). In 757/1356-7 Yazdi read in Isfahān the first chapters of his chronicle to Sultan Mubāriz al-Dīn and his son Shāh Shuḍja’i. Mubāriz al-Dīn having died in 765/1364, shortly before the Maḏḥib-i ildhi was concluded with the year 767/1363-4, the chronicle was dedicated to Shāh Shuḍja’i. Two generations later, Māhmūd-i Kutubi (d. 1007/1598-9) used his work in the preparation of his Taʾrikh-i guzida, up to the downfall of the Muzaffarids, brought about by Timūr (q. v.) in 795/1392-3, and simplified the style. Hence the term used in the present state can be assessed as satisfactory.


Bibliography:

Other works by Yazdi are listed in Dja farl, Tāzikdrīh-i Yazd, 78 (cf. Afshar, Tāzikdrīh-i Yazd, i, 205-7).

Muṣṭafī, whose full name was Muṣṭafī AL-FUKARA’I [see Ahmad b. Muḥammad, in Suppl.], born in 907/1501-2, was a celebrated traditionist. He studied hadith for 31 years, and throughout this period, his life was in the great mosque of Harāt. He was for one year kāfī of Harāt, but gave up the post by his own request. In 966/1461-2, at the request of a friend, he began to write a little book on the life of the Prophet Muḥammad. Out of this little book, there grew in time the great biographical work, exceedingly popular in the East, called Maṣāʾir al-nubuwwa fi madānḏ ūl-futuwwa, which was completed till 891/1486 and contains a very full account of the life of the Prophet consisting of a 731.5
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and was acknowledged to have a lively intelligence and good level of culture which could not have been acquired later. The following month al-Mu‘izz left al-Mahdiyya, and in the middle of Muharram 407/24 June 1016, he made his entrance into his capital al-Mansūriyya founded around 336-7/947-9 by the Fāṭimid caliph al-Mansūr half a mile from Kayrawān, the turbulent citadel of Sunnism, to which the new amīr, as a matter of good policy, owed a visit, a visit which unleashed, in conditions which remain confused and obscure, a huge anti-Shi‘ī revolt.

On 16 Muharram 407/25 June 1016, the princely procession which paraded through the streets of the holy city was at first greeted with acclamation and applause. But suddenly, certainly at a signal or word of command that the chroniclers misinterpreted, rioting broke out. No doubt it was directed at the very life of the young amīr and, beyond him personally, at the regime that the Sunnīs wanted to bring to an end once and for all throughout the Maghrib in circumstances which then appeared to them particularly favourable. Had Hāmmād, miraculously saved by the sudden death of Bādis, rejected from 405/1015 the Shi‘ī dogmas and recognised the ‘Abbāsids of Baghdad? The possibility cannot be ruled out that he was in league with the rebels, if only to distract Bādis, whose doctrine was not reliably known” (Ibn al-‘Aṣā’ī, ed. G.S. Colin and E. Levi-Provencal, Leiden 1950, iv, 626). It also seems certain that the Sunnīs acted in complicity with some in the ranks of the official army who, at first, displayed a curious half-heartedness. As for the relative passivity of the governor of Kayrawān, it is easily explained by the fact that he had got wind of his forthcoming deposition.

The princely guard was quickly overrun. Once rioting broke out, the rebels killed with and without good cause, guided as much, if not more, by their instinct for looting than by their horror of heresy! “The hands of the people turned against the Shi‘īs. Their houses and goods were looted. The situation worsened, and the rioting spread everywhere. The Shi‘īs were massacred in large numbers and where there was a slight doubt many people were also killed whose doctrine was not reliably known” (Ibn al-‘Aṣā’ī, Bayān, ed. G.S. Colin and E. Lévy-Provençal, Leiden 1948, i, 268). Venerable Kayrawān shaykh even advised the unfettered crowds to act quickly. “If indeed the victim is a good Sunni, it will only hasten his entrance into paradise!” (“Iyyād, Madārīk, ed. Beirut 1967, iv, 625). Abu ‘l-Bāhār b. Kha‘lūf, who was a special target and who was to accede some years later to the rank of vizier, only escaped the popular verdict thanks to the troops of his nephew, who was lynched in his place. The rioters finally invaded al-Mansūriyya and sacked it in its turn. Several other towns of Ifriqiyya experienced anti-Shi‘ī pogroms.

Our sources, all Sunni for these events, only wished to preserve the memory of a great victory over Shi‘ism. In fact, the revolt, whatever its scale, had a long-term definitive effect. The Shi‘ī régime, while probably showing clemency, stayed in place. It goes without saying that al-Mu‘izz, if only on the grounds of his age, could not have had at the time of the events any personal policy. It was no doubt the staff left in place by his father who conducted the operations. About a month after the beginning of the revolt, on 19 Šafar 407/28 July 1016, a new vizier was appointed: Abu ‘Abd Allāḥ Muhammad b. al-Ḥasan, the old governor of Tripoli. Was this a concession to restore calm? Sunnism, emboldened no doubt by the state’s clemency, did not meanwhile disar�. Some months later, on going to the open-air oratory (muṣallā) in Kayrawān on the occasion of the Ṣa‘īd al-fitr (the feast of the fastbreaking, 1 Shāwval 407/3 March 1017), al-Mu‘izz narrowly missed becoming the victim of a new attempt. This time the régime decided to strike at the head and to strike hard. Al-Mu‘izz, writes Iyyād (Madārīk, iv, 626) “had become seriously afraid of the Sunnīs and decided to crush their provocation. He executed the leader (as‘im) of Sunnism and the guide (iyyāk) of this movement (da‘ī ‘a‘ī).” On Thursday, 12 Shāwval 407/14 March 1017 the “guide of the movement,” Abū ‘Alī b. Kha‘lūf, was besieged in his mosque, from which he was doubtless orchestrating events, and put to death. At once Kayrawān was in an uproar. But this time the state was not caught off guard. “The troops of al-Mansūriyya, infantry and black guards, then moved against this city and sacked all its shops so completely that they left nothing unpillaged. They set fire to the great commercial arteries and looted the merchants’ goods” (“Iyyād, Madārīk, iv, 626). The Sunnīs were definitively crushed, and the threat that they presented to the régime removed. Practically there would no longer ever be a problem, throughout the reign of al-Mu‘izz, of anti-Shi‘ī disturbances.

Less than three months later (at the end of Dhu‘l-Hijja 407/25 June 1017) the caliph al-Ḥakīm took up residence in al-Ma‘ṣūf. But suddenly, certainly, the Sunnīs again attempted to crush their provocation. He appointed as vizier a man dishonoured and whom he had sent among other gifts, a sabre inlaid with precious stones. His successor, al-Ẓahir (411-27/1021-36), who had nominally under the tutelage of his aunt Sīt al-Mulk (d. 415/1024-5) assumed power at the age of 16, in 414/1023-4, enhanced his honorific title by rendering it even more high-sounding: Sharaf al-Dawla wa-‘Adudahā (Nobility and Right Arm of the State). Of course, at the same time he heaped on him sumptuous presents. Egypt and Ifriqiyya were then both governed by adolescents more or less under tutelage.

Al-Mu‘izz moved first to free himself from the control of his omnipotent and, allegedly, unscrupulous vizier Abū ‘Abd Allāḥ Muhammad b. al-Ḥasan. When he was unsuccessful in persuading him through a go-between to resign from power, he deposed him and had him executed on 7 Rabi‘a I 413/11 July 1022, also inaugurating at the age of about 15 his personal reign. He appointed as new vizier a man dishonoured by the Sunnīs who had come close to lynching him during the revolt of 407/1016: Abu ‘l-Bāhār b. Kha‘lūf. His nomination had a double political significance: for the Sunnīs it was a warning, and for the Fāṭimids of Cairo a sign of loyalty. The same year al-Mu‘izz married, with a great feast.

For more than 35 years, i.e. until the Hilā‘ī invasion, he reigned and was relatively calm, despite some minor revolts, particularly in the south of the country. The edifice seemed solid. But this was only an appearance. Behind the feasting of the court, enriched
by the censers of the regular incense-bearers, was hid-den the collapse of economic structures more and more deprived of the support of servile manpower, a collapse generating repeated shortages and famines—not less than five mentioned by the chroniclers—with their train of disorders, epidemics and demographic depression, particularly in the country areas which became deserted for the towns. When the Hilâlî waves struck directly at the country’s shores, the land was already quite drained and incapable of sustaining the shock. Certainly, there were already internal religious, but also economic, difficulties, which had gradually driven al-Mu‘izz to conciliate the masses who were impoverished and remained solidly faithful to Mâlikî Sunnism, to change his views by exchanging Fâtimid suzerainty, which actually only imposed on him insignificant obligations, for that of the distant ‘Abbâsids, which was hardly more onerous. Helped by the decline of the Fâtimids, particularly after the death of the vizier al-Djârdjara (436/1045 [q. v.]), the break with Cairo took place in fits and starts, and at the mercy of circumstances and perhaps also moods, which explains why the chroniclers assign different dates to it spanning a decade between 433 and 443/1041-51. Numismatics allow us to state that in 441/1050-50 it was well and truly accomplished (Idris, Zirides, i, 190).

The decisive invasion campaign that the caliph al-Mustanṣîr, on the advice of his vizier al-‘Yazûrî, launched against Fârîkiya in order to punish his vassal for his rebellion, took place in the region of Gabâb, at Haydârân [q. v.], on 11 Dhu ‘l-‘Hijja 443/14 April 1052. Despite the courage of the amir and the advantage of numbers in favour of the Fârîkiyans, it was the rout of an army without strategy and cohesion, an army which, a colossus on feet of clay, was threatened by ethnic rivalries and the alleged resentment of the Berber contingents towards the strong black guard of some 30,000 slaves. The Zârid edifice, deeply flawed behind a deceptive façade, crumbled at one blow. To lose a battle is not to lose the war. As the country collapsed and was unable to recover, it must have been without any army reserves and reservoir of resources.

The Hilâlîs, pillaging and sacking all in their path, spread everywhere like a cloud of locusts, according to Ibn Khallûn, and the principal towns of the land set up themselves as independent kingdoms. Kayrawân, finally given up by al-Mu‘izz, who sought refuge at al-Mahdiyya (27 Shâbân 449/29 October 1057), was two days after the flight of the amir, on 1 Ramadan/1 November, looted and sacked from top to bottom, inspiring heart-rending accents of distress from two famous poets, Ibn Râghîk (d. 456/1063-4 or 463/1070-1 [q. v.]) and especially Ibn Sharaf (d. 460/1067 [q. v.]). The extent of the “catastrophe” is debated. J. Poncelet goes as far as to deny it. We think that there is no good reason to doubt the extensive evidence, all in agreement, that has come down to us. Even allowing for the poetic emphasis of Ibn Sharaf, who has left a poignant eyewitness description of the misfortunes of the refugees scattered on all the roads in total destitution when they could save their lives (Ibn Bassâm, Dhâkhîr, Cairo 1945, iv/1, 177-84), such emphasis may not be gratuitous. Nevertheless, one may recover from an invasion, however severe. Real and lasting catastrophe is something more. It is in the blow directed at an economy that was certainly very sick, but still curable. The Hilâlîs provoked the transformation of this economy, definitely in crisis, but traditionally agricultural, artisan and urban, into a largely nomadic and pastoral economy with all the political and economic freezes that such a mutation represents. They caused the regression on a vast scale of peaceful urban life in favour of the adventurous existence of the nomads, whose bellicose vocation severely restricted rural, urban and commercial life, and weighed heavily over the centuries on the political fate of the country.

At bay, not knowing where to turn, al-Mu‘izz actually sought safety in vain and unnatural matrimonial alliances with the rough invaders. Always in the vain hope of averting or at least limiting the disaster, he also returned to Shâ‘î obedience, perhaps at the end of 446/beginning of 1055 and certainly from 449/1057-8, as the dinârs minted at al-Mahdiyya from this date attest. His return to his Shâ‘î allegiance, to which al-Mu‘izz remained faithful until the end of his life, took place amidst the total indif-ference of a land both plunged in anarchy and confronted with preoccupations of too immediate vitality for it to be concerned any longer with heresy.

The Mediterranean policy of al-Mu‘izz was inherited from that of the Aghlabids and Fâtimids, with this difference that the Zârids were no longer in a strong position. Confusions in dates, omissions and contradictions do not allow us, in any case, to follow this policy with certainty. Let us bear in mind that an expedition against central Italy in 411/1020 ended in failure, that the Pisans and the Genoese succeeded in despoiling the Zârid fleet of its booty on the return journey. In 416/1025-6 a powerful Zârid fleet which had appeared near Sicily was destroyed by storm off Pantelleria before achieving its goal. In 426/1034-5 the Pisans briefly seized Bône. In 427/1035-6, an army commanded by ‘Abd Allâh, son of al-Mu‘izz—a youth of not more than 15—invaded in Sicily, at that time in complete anarchy and about to fall into the hands of the Normans, against al-Khalîl who had seized power there in Muharram 410/9 May-7 June 1019. After storming Palermo and beheading al-Khalîl and his father, ‘Abd Allâh was finally checked. In fact before this expedition, in 426/1034-5, al-Mu‘izz had received an ambassador from Byzantium bearing valuable gifts. Could the two events be linked despite the difference of the source of the news?

Until the Hilâlî invasion, al-Mu‘izz had lived very ostentatiously, spending with prodigality and cultivating his reputation as a generous and enlightened patron. He had as his teacher one of the most prestigious Fârîkiyan men of letters, Ibn Abî ‘l-Ridjâl [q. v.], a famous poet and astronomer, whose al-Bârî was translated into several European languages as well as into Latin and Hebrew. Ibn Abî ‘l-Ridjâl later became the astrologer and head of chancellery of al-Mu‘izz, in whose reign the literary school of Kayrawân shone with particular brilliance with masters such as al-Kazzaz [q. v.] and the two al-Ḥûṣîr [q. v.], Ibrahim (d. 413/1022) and his father ‘Ali who, fleeing Kayrawân after the Hilâlî invasion, wandered throughout Muslim Spain where he died in 488/1095. But the two stars of the court were indisputably two rival poets of great talent, Ibn Râghîk (d. 418/1027-8), famous above all as a historiographer, was also secretary of chancery, a diplomat and poet not devoid of talent. In the field of Mâlikî fikr, among a pleiad of celebrities, the domi-nant figure is that of Abû ‘Imrân al-Fâsî (d. 430/1039 [q. v. in Suppl.] who “played a considerable role in the genesis of the Almoravid movement” (Idris, Zirides, ii, 727).

Al-Mu‘izz, as a child, had inherited a kingdom
Al-Mu'izz b. Badis — Mucizz al-Dawla

Economically disorganised and weakened and politically already amputated from its Western part. For the payment of the troops, Mucizz al-Dawla used the income of several districts in Iraq, several times. For the payment of the troops, Mucizz al-Dawla used the income of several districts in Iraq.

While serving under the youngest of the three Buyids of the first generation, founder of Buyid rule in Baghdad, d. 356/967. His attempt, in the wake of his father's policy, to reform the caliphate and its military and economic foundations, failed. Mucizz al-Dawla had the caliph, Ahmad bi'llah, under arrest, and released him only after a treaty had been concluded about reciprocal obligations.

From the very beginning, the realm of the Buyids formed a complex structure. Although appointed amir al-umara' by the caliph, Mu'izz al-Dawla remained under the command of his elder brother 'Imad al-Dawla in Shīrāz. The names of the two brothers appear on the coins minted in 'Irāk, while on the coins minted in his own realm, 'Imad al-Dawla carried the title amir al-umara'. In the spring of 336/948, both amirs met in Arra Ḟād, set up a government, and granted him at the same time the title amir al-umara'.

Once established in Baghdad, Mu'izz al-Dawla had to defend himself against external and internal enemies. His most dangerous opponents were the Daylamis, who succeeded in incorporating the Daylamis into the Buyid realm. From the very beginning, the realm of the Buyids was divided into several districts: 'Irāk, southern Mesopotamia, but without success. Finally, the governor of 'Irāq joined forces with him, and so the road to the city of the caliphs was free. Ahmad marched against the Buyid leader in 'Irāq, and on 13 Djumada I 334/21 December 945, the caliph at-Mustakfi bi'llah [q.v.] appointed him amir al-umara' and granted him at the same time the title lakab [q.v.] of Mu'izz al-Dawla, while his brothers 'Ali and Hasan received the lakabs of 'Imad al-Dawla and Rukn al-Dawla [q.v.], a nephew of Mustakfi. Until the summer of the same year, a period during which the Buyids' position was not yet well established in Baghdad, he kept the Mu'ta' under arrest, and released him only after a treaty had been concluded about reciprocal obligations.

The rule of the Buyids was now established in 'Irāq. It was to last for more than one hundred years.

Though Shī'ī of the Zaydi branch, the Buyids, for reasons of military and economic policy, did not undermine the caliphate fundamentally. They limited themselves to making the caliphs instrumental to their policy. During the public audience of 22 Djumada II 334/29 January 946, Mu'izz al-Dawla had the caliph arrested, deposed and replaced by al-Mu'ti' li'llah [q.v., a nephew of Mustakfi]. The rule of the Buyids was now established in 'Irāq.
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and he also used the method of distributing leases (iktdc [q. v.]). Contrary to the practice used so far, he was to become a characteristic of the financial policy of the Buyids and their successors. The distribution of tax leases (damân), a practice which had already taken root and which the Buyids continued without change, was also disadvantageous for state finances. Yet Mu'izz al-Dawla took trouble to redress the economic bases in the regions under his control. From 334/955-6 he restored the irrigation systems which had been neglected during the upheavals of the preceding decades. He is said to have lent his own hand at this, in order to encourage the works. He also took trouble to promote health organisation, but the construction of a hospital on the site of the Ḥabs al-djadid in Baghdad remained unfinished. The palace which he ordered to be built in Baghdad on the eastern side of the Tigris, in front of the Bâb al-Shammāsiyya, seems to have been an important complex. For this construction were used remnants from the round city (Madinat al-Manṣūr), which was increasingly decaying, as well as from other cities in 'Irāk.

Mu'izz al-Dawla was unencumbered. Instances of his interventions in political and cultural relations in the centre of the 'Abbāsid empire, were transmitted in the form of anecdotes. He favoured the Zaydis and was in relation with Mu'izzalī theologians. From 352/964 onwards, the Twelver Shi'is were able to celebrate their religious feasts under official favour and with great pomp.

Mu'izz al-Dawla was undeniably an able commander and ruler. After the function of amir al-umma? he had changed six times between 324/936 and 334/945, he put an end to the upheavals which had shaken the country and took care of its economic interests. In foreign policy, too, he put Buyid power in Mesopotamia on a firm basis, though he did not succeed in eliminating completely the Ḥamdānids. On the other hand, he initiated the period of the almost total powerlessness of the caliphate by reducing the caliph to a puppet without any real power.

In 343/955 he fell severely ill from priapism, and in the same year appointed his eldest son Bakhtiyār [q. v.], later 'lizz al-Dawla, as successor to the throne and at the same time as amir al-umma? During a campaign against the ruler of the Bâthâ, he fell ill again, returned to Bagdad and died there on 17 Rabi' II 356/1 April 967. He was buried in the Shi'ī sanctuary of al-Kazimayn. About his family relations there is only known that he was married to the daughter of the DaylamI grandee Ispahdust. He left four sons: Bakhtiyār, al-Ḥabashl, Abu Ishāk, Ibrāhīm and Abū Tāhir; and a daughter Zubayda, who was married to Mu'ayyīy al-Dawla, a son of Rukn al-Dawla's.


(K. V. Zetterstöen-[H. Busse]) AL-MU'IZZ AL-DIN ALLAH, Ma'add, fourth and last of the Fatimid dynasty of Ifrikiya. He acceded to the throne of his ancestors on an early age on 29 Shawwāl 341/19 March 953; having been born on 11 Ramadan 319/26 September 951, he had barely come of age. According to his biographer, the famous kādil al-Nu'mān [q. v.], the designation of the young Ma'add to the imāmate does not seem to have been surrounded by the traditional secrecy of the period of tatr [q. v.]. his father al-Manṣūr bi 'llah [q. v.] having for long hesitated as to the choice of his successor among his five sons. It was only after having been justified with regard to Abū Yazid [q. v.] and at Tāhār, where he fell seriously ill, at the end of his long, tough campaign against the Khārijīte rebel, that he decided to make him his presumptive heir and informed his followers of his choice. But the designation of the young Ma'add was not proclaimed until long after, at the beginning of the year 344/952.

At the moment when he assumed power, the young caliph seems, according to the account of the author of the Sirat Djawdhar, to have been distressed, fearing a violent reaction on the part of his brothers, uncles and great-uncles who had been deprived of the throne, and having inherited moreover a difficult political situation. His father had indeed restored royal authority by putting an end to Abū Yazid's revolt, but he had not had enough time to suppress completely the insubordination of the Berbers of the Aurès and to re-establish his dynasty's prestige within the realm as well as outside. However, as nothing occurred to justify the young ruler's fears and as peace reigned throughout his reign, one can understand that he was not slow to make public his father's death which had been kept secret until then, by celebrating in the Manṣūriyya mosque the 'Īd al-Adḥā and marking the beginning of his reign with an enthronement sermon in a solemn manner. In this khutba, whose text has been preserved intact in the Sirat Djawdhar, the new master of Ifrikiya shows that he has overcome entirely the momentary confusion which had seized him on his father's demise. From now on he has the firm and decided tone of the ambitious young monarch who is determined to bring his arduous task to a successful conclusion. He has a very clear view of his programme of action and the vast work which will be demanded of him both inside and outside his realm: to pacify the territory which he governs, to extend his hegemony over it from its frontiers in the West to the East and to realise also the imperialistic aims of his predecessors founded on their belief in the ineluctable return of the throne of Islam to the Prophet's family in a line of descent from 'Ali.

Al-Mu'izz was to devote himself to achieving these vast designs throughout his reign in Ifrikiya, during some twenty years, without ever wearying, revealing as he advanced in age some exceptional qualities and leaving behind him the image of the most prestigious ruler of his period. His Ismā'īlī biographers, like the Sunni chroniclers, actually agree in recognising in him all the gifts which make up the majestic presence of the monarch: tenacity and courage, farsightedness and determination, hilm and magnanimity, benevolence and extreme modesty, that al-Nu'mān takes pleasure in submitting as evidence in his Kitâb al-Maghâfîr, and that the leaves behind him the image of the most prestigious ruler of his period. His Ismâ'īlī biographers, like the Sunni chroniclers, actually agree in recognising in him all the gifts which make up the majestic presence of the monarch: tenacity and courage, farsightedness and determination, hilm and magnanimity, benevolence and extreme modesty, that al-Nu'mān takes pleasure in submitting as evidence in his Kitâb al-Maghâfîr, and that leaves behind him the image of the most prestigious ruler of his period. His Ismâ'īlī biographers, like the Sunni chroniclers, actually agree in recognising in him all the gifts which make up the majestic presence of the monarch: tenacity and courage, farsightedness and determination, hilm and magnanimity, benevolence and extreme modesty, that al-Nu'mān takes pleasure in submitting as evidence in his Kitâb al-Maghâfîr, and that leaves behind him the image of the most prestigious ruler of his period.
the expansion of Fātimid power in the East to the heart of the Ābbāsid empire that one tends to associate with his name. However, it was during his reign in Ifriqiya that the apogee of their power was achieved. It was only towards the end, during the last four years, that al-Mu'izz succeeded in realising the primordial objective of his ancestors, that of displacing the Ābbāsid usurpers, amputating their Egyptian possessions from their empire and establishing his forces in the south of Syria, the Holy Places and Yemen. On the other hand, for a long time his essential preoccupation was with maintaining his hegemony in North Africa itself and pursuing there an unflagging struggle for influence against the Umayyad monarchy of Spain. Al-Mu'izz was in fact eager to press hard from the Far Maghrib in a serious threat to the Cordovan throne, a subject on which al-Nu'mān fortunately informs us, casting new light on this episode by providing evidence of the ardour of the Āl-Mujizz was in fact the principal branch of the Zanata.
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invade al-Andalus as to seriously undermine the prestige of the Cordovan monarchy. Furthermore, the enterprise would have required more powerful forces and the combined intervention of the fleet maintained in this period on the eastern front in Sicily and off Calabria to face up to the aggressive designs of the new emperor Romanus II and his servant Nicephorus Phocas. The death of the Umayyad monarch only some months after Djiwarhar's return to Mansuryya provoked no military reaction on the part of al-Muizz who, from the time of Nicephorus Phocas's conquest of Crete, turned all his attention to the situation on this front. The Fātimids was thus going to confine himself to maintaining under his tutelage the Moroccan territories conquered by Djiwarhar and to intensifying the intrusion of the Shī'a da'wa within the Umayyad realm. The evolution of the conflict was thus to take on a strictly ideological character for many years, during which the new master of Cordova, al-Hakam II, was to devote himself to countering Fātimid propaganda in his country by consolidating the power of Mālikī orthodoxy and by pursuing with the greatest vigour the partisans of Shī'a heresy. On this subject, the case in Cordova—that the kāfīr Ibn Sahil is alone in reporting in al-Ahkām al-kubrā—of a missionary of al-Muizz, a certain Abu '1-Khayr at the beginning of al-Hakam II's reign, illustrates the latter's firm resolution to prevent all Shī'a infiltration in his realm: being accused of the crime of treason against Islam (zandak) in resorting to heterodoxy put into action against the security of the state, the Shī'a agent was judged and executed for having organised a vast propaganda movement in favour of the Fātimids and having attempted to prepare on their account an uprising in Cordova.

Occupied by hostilities with the Greeks, al-Muizz thus left his Andalusian rival full scope to bring the Zanāta back under his influence thanks to the skill of his Moroccan policy based on intrigue and the granting of large subsidies. The defection of the lord of Masila, his foster-brother Dja'far b. 'Ali b. Hamdūn, who had gone over into the service of his Cordovan enemy with his brother Yahyā, and the simultaneous uprisings only by his Sanhajī auxiliaries opposed to the Zanāta, aggravated by the death of their chief Zīrī b. Manād, succeeded in striking a savage blow at his anti-Umayyad policy. Over the years since the victorious excursion of Djiwarhar following the death of 'Abd al-Rahmān III, the situation had thus not evolved in his favour, and the impetus with which he had wanted to threaten the realm of Cordova from Morocco had petered out completely. On the other hand, the development of his conflict with Byzantium was more favourable to his arms. On this topic al-Nu'mān expatiates in his magā lijīs, completing and supporting the scanty information gleaned from the chroniclers.

Hostilities with Byzantium were resumed in 344/955-6 on the initiative of the Greeks, the emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus having had to lend assistance to 'Abd al-Rahmān III by virtue of their alliance established at the time when the Fātimid fleet undertook its raids on the Andalusian coast. Encouraged, besides, by the success of their arms against the Hamdānīs of Syria, the Greeks carried out some successful operations against the Fātimid forces in Sicily, notably at Termini and Mazara, and on sea, near the island of al-Rāhīb. But the fleet under the orders of Ibn al-Kalbī, having returned from its expedition against Muslim Ikhshīdids, succeeded in containing their offensive. Anxious to regroup his forces with a view to a decisive campaign against Sayf al-Dawla in Syria,
Al-Mu'izz li-Din Allâh

‘Abbasid contemporary, al-Mu'tiz, a simple plaything in the hands of the Buyid Mucizz. The latter in the person of a simple officer Al-Mutlul, a Buyid vassal, had become a gift to his master. After Khurâsân and Syria were annexed to the Abbasid empire, the Buyid Mucizz took advantage of the hands of Aftakln, a Turkish officer supported by the Hamdanids. The latter took advantage of the Ikhshidid troops who had taken refuge, supported by the treaty, tried in vain to resist. But Djawhar made far b. Falâh, who was powerful Arab tribes, the Ukayl, the Murra and the c. was occupied with trying to chase the Kar-...militant, Kayrawan against Abu Yazid, he succeeded in holding in check the Karmatî leader al-Asam and in forcing him to fall back on his capital al-Ahmadâ, where serious dissensions were about to erupt in the heart of his movement.

It is to the seriousness of the Karmatî threat, although contained by Djawhar, that we must attribute the decision of al-Mu'izz to join his faithful officer on the banks of the Nile. The threat that Caramathism from now onwards presented to the unity of the Ikhshidid state and the prestige of the Fâtîmid caliphate in the East thus incited him to transfer the seat of the imâmate to Egypt without further delay and to leave Irikiâyî for ever.

The choice of a viceroy able to take on the government of the Maghrib was bound to be a matter of serious concern to the ruler, a step for which Ibn Falâh reported in the Strat Djawshar bear witness. This valuable source has the merit of confirming that he had the intention of entrusting the charge to the lord of Masill, Djâ'far b. Ahmed, consequently correcting the incoherent information of the chroniclers on Buluggin's appointment to head the realm. That al-Mu'izz's choice had fallen on the amir of the Maghrib, consecrated with his memory, was due to the choice of a viceroy able to the Karmatî leader al-Ashâb and to keep the turbulent Zanâtî in check there. In any case, as a proved warrior, a worthy successor to the prestigious Ziri b. Manâd at the head of the Sanhadja nobles and warriors, Buluggin appeared in the eyes of al-Mu'izz to have the proper qualities for a viceroy. In addition to his anapages in the central Maghrib augmented by those of Ibn Hamdûn, the sovereign thus left to his lieutenant the government of the realm of Irikiyî, separated nevertheless from Sicily, which had remained under the authority of the Banû 'Atâ, and the provinces of Tripoli and Bakrâ, which had been attached to the seat of the caliphate in Egypt. Al-Mu'izz set out in the direction of Egypt on Thursday 5 Safar 358/12 November 972, accompanied by Buluggin, after a stay in Sardanîyâ, where he spent four months in organising his journey from which he would not return. Then the viceroy having taken leave of his sovereign on his halt at Gablès, the last Fâtîmid ruler of Irikiyî went on his way to the new seat of his dynasty.

During the last three years of his life spent in Cairo, al-Mu'izz was occupied with trying to change the Karmatî out of Syria by assuring himself of the support of Arab tribes, especially the chief of the 'Ukkâtî. But his troops commanded by the Kutâmî Abû Muhammî b. Djâ'far b. Falâh, were not able to assert his authority in Damascus, which was not slow to fall into the hands of Aftakhn, a Turkish officer supported by the Hamdûnids. The latter took advantage of the
Byzantines’ incursions into Syria to extend his power over this land and to provide an obstacle there to the Fatimids’ penetration. Al-Mu‘izz died on 11 Rabi‘ II 365/19 December 975 without having been able to seize Damascus permanently, nor to open up victoriously the route to the ʿAbbāsid capital. But his work as a great ruler is still associated with the period of his reign in Irīkīyā, during which he set about ending the state, which had barely emerged from the Khāridjīte disruption, with a rigorous administrative and financial organisation and solid political and religious institutions, promoting the rise of intellectual and artistic life and initiating the development of a brilliant civilisation which reached its full flowering on the banks of the Nile. If his name evokes dazzling military exploits, it also remains linked to the domestic level, with a policy of moderation and realism, a reform of Isma‘īlī doctrine centred on the elaboration under his aegis of a clear and homogeneous juridical and doctrinal system adapted to his designs for expansion and hegemony. The correspondence which he exchanged with his rival in Cordova al-Nāṣir, his famous letter to the Karmatī chief al-ʿAṣam and the one which he addressed to Romanus II, emperor of Byzantium, bear witness to the extent to which he subjected the universality of the dogma to the services of a far-sighted and able policy and to the extent to which he left of himself an image of majesty and glory.


MU‘IZZI, MUHAMMAD b. ʿABBAD AL-MALIK, Persian panegyrist of the Saljuq period and poet laureate (amīr al-sha‘rān) of Malik Shāh and Sandjār [q.v.], born in Nishābūr around 440/1050-9, died between 519/1121-5. His tadhkīl al-Mu‘izzī (or Amīr Mu‘izzī) was given him by his patron the Kākūyī prince ʿAlī al-Dawla ʿAlī b. Farrāzīr, son-in-law of Sandjār, after Malik Shāh’s death, as suggested in the elegies composed by his court for a year), and may finally have caused his death, as suggested in the elegies composed by his contemporary Sanā‘ī [q.v.].

Despite his great popularity, no early manuscripts of Mu‘izzī’s Dīvān survive, the earliest dating from Saʿwāfī times, and the poems appear to be in some disarray (especially those of the latter portion). The Dīvān contains mainly of panegyric kasidas dedicated to Malik Shāh and Sandjār, predominate, Mu‘izzī’s other manādsūr include, in addition to those mentioned above, Bahrām Shāh Ghazānawī, Mahmūd b. Muhammad b. Malik Shāh, and the Khārazm Shāh’s Atsūz and Dja‘lāl al-Dīn Muhammad. A large number are dedicated to Nīzām al-Mulk and his offspring, in particular his sons Mu‘ayyad al-Mulk and Fāhr al-Mulk, the poet seems to have had a close friendship with the latter, and composed a moving elegy following his assassination in 1096. Another important patron was Nīzām al-Mulk’s son-in-law the Sayyid al-Ru‘ūsī, Mu‘in al-Mulk Abu l-Maḥāsin, head of Malik Shāh’s diwan al-ma‘na, who supported Sandjār’s brother Habahgī (who supported Sandjār’s brother Habahgī [q.v.]). Barkāyūrī himself, and a variety of ministers and officials. From 490/1097 onwards he served as Sandjār’s personal poet. According to a famous anecdot, well supported by evidence from the Dīvān, in 511/1117-18 he was wounded, under circumstances which remain obscure, by an arrow shot at him by Sandjār; the wound caused him much suffering (several poems tell of his being ill and absent from court for a year), and may finally have caused his death, as suggested in the elegies composed by his contemporary Sanā‘ī [q.v.].

Mu‘izzī tends to favour the polythematic form of the kasida. Many of his poems include passages of self-reference describing his impoverished condition, requesting the patron’s favour, or praising his own poetry. His kasidas show the influence of early Ghazawī poets such as ʿUṣūrī, Farrukhī and Manūṣīrī; for example, a Mihragan kasida, poem employs the same prosodic scheme as one by ʿUṣūrī and quotes its manādūr. Quotations from Rūdakī and Farrukhī are also frequent. Mu‘izzī often uses extended metaphor and personification; several nasībīs consist of dialogues, e.g. between the poet and Reason (ʿakl), and another with Fortune (iḥkāb), which consists of four questions and answers, each passage ending with a title of the manādūr. Several poems anticipate the ‘‘erotic panegyrics’ which became popular at the Ghazawī court slightly later; one, dedicated to Fāhr al-Mulk, consists of a dialogue between jasmine and rose, who voice their praise of the patron. Such poems are extended metaphor as supported men as a Kasīr bānī ghalawal later developed by Ḥāfīz [q.v.]. In addition, though some of the pieces classed as ghazals are having been at Malik Shāh’s court for a year, composing panegyrics but receiving no reward. He remained at court until the assassination of Nīzām al-Mulk [q.v.] in 485/1092 and the death of Malik Shāh some months later (his Dīvān contains elegies on their deaths); there followed a period of instability during the struggle for Malik Shāh’s succession, during which he praised various patrons including Arslān Arghūn (who attempted unsuccessfully to achieve autonomy in Khurāsān), Ismā‘īl b. Ǧīlāki (the Ismā‘īlī ruler of Tabāa) and Abū Shujā‘ Yāhūb Hābaḡī (who supported Sandjār’s brother Habahgī [q.v.]). Barkāyūrī himself, and a variety of ministers and officials. From 490/1097 onwards he served as Sandjār’s personal poet. According to a famous anecdot, well supported by evidence from the Dīvān, in 511/1117-18 he was wounded, under circumstances which remain obscure, by an arrow shot at him by Sandjār; the wound caused him much suffering (several poems tell of his being ill and absent from court for a year), and may finally have caused his death, as suggested in the elegies composed by his contemporary Sanā‘ī [q.v.].

Despite his great popularity, no early manuscripts of Mu‘izzī’s Dīvān survive, the earliest dating from Saʿwāfī times, and the poems appear to be in some disarray (especially those of the latter portion). The Dīvān contains mainly of panegyric kasidas dedicated to Malik Shāh and Sandjār, predominate, Mu‘izzī’s other manādsūr include, in addition to those mentioned above, Bahrām Shāh Ghazānawī, Mahmūd b. Muhammad b. Malik Shāh, and the Khārazm Shāh’s Atsūz and Dja‘lāl al-Dīn Muhammad. A large number are dedicated to Nīzām al-Mulk and his offspring, in particular his sons Mu‘ayyad al-Mulk and Fāhr al-Mulk, the poet seems to have had a close friendship with the latter, and composed a moving elegy following his assassination in 1096. Another important patron was Nīzām al-Mulk’s son-in-law the Sayyid al-Ru‘ūsī, Mu‘in al-Mulk Abu l-Maḥāsin, head of Malik Shāh’s diwan al-ma‘na, who supported Sandjār’s brother Habahgī (who supported Sandjār’s brother Habahgī [q.v.]). Barkāyūrī himself, and a variety of ministers and officials. From 490/1097 onwards he served as Sandjār’s personal poet. According to a famous anecdot, well supported by evidence from the Dīvān, in 511/1117-18 he was wounded, under circumstances which remain obscure, by an arrow shot at him by Sandjār; the wound caused him much suffering (several poems tell of his being ill and absent from court for a year), and may finally have caused his death, as suggested in the elegies composed by his contemporary Sanā‘ī [q.v.].

Mu‘izzī tends to favour the polythematic form of the kasida. Many of his poems include passages of self-reference describing his impoverished condition, requesting the patron’s favour, or praising his own poetry. His kasidas show the influence of early Ghazawī poets such as ʿUṣūrī, Farrukhī and Manūṣīrī; for example, a Mihragan kasida, poem employs the same prosodic scheme as one by ʿUṣūrī and quotes its manādūr. Quotations from Rūdakī and Farrukhī are also frequent. Mu‘izzī often uses extended metaphor and personification; several nasībīs consist of dialogues, e.g. between the poet and Reason (ʿakl), and another with Fortune (iḥkāb), which consists of four questions and answers, each passage ending with a title of the manādūr. Several poems anticipate the ‘‘erotic panegyrics’ which became popular at the Ghazawī court slightly later; one, dedicated to Fāhr al-Mulk, consists of a dialogue between jasmine and rose, who voice their praise of the patron. Such poems are extended metaphor as supported men as a Kasīr bānī ghalawal later developed by Ḥāfīz [q.v.]. In addition, though some of the pieces classed as ghazals are
clearly fragments of longer poems, a significant number are complete ghazals (in the early sense of sung lyrics) and anticipate the characteristic diction of the later, formal ghazal. Not without reason was Mu'izzî considered the foremost poet of his time; the variety and subtlety of his lyricism, his mastery of panegyric topics, the personal note of his hatb-i bâlî, and his skillful use of transitions, had a clear and considerable influence on later poets, and he must be recognised as one of the outstanding poets in the Persian language.

Bibliography: Although Mu'izzî is mentioned by taḥdîrî writers such as ʿAwfî, Dawlatshâhî, and later sources, their information is scarcely reliable. He receives scant attention in more recent Persian sources (for a listing, see ʿA. Khayyâmîrî, Farhang-i sâkhânsârân, Tabriz 1961, 552), and almost none in Western histories. (JULIE S. MEISAMI)

MU'IZZÂLÀ (A.), a technical term in a number of different disciplines.

1. In astronomy. Here it corresponds to Gr. διαμέτρος, in the Almagest (υνάω), Lat. oppositio, the term for different disciplines. When they are diametrically opposite one another, the moon is in opposition to the sun, we have the full moon; the moon is above the horizon the whole night. When the moon is in opposition to the sun, we have the new moon; at midnight it passes through the meridian and is above the horizon the whole night. When the moon is in opposition to the sun, we have the full moon; the usual technical expression for this in Arabic astronomy is al-istikbâl, which is almost the same root as mukâbala (Greek μαχηθείς), and is rendered by Plato Tiburtinus and other mediaeval translators by praemunit; but we not uncommonly find the general term mukâbala applied to the opposition of sun and moon, while on the other hand we never find al-istikbâl used in the general sense of opposition of the planets (cf. al-Battânî, ii, 349, s.v. b.b.); al-mukâbala, opposition, forms along with al-tarbî, quadrature (Gr. πτερύγωνον, Lat. tetragonum, quadratum), al-tahâtîth, trigon (Gr. πτερύγωνον, Lat. trigonum, triangulum, triquetrum, aspectus trinus), and al-tasâdîs, hexagon (Gr. ἕξωκα, Lat. hexagumon, sex-angulum, aspectus sextilis), the four astrological aspects (aşkâl, s.g. şâdîk, Gr. σχήματα, σχηματισμός, συσχηματισμός, also ὥσπερ, Lat. aspectus or translationes), which are applied to the ecliptical differences in longitude of two planets to the amount of 180°, 90°, 120° or 60° respectively. The aşkâl also play a part in the astrological arrangement of the signs of the zodiac (burûjîh) (see MİNÇÂÄT AL-BURÂJ and al-Battânî, iii, 194). It should be noted that the conjuction of planets (mukârana, Greek οὐφος; for moon with sun [new moon] always the ʿugfînâ) is not included among the aşkâl, nor the position when the difference of latitude is 30° or 150° (cf. al-Battânî, op. cit.). Furthermore, mukâbala and tarbî are as a rule regarded as unfavourable in principle, tahâtîth and tasâdîs on the other hand as favourable.


(W. HARTNER)

2. As a technique in manuscript production. Here it has the meaning of "collation", i.e. the textual comparison of a manuscript with another of the same work, preferably, with one from which it was copied. A synonym is muṭrada (ʿurd, ḫâlīf; for the less common use of the latter, see H. Ritter, in Orosi, vi (1953) 86-7, pls. XIX, XXI, ms. Köprülü, i, 1551, 1522, see also Köprülü, i, 1530). Muṭrada is the older, originally less technical, and somewhat broader term, as shown by its use in the hadîth literature. An oral procedure of collation remained throughout, conceptually undistinguishted from the written one. Discussion of the supposed semantic development of mukâbala is found included already in al-Suli, Adab al-kâtibî, Cairo 1341, 120-1, and repeated later on, e.g., in al-Sâkhâwî, Muḥṣîb.

The practice. About the middle of the 3rd/9th century, we find the procedure described in connection with the more complicated case of translation by Hunayn b. Isâkî, Risâla, nos. 3, 20, 36-7, 39, 53, 74, 84, 86, 113, 123; the most famous passage (no. 20) speaks of Hunayn being "confronted by the Syriac translation..." (Risâla, 39), and the whole procedure is described in somewhat unusual description of mukâbala in personal terms. While Hunayn's involvement suggests non-Arabic antecedents, the internal Muslim situation which had its principal starting point in the science of hadîth is well documented. It resulted in the express indication in manuscripts of mukâbala, and mukâbala notices are found very frequently in preserved scholarly manuscripts; collation can also be inferred on occasion by other means. The notices allowed of a variety of phrases; the basic forms are listed in R. Şeşen, Cat. Köprülü, i, 20 (Ar.), i, 31 f. (in Turkish), Istanbul 1946/1986. The simple balaghâ "done to this point" (balaghâ al-m, balaghâ mukâbalat), when not followed by mukâbala or followed by kiraʾuʿi-samaʾa, refers, strictly speaking, to the process of study in general, manuscript collation; the former seems more limited.

The mention of mukâbala characterises serious scholarship. Famous scholars are represented in the notices, e.g., al-Sirâfî, whose notice is dated in 345/954-5 (see Köprülü, i, 1507, and Cat., ii, pls. I and VI). Intended to confirm the correctness of the text as copied, the form III of k-b-h is often followed by the form II of j-h-h, "to provide a correct text" (although taḥâtîth was, of course, also practiced freely without recourse to mukâbala). Not surprisingly, notices are found where a copyist wished to make it clear that he was aware that his Vorlage was faulty (sakîm); at the same time, it was acknowledged that absolute correctness was unattainable, thus various forms of "(corrected) as much as possible" were often added. Occasionally, the need for collation (Köprülü, i, 244, 596) or the hope of future access to another manuscript for renewed collation was expressed (e.g., Aya Sofia 4360/Fatih 5322, see M. Grignaschi, in Museon, lxxx [1967], 215 ff.; Beşir Ağâ 494 [Şîvan al-kikma]; Ahmet III 1975 [al-Râzi, Taḏārâbî]; Université 1458, fol. 219a). Samânotice and igûzdî, since they implied mukâbala, required no express mention of it, but it was occasionally mentioned in them (e.g., Ahmet III 2951, see S. al-Munadjdjid, RIMA, ii [1956], 101-2 [al-Birzâlî]; Cairo, muṣâbaḥa al-hadîth, 65, fol. 343/954-5 (see Koprulu, i, 1507), or a muṭrada). Mukâbala is not infrequently dated, sometimes within a couple of days after the manuscript was written (as indicated by
The theory. Possibly already in the later 2nd/8th century, the mukābala was accepted as being of particular importance for the rapidly developing science of hadīth and, in the course of time, found a small niche in its theoretical framework. Various usūl al-mukābala are among the first to write a book on the subject (according to Ibn Ḥadjar, Nuzhat al-nazar fi taqwīd Mukhābat al-fikr, beg.), Ibn Khālid al-Rāmūrushi (latter part of the 4th/10th century) included a chapter on muṣūra in his al-Muhadith al-fasāl. Practically all later authors paid special attention to it, among the most prominent among them al-Khāṭib al-Baghdādī and, after him, ʿIyād, Ibn al-Salāḥ, and al-Sakhāwī who quoted copiously from many of the earlier authors. Their independence is expectedly great. The discussions differ with respect to their authors' views on correct procedure. A large number of questions as to the "conditions" governing mukābala were raised, for instance: When should it take place, during the lecture or at any time thereafter? Can it be based on the teacher's oral exposition? Is the original Verlag to be used or what other copies are suitable? Must it be done by the student personally? Should every student in class have a manuscript of the studied text in front of him (recommendable, according to al-Khāṭib al-Baghdādī, Kifāya, 238), with the teacher himself on occasion providing the students with a sufficient number of copies (al-Sakhāwī, Muḥdī, ii, 169, with reference to earlier authors) and so on. The purpose of it all was to establish whether a manuscript, and the person who wrote or relied on it, could function in the process of hadīth transmission. It was widely agreed that mukābala was a necessary requirement. Strict interpreters of the conditions granted the right of transmission only if they were punctiliously preserved. Much more leniently were those who did not subscribe to strict observance. Some authorities held that transmission was permitted when the absence of mukābala was expressly stated. Some even went so far as to dispense with the requirement of it (al-Djurdjānī, R. fi fann usūl al-hadīth, 6 [in al-Tirmidhī, Dāmī, Dīhlī, 1266/1849-50], see E.E. Salisbury, in JAS, vii [1862, 76]. In sum, however, the theory of mukābala and the added stimulus which it provided for the practice contributed immeasurably to accuracy in bookhand.


In literary theory. In scholastic rhetoric (ʿilm al-balāgha), mukābala was valued variously as "opposition" or "correspondence", refers to a type of antithesis [see ʿībāk], in which both sides of the opposition consist of two or more terms, as in sūra IX, 82: fa-ʾl-yādāhū kalīfī wa-ʾl-yābīkī kāfīfī, therefore let them laugh little, and weep much, where "laugh little" corresponds to its two respective opposites "weep much" (al-Kaṣwānī, Ṭahrīḵī, 352-4, Ḥādīs, 485-8; Menhen, 99-100). In its earliest attestation, the term appears in the form of siḥḥat al-mukābala, "correct correspondences" and covers both parallels of contraries and non-contraries (Kūdāmā, Nādī, 72-3; note that kāfīfī, "antithesis" of single terms, is treated separately on 78-81). Since al-Khāʾrāzī lists this term under the technical terms of the state scribes (Maḥfīl, 73-4: mawādaʾī kutūb al-ʿaṣīrāt), but not among the terms used in the critique of poetry (Naḍī al-šīrī, where, however, the word mukābala is used to explain the term muqābala, "antithesis"!) it is likely that siḥḥat al-mukābala originally belonged to the professional jargon of the epistolographers, who used the technique denoted by it to construct pleasing isocola. Due to the preponderant use of contraries in these "correspondences", the term was gradually drawn into the category "antithesis" as used by the literary critics. However, Ibn Abī ʿl-Iṣāṣa (d. 654/1256) still clearly distinguishes between muqābala and mukābala: the former being a contrast between two single contraries, whereas the latter balances two or more terms on each side which, in addition, need not be contraries, although they often are (Tabrīz, 179).


MUKADDAMS (a.), literally, “placed in front”. Applied to persons, the word means the chief, the (captain). Dozy, Suppl., s.v., gives a number of police appointments which have this name. In the dervish orders, the word is used for the head of the order or the head of a monastery.

As a neuter noun, the word is a technical term in logic and arithmetic. In logic, it means the protasis in a premise in the form of a conditional sentence, e.g. “If the sun rises (it becomes day),” where this whole sentence is to be regarded as premise of a syllogism. But as every sentence can be a premise, a mukaddam is sentence is to be regarded as premise of a syllogism. If, however, he was a muwashshih, not a single muwashshih of his, or even part of one is known to be extant, nor, so far as we know, is there any muwashshih that has been attributed to him.

Bibliography: Dozy and other dictionaries; Thorning, Beitrag zur Kenntnis des isl. Vereinswesens (Turk Bibl., vi), 160; Tâhânawî, Dict. of technical terms, ed. Spranger, 1215, 1302.

MUKADDAMS B. MU’ÂFÂA AL-KABRI (“of Cabra”), Córdoba Province, Hispânico-Arab poet, d. ca. 299/911-12. According to the Andalusian historian al-Hîjâjî (500-49/1106-55) (on whom see EF1, 602b and, in particular, III, 926a) and to such authors as relied on him, Mukaddam was the inventor of the muwashshah genre (q.v.) of poetry. Although he is described as such without qualification by Rachel Arîf in her article KARBA (q.v.) (cf. also her Espaîa musulmana (siglos VIII-XV), Barcelona 1982, 396), it should be noted that Ibn Basâmîn (d. 543/1147 [q.v.) gives the name of the genre’s inventor as Muhammad b. Mâhmûd al-Kabri, the Blind (not “Mukaddam ibn Mu’âfâ al-Qâbrî, the blind”), a gratuitous emendation, appearing without comment or explanation, in J.T. Monroe’s translation of the relevant passage from Ibn Basâmîn, Shabkdrîn, Cairo 1942, ii, 1-2, ed. Ihsân ‘Abbâs, Beirut 1975, i, pt. i, 469), in his Hispánico-Arabic poetry, Berkeley-Los Angeles-Denmark 1974, 28). S.M. Stern took the view that al-Hîjâjî’s “Mukaddam” rather than “Muhammad” was probably an error (Hispánico-Arabic strophic poetry, ed. L.P. Harvey, Oxford 1974, 65 f.), apparently on the ground that the value of al-Hîjâjî’s testimony, reaching us indirectly through the Kibdâ al-Mukaddam min akhîr al-nâs by Ibn Sâd, cannot be compared with that of Ibn Basâmîn (ibid., 65).

That there were two poets each bearing the name nishâ “al-Kabri” seems demonstrable beyond a reasonable doubt on the evidence of the sources cited by Stern (ibid., 92 f.), who, presumably on the balance of probabilities, suggested that “the invention [of the muwashshah] was credited to the second [Mukaddam] in error because his name was slightly better known than that of the first [Muhammad]” (ibid., 92). Such an assumption may or may not be correct, but of this much we may be sure: there was indeed a poet by the name of Mukaddam b. Mu’âfâ al-Kabri. From two passages preserved in the Mukaddam of Ibn Hâyân (q.v.) from the—apparently no longer extant—Tahbîs al-‘Imâmîn, of the well-known wakhshih Ubâda b. Mâ’âm al-Sâmî (q.v.) we know that he flourished in the reign of ‘Abd Allâh b. Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Rahîm (reg. 275-300/888-912 [q.v.]), seventh Umayyad amîr of al-Andalus, and we have evidence of his existence from passages in other sources (cited by Stern, ibid., 93). At the same time there is nowhere in any of these passages a single mention of muwashshahs, though, as Stern so rightly points out, this is “no proof by itself that he was no wakhshih” (ibid.).

That there were two different poets each bearing the name of poetry. bear witness to a classical training in grammar and literature, while the arguments on a basis of fîk and the discussions of the various theological and
juridical schools provide evidence of a marked interest—and no doubt one awakened very early—in these fundamental disciplines. But these displays of a benefit of the work itself, which brings them together with other traces of different fields of learning, history, philology and hadith, philology and hadith, philology and hadith, phi

There is an original sce... al-Balkhi and consisting of the world of Islam, giving it priority and unifying symbol of this world, al-Mukaddasi can...

The definition of the province is no less remarkable: the ilkm (q.v.) is seen as a geographic whole, strongly individualised through its physical characteristics and ready, in consequence of this very situation, at a given moment in history, to transcribe this individuality into a more or less assured autonomy. At the head of the province is the miqat, metropolis, ruling several surrounding districts (kāna), themselves containing main towns (madina) around a kāsaba. Thus is brought to its conclusion, in the most minute detail, this ordered presentation of the mamlakat al-Islām, a new geography that al-Mukaddasi also wanted to baptise with a new name, Ahsan al-taḥqīm fī maṣūf al-aṣrāf, "the best division for the knowledge of the provinces".

This science required a specialised vocabulary. Apart from the words cited, the author uses the distinguishing words nābiya and rūstāk, the latter too small to constitute a kūra, but benefiting from a separate status within a fixed kūra, the former occupying a situation of the same order, but in relation, especially, to the ilkm, taking account of its superior status as against the rūstāk. Other specific terms touch on current terminology and the author, which makes al-Mukaddasi the finest representative of this science of geography of Islam in the 4th/10th century. Through his ambition, above all, an ambition in ordering and content, al-Mukaddasi intends to create a useful science, notably for merchants and the cultivated man (adīb). This last point is particularly important; by invoking authorities, one should say challenging them, by inventing, when necessary, a noble oraided by rhymed prose and poetry, the new discipline was to be given its letters-patent of nobility in the field of literature as well as in that of strict learning. As for ambition in content, the programme that the author assigns, from as early as the preface, to the science that he intends to found covers all the fields that it is agreed upon to call geography today: physical, economic, political and human.

On the map, it is then to the world of Islam that study is devoted, and to it alone, apart from some very rare excursions into foreign lands and recollections of the universal cosmography of the ḥawāl al-ard outlined in the introduction to the work. This world, which is made up of two parts, mamlukat al-ʿArab and mamlukat al-ʿĀlam—Mukaddasi joins together in a unique concept, that of mamlukat al-Islām, at times, simply, al-mamlaka or al-Islām: the domain of Islam, the Domain or Islam. It is within this whole, as soon as unity has been reconstituted and established in principle, that there reappears the distinction between Arabs and non-Arabs. On the one hand, six Arab provinces, sc. the Maghrib, Egypt, Arabia, Shām, ‘Iraq and Fars (Kūra, Upper Mesopotamia); on the other, eight non-Arab provinces: Rihāb, (Armenia-Arān-Ādharbaydjān), Daylam, Djiβāl, Khūzistān, Fārā, Kirmān, Sind and the Mashrik, the latter term covering all the lands coming, more or less directly, under the authority of the Sāmānids, sc. Sījistān, Afghānistān, Khūrāsān and Transoxiana (Ma warāʾ al-nahr). In order the better to assert the expression disappear. Although he continues with others the eulogy of Baghdād, presented as the living and unifying symbol of this world, al-Mukaddasi cannot fail to stress its decline, as against the two powers that were challenging it, Cordova and especially, the Fatimid Egypt, which he acknowledges is quite ready to take over from its rival. The work itself bears witness to these tensions, even in its composition: the two manuscripts of Berlin and Constantinople differ not only in variations of date, content and title (cf. Miquel, Fr. tr., op. cit., p. XXVII), but in the references made to the two powers of the Muslim East at the end of the 4th/10th century, the Fatimids and Sāmānids. The conception of the heart of Islam, Arabia, being also itself a province with two capitals, Mecca and Zābih.


MUKADDĪ (A.), pl. mukaddā, defined by al-
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Đjahiz (Bukhāla, ed. Ḥaḍīrī, 46) as a man who practises ḵadd (ṣahīb al-ḵadd), a term often replaced at a later date by the meanings indicated here, and if al-Đjahiz feels the need to define—too briefly—the word mukaddī (together with, as we shall see, a whole series of other "technical terms"), this is because he considers them as slang words belonging to the argot of the rogues and vagabonds and intelligible only to initiates; in any case, as C.E. Bosworth suggests (Underworld, i, 40), it derives possibly from the Persian gōdī "indigent person, beggar".

Whatever the position, al-Đjahiz was probably the first to have introduced vagabonds into Arabic literature by devoting several opuscules to their activities and by consecrating a complete chapter of his K. al-Bukhāla (ed. Ḥaḍīrī, 39-46; tr. Pellat, 65-75) to a mukaddī called Khalīd b. Ţayṣād. This person sets forth a discourse in which he enumerates the terms denoting his confederates and boasts that he had met under his control the members of the band of which he claims to be chief, before going on to list at length the pieces of advice which he is now giving to his son. Whether this passage was a historical one or not, it is worthy of note that Yākūt (Udabd, xi, 42-7) has borrowed the introduction of the chapter and the latter part of the discourse in order to make out of these a bibliographical notice on Khalīd b. Ţayṣād. The terms cited are explained by al-Đjahiz, but the readings for these have been more or less satisfactorily established, and C.E. Bosworth (op. laud., i, 34-41) has made it his task to correct and comment upon these. If the reading kāḏīr is correct, we have here the first attestation of a word which denotes the gypsies; then comes mīz-hī ţārī, whose vocalisation is uncertain, but denotes a person of ascetic appearance; a mukaddī who has been robbed might, after a kāḏāmī gives out that he is demonically possessed or an epileptic; a bānawānī stands before a door, rattles the bolt and cries "O Master!", in order to get alms; an ʿarīf stops the circulation of blood in an arm or leg so that people might think the limb is gangrenous; a muqaddīmāqām maizes a child at birth in order to make use of it at a future time for begging purposes; a filāwī simulates a hernia or ulcer or tumour or some similar affliction with his testicles or anus, or with her vulva, in the case of a woman; a kāḏānī is a boy who acts as a male prostitute; an awwādī begins between sunset and the evening worship, at times singing; an istilāf intends to be blind; a māzdī gives out that he just needs a little more money to purchase what he needs; a mukaddīs makes a collection for buying a shroud; a kāḏītī derives his name from Ubayy b. ʾAṣā ṭārīqā, who married a group of beggars around a water-hole; and zaḵārī is bread collected as alms and intended for prisoners and beggars.

The above gives only an incomplete list of the constituent elements of a remarkable assemblage of persons whom al-Đjahiz was able to observe at Baṣra and at Baghdād. Among his other writings on the same subject, one page only of the K. Ḥiyād al-mukaddīn has been preserved by al-Bayhākī; in his K. al-Maḥāsin wa ʾl-mudawwārī, ed. F. Schwalli, Gießen 1902, iii, 622-4; Eng. tr. D.M. Hawke, in Pellat, The life and works of Ḫābīz, London 1969, 255-6; Ger. tr. W.W. Muller, in idem, Arabische Geistesleute, Zürich-Stuttgart 1967, 410-12. This contains a vivid portrayal of the vagabond in the mouth of an old mukaddī, who returns to a young beggar who has been too easily discouraged by his experience of ḵudī but who is in the end convinced by the advantages which it offers. It is a noble craft or calling (ṣināʿa) which brings happiness to those who practice it. These last range through the whole world in every direction, stop where they will and enjoy total freedom; they do not have to devote any care to a family or to material goods and are able to live on whatever they find when they halt. This vagabond recounts how he installed himself in a mosque in one of the towns of Ḫābīz, with his body draped in a large towel and with a robe of palm fibre wound round his head; in his hand he held a staff made from a branch of the oleander. He retailed the following discourse to the public assembled round him, as if he had been, so he says, al-Ḥaḏīrī b. ʿYūṣuf [q.e.], in his pulpīt: "Good people, I am a man from Syria, more specifically from a town called al-Maṣṣaṣṭa. I am the descendant of fighters in the holy war and warriors of the ribāt, who travel in the way of God and are the guardians of Islam. Together with my father, I have taken part in fourteen raids, seven by land and seven by sea. I have fought with al-ʾArmani (Say: May God have mercy on his (Hasan)) and with ʿUmar b. ʿUbayd Allāh (Say: May God have mercy on his (Hafṣ)). I have gone on raids with al-Battāl [q.e.] b. al-Husayn [and many others]. I have entered Constantine and prayed in the mosque of Maslama b. ʾAbd al-Malik [q.e.]. If you recognise my name, well and good; if not, well, I am now going to let you know it: I am the son of al-ʿOṣayyyil b. al-Rakkān (?) al-Maṣṣaṣṭi, well known and feared in all the frontier marches... I am one of the barriers of Islam. I fought with the ruler [of Byzantium] at the gate of Tarsus; he killed the children and enslaved the womenfolk, and seized two sons of ours and carried them off into the land of Rūm. I fled precipitately in the company of a group of merchants, but some brigands cut the route of my escape. I have sought the protection of God, and now I seek from you if you will make it good to restore one of the pillars of Islam to his home town, [then I appeal to you]!" The mukaddī added that the dirhams began to rain in from all directions and that he departed richer by more than 100 dirhams. The greater part of the heroic figures cited in this text are also to be found in al-Maʿṣūdī's Murūǧ (viii, 74 =§ 3201), who reproduces a tale regarding the Byzantines, and one discerns that the character presented by al-Đjahiz could on occasion himself also exploit this in order to make a firm impression on an audience very ready to listen to the promises, real or imaginary, made by the Muslim warriors.

The above text is followed by a listing of the kinds of beggars which does not necessarily come from al-Bayhākī's own pen and may possibly have been part of the original. It includes some new names additional to the list given in the Bukhāla; a makkī pretend to be a rich merchant who has been robbed of his goods; a sahāri begins to ply his "trade" before the dawn; a ṣudājāwī pretend to have been imprisoned and loaded with chains for fifty years; a ṣhurārabī Leighs serious wounds; a ḫādīr is similar to the filāwī mentioned above; a ḥakāmī paints over his face in order to make it swell up, but this may be a case of a male prostitute; a ṭabīṣī has a greenish face, he is the confidante of a kātī [q.e.]; a muṣafīlī works together with a confidante and, like the makkī, pretends to have been the victim of a robbery; zuḵāydm
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al-Habasha apparently denotes a fraudulent warrior engaged in djihdd zukaym al-marhuma, a band of blind men led by an isif (see above); and finally, a mutayyin smears himself with mud and feigns madness.

This veritable professional corporation, composed of various "specialists" arranged more or less in a hierarchy and under the leadership of a shaykh, was to continue to exist with varying fortunes over the course of the ensuing centuries and, with the aid of the public's taste for sdsdniyyas and kasidas, was to inspire C.E. Bosworth to write his magistral study (Underworld) on this Islamic "milieu", based precisely on this poem which he has edited, translated and commented upon in detail. Another kasida sásıniyya, the work of Saff al-Din al-Hillī (677-750/1278-1349 [q.v.]), is likewise studied by Bosworth (op. laud., i, 132-49), who furthermore takes care to note that the celebrated Ibn Dāmin al-Din al-Abbādī (1014/1602 - 1090/1679 [q.v.]) introduced the character of the vagabond into the shadow plays. From another aspect, a kind of theoretical justification for kadqa which al-Dājūzī and perhaps also Ibn Shuwaydī (d. 426/1035 [q.v.]), author of a Kadqf al-dakk fi ṭādaq al-dhāk, had first outlined, finds its full development from the pen of al-Dājwawī (first half of the 7th/13th century [q.v. in Suppl.], who has left behind a K. al-Makhdūqī r Kadqf al-dakk wa-maṣālikh al-dakwā al-dhāk, which played an important role in Europe in the 17th and 18th centuries, as well as the praise of the virtues of the rule.

Among the best-known topoi are expressions dealing with the reason and the justification for composing a literary work ("I have been requested to write a book on the subject"); or, "I write a book, so that other works dealing with the subject can be forgotten", or "I shall report briefly and avoid prolixity"). To these topoi belongs also the modesty topos which, as captatio benevolentiae, can be traced in almost all literatures. In this context must also be mentioned the well-known "querelle des Anciens et des Modernes", which played an important role in Europe in the 17th and 18th centuries, as well as the praise of the virtues of the rule.

Finally, in the third part of the preface there follow renewed praises to God. As far as the form is concerned, the prose of the three parts is characterised by the use of sadqī [q.v.], in particular for the initial and final praises.

As a literary genre, the mukaddima was developed in particular by al-Dājūzī (d. 555/1159) and Ibn Katayba (d. 576/1180) [q.v.]. From the latter onwards, the independent development of the preface, which becomes separated from the work, is clearly discernible in both content and form. After the 4th/10th century, the obligatory outer form remains unchanged, and is found above all in the adab literature, but also in the 19th century in the work of al-Tahšawi, and in the 20th century in Rāshid al-Bārāwī's translation of Karl Marx's Das Kapital.

The preface had an importance of its own, because the author there turns directly to the reader and thus steps out of the context of his work. Because of its conformity to the established tradition in form and language, the author is able to solve, right into

Bibliography: In addition to references given in the text, see esp. Dājūzī, Bukhdādī; ed. Ḥajjī, 378-81; F. Schwally, Ein arabische Liber Fugatorum, in ZA xxvii (1912), 28-42; W.T. al-Najmī, Shaktisya al-mukadda nadh al-Dājūzī, in Majalisat Kuliyat al-Ādākh, Bagdādī, i (1759/1959), 1-10; C.E. Bosworth, The mediaeval Islamic underworld. The Banū Sādīn in Arabic society and literature, Leiden 1976, 2 vols.; M. Tarchouna, Les marginaux dans les recits picaresques arabes et espagnols, Tunis 1982, and the bibls. to these last two works and the art. Mukaddima (Ch. Pellat)
our own time, the problem of finding an appropriate beginning for his work.


AL-MUKALLA, port in the Hadramawt [q.v.] on the shores of the Indian Ocean (14°31'N., 49°08'E.), some 550 km. (300 miles) east of Aden. The name is probably the noun of place of form II of the Arabic radicals k-l-w with the meaning of "station of ships" (cf. Lane, s.v.). The Kalā is dominated by the seven-storied Kasādī palace. The open anchorage on the west side of the promontory is not used during the south-west monsoon (June-September), the anchorages made by the British, but not the Ku-aytīs, their genealogical trees and the organisation of the Ku'aytī Sultanate during the British Protectorate, are described by Ingrams, A report, 27 ff., 78 ff., 174-5; for pictures of al-Mukalla, see e.g. idem, Arabia and the Isles, 145 ff., and Western Arabia, 556-7.

Al-Mukalla stretches out along the small coast-line between the Indian Ocean and the steep cliffs of the Jabal Katat. The al-Bilād quarter, the oldest part of the town, is built on a promontory protruding into the sea like a bird's tail and is thus surrounded by the sea on three sides. It is dominated by the seven-storied Kasādī palace. The open anchorage on the west side of the promontory is not used during the south-west monsoon (June-September), the anchorages made by the British, but not the Ku-aytīs, their genealogical trees and the organisation of the Ku'aytī Sultanate during the British Protectorate, are described by Ingrams, A report, 27 ff., 78 ff., 174-5; for pictures of al-Mukalla, see e.g. idem, Arabia and the Isles, 145 ff., and Western Arabia, 556-7.

The town is linked with Aden by a newly-built road (early 1970s). There is also a small tuna-canning factory. The Indian Ocean has been of little importance. A small port, writes Markalla (Beschreibung von Arabien, 283), and knowledge of the port. Niebuhr, who did not visit the town, writes (pers. comm. 1791), that his Turk and the Al-Ku-aytīs, their genealogical trees and the organisation of the Ku'aytī Sultanate during the British Protectorate, are described by Ingrams, A report, 27 ff., 78 ff., 174-5; for pictures of al-Mukalla, see e.g. idem, Arabia and the Isles, 145 ff., and Western Arabia, 556-7.

Ingrams, A report, 27 ff., 78 ff., 174-5; for pictures of al-Mukalla, see e.g. idem, Arabia and the Isles, 145 ff., and Western Arabia, 556-7.

In the 18th century, al-Mukalla, overshadowed by al-Shihr [q.v.], became an object of the struggle between the Ai Katthī [see Dāvr ab-Aswār, 3; HADRAMAWT. 1. History (in Suppl.), the Al Kasādī and the Al Ku'aytī. Around 1840 the Al Kasādī, originating from Lower Yafā [q.v.], were nakibs of al-Mukalla. The Al Ku'aytī, also of the Yafī tribe, became masters of the port in 1880. In 1850 and again in 1867 the Turks, having failed to re-establish them-selves in San'a, retired on a pension to Zanzibar, but not the Ku-aytīs, their genealogical trees and the organisation of the Ku'aytī Sultanate during the British Protectorate, are described by Ingrams, A report, 27 ff., 78 ff., 174-5; for pictures of al-Mukalla, see e.g. idem, Arabia and the Isles, 145 ff., and Western Arabia, 556-7.

In the 18th century, al-Mukalla, overshadowed by al-Shihr [q.v.], became an object of the struggle between the Ai Katthī [see Dāvr ab-Aswār, 3; HADRAMAWT. 1. History (in Suppl.), the Al Kasādī and the Al Ku'aytī. Around 1840 the Al Kasādī, originating from Lower Yafā [q.v.], were nakibs of al-Mukalla. The Al Ku'aytī, also of the Yafī tribe, became masters of the port in 1880. In 1850 and again in 1867 the Turks, having failed to re-establish them-selves in San'a, retired on a pension to Zanzibar, but not the Ku-aytīs, their genealogical trees and the organisation of the Ku'aytī Sultanate during the British Protectorate, are described by Ingrams, A report, 27 ff., 78 ff., 174-5; for pictures of al-Mukalla, see e.g. idem, Arabia and the Isles, 145 ff., and Western Arabia, 556-7.

In the 18th century, al-Mukalla, overshadowed by al-Shihr [q.v.], became an object of the struggle between the Ai Katthī [see Dāvr ab-Aswār, 3; HADRAMAWT. 1. History (in Suppl.), the Al Kasādī and the Al Ku'aytī. Around 1840 the Al Kasādī, originating from Lower Yafā [q.v.], were nakibs of al-Mukalla. The Al Ku'aytī, also of the Yafī tribe, became masters of the port in 1880. In 1850 and again in 1867 the Turks, having failed to re-establish them-selves in San'a, retired on a pension to Zanzibar, but not the Ku-aytīs, their genealogical trees and the organisation of the Ku'aytī Sultanate during the British Protectorate, are described by Ingrams, A report, 27 ff., 78 ff., 174-5; for pictures of al-Mukalla, see e.g. idem, Arabia and the Isles, 145 ff., and Western Arabia, 556-7.
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AL-MUKALLAD B. AL-MUSAYYIB, HUSAM AL-DAWLA ABU HASSAN, member of the Arab ʿUmayyid dynasty of ʿIrāq and al-Dāʿīzirā (d. 391/1000).

After the death in 386/996 or 387/997 of the ʿUmayyid amir Abu ʿl-Dhawwād Muhammad b. al-Musayyib, a quarrel arose between his brothers, ʿAlī and al-Mukallaḍ, each of whom claimed power. ʿAlī was the elder, but al-Mukallaḍ wrote to the Buyīd ʿAlī b. Nūh; cf. Genesis, x). The ʿAlīs b. Mazyad [see TAKLID; also KASS; MADDAH].

The Byzantine general Leontius in 678 ing to which Mukan and Djilan—both inhabitants of the Alazan with the lora). 363, has Bouxocxioc (var. Bouxocxioc), the Armenian geography Mukan and the Georgian chronicle Mowakan another Mowakan lay near the confluence of the Alazan with the Iora).

History. The Byzantine general Leontius in 678 subdued Iberia, Albania, Bukania (cf. above) and Media. The district of Mukan was conquered in 21/642 by an officer of Suraka b. Bukayr, who addressed a letter guaranteeing peace to “the people of Mukan and the mountains of al-Kabdj” (the Alazan) (cf. ʿAlībīn). Another campaign of Saʿd b. ʿAlī against the people of Mukan and Djilan, although successful, entailed severe losses. According to al-Yaʿkūbi, ʿAlīmāḥ, ii, 395, 15, in 123/741 the future caliph Marwan II b. Muhammad undertook a campaign in ʿAlīmāḥ and Mukan. Mukan figured several times as a stronghold of Babak (al-Tabari, i, 1174, 1178). In the 3rd/9th century Ibn Khurraḍādžībīh, 19, mentions one ʿShakla (? as chief of Mukan.

Encyclopaedia of Islam, VII
According to al-Mas‘udi, Murudji, ii, 5 = § 445, in his time the Sharwan Shah [see SHIR WAN] had conquered the steppe of Lāyān (several wazirs) and of Mūkānīyya. It appears from Miskawayh (ed. Arnedroz and Margoliouth, i, 399), who mentions the isphakhād of Mūkān b. Dāhūla as ally of the Gil chief Lāqkārī b. Mardī, who rebelled against the Daylamīs in 326/937, that Mūkān enjoyed a certain degree of autonomy. In 339/950, the Kurds Daysam sent his vizier “into the mountains (sic) of Mūkān to entrench himself.” In 349/960, Mūkān appears as a centre of rebellion (Miskawayh, ii, 135, 178-9). The poet Katrān [q.v.] mentions the rising of the isphakhād of Mūkān against the Rawwādī Wahsūdān (344/7895-89; cf. Ahmad Kisrawi, Pādshāhīn-i gūmnām, Tehran 1929, ii, 94). Later, we hear of Mūkān mainly as an excellent area for the winter pasturage of the conquering nomads. In Yākūt’s time (iv, 676) the majority of the people of Mūkān were still Turkomans. In the history of the Khwārezmshāh Djādāl al-Dīn, Mūkān is constantly mentioned. The sultan sends his booty there, keeps his baggage and mobilizes his troops there (al-Nasawi, Sīra, 210, 280, 366, etc.). But in 617/1220-1, the Mongol generals Djebe and Subutay spent the winter in Mūkān (Diwawānī, i, 116), and al-Kawzī, 379, says that Mongols took Mūkān for their winter pastures and drove out the Turkomans. In the important passage of Miskawayh, i, 2, 280, 366, etc.), it is distinctly stated that the al-Mukaniyya (from the people Muxot, Mochi?) was of much greater extent. In the Arab geographers tell us: al-Istakhri, 182 ( = Ibn Hawkāl, 219), mentions Mukan among the towns of the Caspian Sea and included the coastal region of Rusvansh. Also, in a Persian translation of al-Iṣṭakhri, 186, 17, we read: “The Gils and the Mukan are tribes on foot who rarely go on horseback” which can only refer to a few remnants of the old population settled in upper Tałish (where the highlanders are very distinct from the lowlanders). Al-Mukaddasi does not definitely say that the fortress belongs to Mūkān, and evidently speaks of it by hearsay. Is this a reference to Shindān-ka‘la (which is about 50 miles = 2 marhālas to the south of the presumed site of al-Shirvān of Muqān)? On this imposing mountain (6,000 feet high) can still be seen ruins of important fortifications (Radde, 135; “ruins of a strong castle... many ruins of brick buildings”). Also, in a Persian translation of al-Iṣṭakhri, 186, 17, we read: “The Gils and the Mukan are tribes on foot who rarely go on horseback” which can only refer to a few remnants of the old population settled in upper Tałish (where the highlanders are very distinct from the lowlanders). In the case of the passage of al-Iṣṭakhri, 186, 17, maqāmat, iii 5 = § 445, it is distinctly stated that the al-Mūkānīyya conquered by the lord of Shīrwan [q.v.] was situated near Kabala [see MPaki], i.e. to the north of the Kur, and was different from al-Mūkānīyya on the shore of the Caspian Sea (cf. Hūdūd al-ʿĀlam, tr. Minorosky, 407). In the Georgian Chronicle (Broset, Histoire de la Géorgie, i, 10) we read that Mowakan son of Mhargan received from his father “the north (ie) of Mtkvar (= Kur) from the junction with the Little Alasan (lor?) to the sea and there founded the city (kingdom?) of Mowakhet”. In ibid., i, 397, the Shīr- wānshāh (in the 6th/12th century) is called “lord of Mowakan and Shirwan”. Prince Wakhshūt in his Georgian geography (18th century) places Mowakan between the Kur and Alasan. In Georgian, the same term Mowakan is also applied to the Mughan situated to the south of the Kur (Broset, i, 161). These facts indicate that the original territory bearing the name Mūkān (from the people Muxo, Mochi?) was of much greater extent. As regards the Mūkān south of the Kur, this is what the Arab geographers tell us: al-Iṣṭakhri, 182 (= Ibn Hawkāl, 219) mentions Mūkān among the towns of Adharbaydžan, and (ibid., 219) places it on the Gilan road to the Būb āl-Abwāb (q.v., and see DEIREN). According to an additional passage (ibid., 190c), the town of Mükān is separated from Bākū by a gulf (fawhat al-bahr = the Gulf of Kīsh-Ālgha) where they
fish for the fish called sumahi (*sufmdhi? = "hake"). On the shores of this Gulf (?) is Mukan, which has fish for the fish called sumahi (*sufmdhi? = "hake"). Le Strange, Lands, 175-6, 230-1; Schwarz, Iran, 1086-94; Hudud al-^dlam, tr. (ibid., 17 [August 1862], 72); Yunan (?) = in the region ofJA. On the shores of this Gulf (?) is Mukan, which has fish for the fish called sumahi (*sufmdhi? = "hake"). Now just to the east!) from Barzand farsakh. This route (al-Istakhrl, 192; Ibn Hawkal, 251 [important details]; al-Mukaddassi, 381) went by Ardabil-15 farsakhs—Barzand-7 farsakhs—Balkhâb-7 farsakhs—Yânân (Yümân, Tûmân, etc.); the farsakhs—Barzâbâh. If we call the farsakh 3 miles, the identifications would be as follows: Barzand = the village of Ka`fa Barzand; Balkhâb = Bel-bulakh (a spring and a ruined caravanserai in the middle of the steppe; cf. Ibn Hawkal, 251); Warthân = Altan (ruins of a fort on the bank of the Araxes and a canal which runs towards the steppe); Baylakân = Mîl (properly Mît-i Baylakân, near the ruined fort of Urem-ka`; cf. Khanaykov, in J4 [August 1862], 72); Yümân (?) = the region of Bayat—Hind-arkh [see Bardha]. Now just to the east of this route (south-east to north-west) Hamd Allâh Mustawfî, Nazat al-kulâ, 181, gives a third itinerary (south-west to north-east): Ardabil-8 farsakhs—Ribât *Arshak-8 farsakhs—village of V.r.n.k (?)-4 farsakhs—Bâdjarwan—gap (which in al-Istakhrl, 182; Djûbarwan seems to correspond, perhaps a new conflation of a place in the south of Lake Urmîya; [see NIRKH]-8 farsakhs—Bâlûsawâr-6 farsakhs—Djû-i naw-6 farsakhs—Mahmûd-âbâd-i Gwâbarî. The fixed points are Ardabil and Bâlûsawar (Russian customs-house). Bâdjarwan, which according to al-Kazwinî was formerly the capital (shahristan) of Mughân, should be sought on one of the sources of the independent river Araxes which rises in the district of Ulgardar and ends in a lake to the south of the estuary of the Araxes. Bolgar is the Russian pronunciation; the element -rî is certainly “river”; in Olearium and Struys the name is written Balbar, which is more accurate; the name must be connected with that of the spring Batkîb (Balkhâb) (see above). Mustawfî specially notes that the road which he is describing passes one farsakh towards the east! from Barzand [q.v.]. Now the river Barzand is the most westerly source of the Bolgaru. At one farsakh (3 miles) east of Barzand and parallel to the latter runs the river Dizâ. The village of Dizâ (“fort”; cf. Olearium: Dizla) is situated near the junction of the two sources of this river (which corresponds to the detail noted by al-Mukaddassi, 378, for Mughân). The identity of the shahristan of Mughân (which is to be distinguished from Mughâkan) = Bâdjarwan seems to fairly seem to confirm the name Bâdjarwan in the local Iranian dialect may mean the “market of Wân”. The upper course of the Bolgaru is now actually called Bâzârçây; and there is a considerable village there called Wân. The name “Bâdjîrewân” is borne by two villages in Russian Tâllah, which perhaps represent colonies from the old town. Mustawfî, 89, deals with the vilâyât of Mughân separately from Arrân. He indicates the extent of Mughân as from the pass of Sang-barsang “which is opposite the tuman Pi$hkin” (now Mîtqân) to the Araxes. The said pass seems to correspond to the pass of Salawat (Tâf-dere) which separates the Kara-su from its right tributary the Sambur (district of Yâfî) along which runs the most westerly road to the Araxes. He mentions five towns of Mughân: 1. Bâdjarwan (see above); 2. Barzand, on the western source of the Bolgaru, where at the present day there are still at least 7 villages called Barzand; 3. Bâlûsawar, called after a Bûyîd amîr (cf. Miskaywî, i, 401), whose name means “great horseman” (cf. in the dialect of Gîlan, pîla ‘great’); Bâlûsawar was situated on the river of Bâdjarwan = (Bolgaru); now Bâlûsawar is the Russian customs-station northwest of the Russian Tâllah; 4. Hamshâhara is an ancient fortress on the Russian Tâllah about 12 miles south-east of Bâlûsawar; 5. Mahmûdâbâd built by the Ilkhan Mahmûd (Ghâzân Khân?) was situated near the sea in the Gawbâri plain. Mustawfî’s itinerary (Bâlûsawar-6 farsakhs—Djû-i naw-6 farsakhs—Mahmûdâbâd) indicates for Djû-îi naw the environs of Kizî-Aghâ, immediately south of the branch of the Araxes which flows into the sea, and for Mahmûdâbâd, the environs of the village of Mahmûdâbâd, about 12 miles south of Lankurân. In the Safatul-as-safa of Tawakkûl b. Bazzak, Bombay 1329/1911, 12, we find a somewhat obscure reference to a Kurdish army which set out from Sindjân, led by a king descended from Ibrahim b. Adham [q.v.] (d. ca. 166/783) and conquered Âdharbaydjan. It was then that the people of Mûghân, Arrân, Aliwan (?) and Darî-Bûm (?) who were all infidels were converted to Islam. There are certain reasons for believing that by the Kurds of Sindjân the author means the Rawwâdî dynasty, representatives of whom reigned in Arrân in the 14th-15th centuries [see MARAGHA, RAWWÂDIDS, TARBEZ]. Bibliography: Djhân-nâmâ, 192 (of little originality); Olearium, Voyages, 1633, book iv, ch. 21 (ed. 1656, 447-51); Shamâkhâ—Djâwâd—Balharu river—Bêqîrwan—Dizle—Aghîz—Sâmîyân—Ar- dibâl, J. Struys, Les voyages, Amsterdam 1720, ch. 27 (ii, 235); itinerary exactly identical with that of Olearium; [J. Lerc, Nachricht von d. zweiten Reise nach Persien (1747), in Bâsching’s Magazin, part x, 367-476: Shamâkhâ—Djâwâd—Bolgaru—Lankurân—anastâr-Râshî; Montchêit, Journal of a tour through Azerbaijan (sic), in JRGS (1834), iii, 28-31: Ardabil—Barzand—Kizîf-ka` (at the confluence of the four rivers which form Balarood = Balharu?) — Kuyular-tapa — Agha-mazar — Jeli-Bolûk — Al-tun [Al-tna]-takht—Alandzur—Bay (wrongly taken for the old Baylakân)—Barbâh—a; Toporov, Magyanskaya steppe, Kusak, calendar, 1864, 242-98; Toporov, in Kusak (1864), no. 28; Grigorović, Uročîštî Belasuwar, in Kusak (1871), no. 32; Dorn, Caspia, St. Petersburg 1875, index; Grigorović, Prosvjeta Persi Adherbajshka i Srabskaya, in Zap. Kauk. Oddel. Imper. Russ. Geogr. Obshc., x/1 (1876), 214: Uğurîdär; Radde, Reisen an der persisch-russischen Grenze, Talsich und seine Bewohner, Leipzig 1866, passim; Belasuwar, etc; Le Strang, etc, Travels, 1975, 230-1; Schwarz, Iran, 1066-94; Hûdud al-islâm, tr.
The "doctrine" of al-Mukanna, so far as one can picture it from the information in the works of heresiographers, was connected with Mazdakism [see MAZDAK] and with the Bātiniyya [g.e.], but it seems to have been rather strange. He claimed divinity, God having created Adam in His image and then become incarnate in Seth, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Muhammad, Ali, Muhammad b. al-Hanafiyya, Abū Muslim and finally, in the best of them all, al-Mukanna. To this anthropomorphism and incarnationism, he added the idea of the transmigration of souls (tandusukh al-arwād [g.e.]). He practised feats of magic in order to impress his followers, who were moreover left at liberty to cast aside the prohibitions of Islam (whence their name of mubayyidah).

The mukarnas, or mukarbas (A.), a term denoting a technique of architectural craftsmanship used in the Mediaeval Muslim West, yielding the Spanish word mocdrabe. According to Dozy and Engelmann, Glossaire des mots espagnols et portugais dérivés de l’arabe, 167-8, and Dozy, Supplément, ii, 324a, cited in J. Corominas, Diccionario critico etnológico, Madrid, 1961, p. 428, the verb karbās (mocdrabe) "is fairly clearly explained by the astralabists. The term mubayyidah would seem to be an Arabic translation of the Persian equivalent sipād djamān."

The "doctrine" of al-Mukanna, so far as one can picture it from the information in the works of heresiographers, was connected with Mazdakism [see MAZDAK] and with the Bātiniyya [g.e.], but it seems to have been rather strange. He claimed divinity, God having created Adam in His image and then becoming incarnate in Seth, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Muhammad, Ali, Muhammad b. al-Hanafiyya, Abū Muslim and finally, in the best of them all, al-Mukanna. To this anthropomorphism and incarnationism, he added the idea of the transmigration of souls (tandusukh al-arwād [g.e.]). He practised feats of magic in order to impress his followers, who were moreover left at liberty to cast aside the prohibitions of Islam (whence their name of mubayyidah).
seven secondary adarajas are obtained with two perpendicular guillillos on the “unity” face, or cut in the normal direction of the proportional face, thereby leaving V2 between them (figs. 20-21). The mukarnas is carved in jesso, brick, wood, marble or stone and was frequently coloured. In glazed ceramic it is characteristic of the earthernware mosaics of the Earthenware mosaics of Western Europe. Grooved ceramic prisms appear in the Kalâ of the Banû Hammâd, perhaps due to Yûsufl al-Mansûr (reigned 481-508/1088-1105), the contemporary of al-‘Udhri, and probably came from the Orient. It appears under the Almorâvids, formed of prisms and proportional cuts on V2: Kubba Barudiyyin of the 5th century fragments of carved and painted stucco niches (576/1180). The Almohads developed it further: mosque of Timmâl (554/1159-4); Kutubiyya mosque at Marrâkûsh (557/1162), Seville mosque (566/1171) and Bandera Pato vault, and the Hâssan mosque minaret (593/1196). The royal chapel of Cordova mosque (565/1268), with mixed arches and vault sections of mukâraba, was perhaps imitating the lost Sevillian Oratory vaults. The Asunción chapel in Madrid and Salamanca, and a little later, 30,000; there were a large number of sââis scattered all through the city for donkeys, since these were the mounts and beasts of burden used by the mass of population, whereas camels and horses were more connected with the Mamlûk military establishment, hence their sââis were concentrated near the Citadel. The Mamlûk development of Western European-oriental decoration is composed of a series of niches embedded within an architectural frame, geometrically connected and forming a three-dimensional composition around a few basic axes of symmetry. It has often been compared with the form of a honeycomb. Its equation with stalactites, generally used in European languages to designate the mukâraba, is still obscure, though it is generally used in European languages to designate the mukâraba, is not quite adequate because the comparison with the geological dripping stone formations is valid only for a certain later type of dripping mukârâs.

Bibliography (in addition to references given in the article): Subki, Mu‘âd-al-nâm, Cairo 1367/1948, 140-1 (the hirer must be careful not to hire beasts out to women bent on immoral purposes); M.A. J. Beg, The Mukhâs: a group of transport workers in Abbasid Middle East, in: Jurnal Pakistan Hist. Soc., xxiii (1975), 143-51.

MUKARNAS (A.), a type of decoration typical for Islamic architecture all over the central and eastern parts of the Muslim world; for its counterpart in the Muslim West, see MUKÂRÂS. The term derives from the Greek xopcovâ (Latin coronis, Eng. cornice), and has no explanation whatsoever in any of the Arabic dictionaries that could be associated with its function in Islamic architecture. It is therefore a popular term, or rather, a mason’s technical term. Mukârâs decoration is composed of a series of niches embedded within an architectural frame, geometrically connected and forming a three-dimensional composition around a few basic axes of symmetry. It has often been compared with the form of a honeycomb. Its equation with stalactites, generally used in European languages to designate the mukâraba, is not quite adequate because the comparison with the geological dripping stone formations is valid only for a certain later type of dripping mukârâs.

The origin of the mukârâs is still obscure, though it is usually attributed to 4th/10th century Eastern Persia. Excavations by the Metropolitan Museum at Nîshâpûr have brought to light 3rd/9th or 4th/10th century fragments of carved and painted stucco niches of mukârâs, which often have been used as specific elements in the boxing of walls and corners in residential architecture. Stucco mukârâs with Sâmârâa style paintings belonging to a bath at Fustat and now in the Islamic Museum of
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Elevation of the mukarnas portal of the Kāshīn/Yaḥbak palace in Cairo (738/1337) by Bourgoin.

Cairo, could also be of the same period. Decorated with motifs showing a female dancer and a seated youth with a cup in hand, they once formed part of a vault or disguised a corner of the bath. If the paintings are to be attributed to the ʿAbbāsid period, i.e. to the 3rd/9th or 4th/10th century, as recent studies suggest, and not to the Fāṭimid period as commonly assumed, these mukarnas would be the earliest example known in Egypt and at the same time among the earliest known of the Muslim world. In that case, Baghdad as the capital of the ʿAbbāsid empire, could well be the place of origin of the mukarnas.

The essential function of the mukarnas is ornamental. It was widely used as a cornice to adorn the edges and disguise the joints of an architectural structure, especially projections. Most of all, it was closely connected with the transition zone of domes especially where the squinch was adopted as transitional device. Rosintal and other mukarnas historians of the early decades of this century have therefore attributed its elaboration and development to Persia, where dome architecture was characterised by the squinch as form of transition from the cubic to the domical section of a building. Being itself an architectural composition of niche-like quarter domes, the unit of the mukarnas which repeats and multiplies on a smaller scale the shape of the squinch would therefore have appealed to the mediaeval architect as a suitable motif for squinch filling and decoration. A parallel development, according to Rosintal, occurred in Seldjuk Anatolia, where the triangular form of the pendentif, adopted there as formula of dome transition, was also repeated in decorative bands to adorn the transitional zones of Anatolian domes. This interpretation, which assigns an architectural and structural origin to the mukarnas, finds less acceptance in more recent literature. It is still not quite clear whether the development of the mukarnas in Persia started from the linear toward the three-dimensional, or the opposite way, or whether it went parallel in both directions. Since the excavations of Nishāpūr, and Pugačenkova’s studies in Eastern Persia, the ornamental rather than structural origin is being favoured. The close association, however, of the mukarnas with dome architecture, articulating the transitional zone, added a new dimension to its decorative role in architecture.

The mukarnas spread in ca. the 5th/11th century all over the Islamic world becoming, like the arabesque and the inscription bands, a characteristic feature of its architecture from Egypt to Central Asia, a fact which led Diez to the idea that mukarnas was not an individual invention whose inventor could be located; rather, it is rooted in Islamic mentality and culture. The device was universally used by Muslim world architects to cover or enhance all kinds of transitional zones on the interior as well as the exterior of buildings, to conceal the joints and create at the same time a fusion of structural with decorative elements, often conveying the illusion that it carries the thrust above it. The mukarnas with its geometrically cut surface, has the quality, like a crystal, of breaking the
light and forming the additional contrasts of light and shade that always have been sought after by Muslim architects and decorators.

In Persia, the mukarnas appeared on the exterior of buildings as two superimposed rows, resulting in a more complicated cell composition (e.g. the tomb tower of Lādjin at Māzandarān (413/1022) and a few years later the minaret of Sangbast). As for its internal use in domes, a trilobe arch, segmented by symmetrical niches, was elaborated to fill the squinch in the transitional zone. As a variation of the trilobe arch, the arch with a polylobed or stepped profile developed: the squinch at the dome of Gulpāygan (498-512/1104-18) includes a stepped arch filled with mukarnas niches, and at the Masjd-i Haydariyya at Kāzvin (first half of the 6th/12th century), such stepped arches, filled with mukarnas, decorate also blind niches. A squinch that includes a trilobed segmented arch characterises the Saljuk dome architecture at the Great Mosque of Iṣfahān (last quarter of the 5th/11th century). Stucco and brick-work mukarnas were followed by plaster covered with faience. This technique produces mukarnas cells totally angular and without curves. Plaster mukarnas were suspended on ropes and glued.

In Egypt, both squinches and pendentives were built with mukarnas. Unless the mukarnas of the Fustāṭ hammām should prove to be ‘Abbāsid, the earliest
extant occurrence of mukarnas in Cairene architecture has so far been attributed to the minaret of al-Djuyûshi, where a cornice of mukarnas (478/1085) adorns the top of the rectangular section of the shaft. It is the only mukarnas on this building, the squinches of whose dome are plain.

With the evolution of domes in Cairo towards more height, the transitional zone expanded and the squinches grew, with the result that the trilobe replaced the plain arch squinch. Although Creswell demonstrates that the evolution of the Cairene mukarnas pendentif and squinch followed a path independent from the Persian one, in Egypt as in Persia, the squinch was segmented, though in a different style. The trilobed was followed by a polylobed or stepped arch profile, segmented into smaller elements, which owing to their symmetrical arrangement, formed niches or cells of mukarnas. Such trilobed squinches carry the domes of Sayyida Rukayya (527/1133) and Yahya al-Shabih (ca. 1150). The dome of the Imam al-Shafi’i, built in 608/1211, has subsequently undergone several restorations that leave doubts about the date of its mukarnas squinches. These, made of wood, have the shape of a stepped arch filled and flanked by mukarnas niches. The dome of Sultan al-Salih Nadîm al-Din, the next in development that is surely dated (648/1250), displays stepped squinch arches included within a ring of mukarnas niches carved all along the transitional zone of the dome, entirely made of wood. Simultaneously, mukarnas was used to decorate all kinds of niches, forming a natural frame for fluted conches, and also to fill façade recesses, like at the al-Akmar mosque (519/1125). On façades, it was made of stone, on prayer niches of stucco or stone and on domes it was of brick or wood, later also carved in stone.

In Cairo, where the triangular pendentif was adopted in Mamlûk architecture long after the squinch had been in use, the pendentives were carved with large trilobe or stepped mukarnas, simulating squinches. The windows in the domes which alternate with the squinches in the octagonal section acquired the same trilobe and stepped profile as the squinch. With the adoption of stone domes, squinches were replaced by triangular pendentives simply carved with linear mukarnas.

All over the central and eastern parts of the Islamic world, mukarnas was applied on minarets, to "carry" the balconies, or lead from the lower thicker to the upper slimmer section. In Dihili, on the Kutb Minâr [q. v.] the balconies project above two rows of stone carved niches. In Cairo, it was traditional that each of three or four rings of mukarnas would display a different pattern. The mukarnas along the façade at the mosque of Sultan Hasan is an architectural tour-de-force, built as a stone cornice boldly protruding from the top of this façade. In Anatolian architecture, mukarnas is often carved on the capitals of columns and as filling of prayer niches. Ottoman mukarnas, made of stone, is often carved with characteristic dripping structures, conical and covered with carvings. Dripping stalactites are frequently in wood and stone. Wall recesses in Spain, North Africa and Egypt, arched or rectangular, are topped with mukarbas or mukarnas. In Spain and North Africa, the soffits of the arches were often adorned with mukarbas; this inspired the architect to develop an arch with scallops that simulate the profile of mukarbas cells. Such arches characterise the mosque of Kutubiyya at Marrakesh (mid-6th/12th century), the mosque of Timmâl (548/1153-4) and the Karawîyyîn mosque at Fez (530/1135-6) and the architecture of Granada. Mukarnas-vaulted arcades were built at Baghêdad at the Kâfa palace (576-622/1180-1225).
In 'Irāk, Syria and Persia, there are a series of 6th/12th century mukarnas domes with a conical shape, which have been compared to sugar-loaves. They have been associated in recent studies with symbolical meanings, such as representing "Domes of Heaven" (Grabar, The Alhambra) or being the physical representation of the Ash'ari vision of the world (Tabbaa, Muqarnas dome). They appear from the outside as a conical heap of quarter-domes which form the exterior or back of the mukarnas cells of which the entirety of the inner dome is composed. Such domes are not truly vaulted, but corbelled. The earliest datable one of such buildings is in 'Irāk, the mausoleum of the Imām al-Dawr near Samarra built before 483/1090-1. In Syria, the mukarnas heaps were in the first stage haphazardly constructed (the Mārīstān of Nūr al-Dīn at Damascus built in 567/1172) (Herzfeld, in Ars Islamica, ix [1942]). Whereas the mukarnas domes whose vaults are visible from outside are brick constructions, there is another type of dome, whose mukarnas are visible only inside and are made of stucco. Among such domes is the dome of Shaykh 'Abd al-Šamad at Natanz [q.v.] (707/1307-8), a masterpiece according to Herzfeld, who considers, however, 'Irāk and not Persia as the place of origin of mukarnas dome architecture. The dome at Natanz, which has an octagonal base and a twelve-pointed star at the summit, is made of suspended plaster glued to an upper vault. The stucco dome of the Two Sisters at the Alhambra (second half of the 8th/14th century) is perhaps the most spectacular mukarba dome; it has the shape of a star composed of smaller mukarbas domes resting on mukarbas squinches and arches, the whole being a cascade of
Natanz, shrine of Shaykh ʿAbd al-Ṣamad, vault (Herzfeld).

carved and plain as well as dripping mukarbas elements. The Alhambra palace displays the largest variety of mukarbas shapes to be found in one place.

In Egypt, mukarnas domes never played a major role; there are only a few examples built in stone, on a relatively small scale, in portal vestibules, the most prominent ones being at Sultan Hasan and the Palace of Yaqḥbak, both from the mid-8th/14th century. Al-Makrizī, describing a palace of Sultan Hasan at the Citadel, writes that it had a one-piece mukarnas, which suggests that it was made of stone (Khitat, 211).

Portal vaults, being built on the principle of a half-dome above a half-cube, also display highly sophisticated forms of mukarnas, with cells developing along multiple axes departing from the portal conch, which rests on mukarnas squinches or pendentives. Persian, Syrian and Egyptian architects excelled in mukarnas portals, in Persia using stucco and faience, whilst in Egypt and Syria using stone as material.


(Doris Behrens-Abouseif)

MUKĀSAMA (A.), lit. “dividing out”, a system of raising the ḥarāb or land tax.

1. In the caliphate. This involved the levy, by agreement, of a percentage or share of the crops, usually taken when these last had ripened. The early sources on law and finance, up to the time of al-Mawardi [q.v.], distinguished it from the system of misdha [q.v.] “measurement” or assessment of a fixed lump sum on the land according to its fertility, location, etc., and from the system of mukda�a [q.v.] which implied a fixed annual sum payable without regard to the variations of prosperity and harvest and often the
The early historians state (cf. al-Tabari, i, 960) that the system of mukāsama goes back in 'Irāk to Sāsānī practice, and that it was the general mode of levying taxation on cereal crops, with the proportion varying from one-third to one-sixth and account being taken of ease of irrigation, soil quality, etc., until the Emperor Kawākh (484-96) attempted a fiscal reform. Indeed, mukāsama must have continued to exist there up to the Arab invasions and into Umayyad times in certain districts, even if misābā became the prevalent mode. The 'Abbāsīd caliph al-Mahdi (158-69/775-85) put into effect a request from the peasantry of 'Irāk to the end of the previous reign of al-Manṣūr that mukāsama be renewed there (al-Baladhurī, Futūḥ, 272); thereafter, all three forms of levy must have continued to exist, but with mukāsama dominant (see Lokkegaard, i, 131-6).

Important information on the systems of taxation in the various parts of the caliphate can be found in the classical Arabic geographers. Thus al-Īstakhrī, 156-7, and Ibn Hawkal, ed. Kramers, 301-3, tr. Kramers and Wiet, i, 296-7, state that part of the revenue of Fārs was raised by mukāsama, this being one of two kinds: (1) when the encampments of nomadic and transhumance Kurds and Lurs (rumīm, sing. ramī; read thus and not rumīm, according to A. Miquel, Ahsan at-tagāṣīm... la meilleure répartition, Damascus 1963, 6 n. 12) had made agreements with the early caliphs, the state treasury received one-tenth, one-quarter or one-third, according to the arrangement; and (2) when villages had passed to the state treasury because of abandonment by their former owners or some other reason, the cultivators paid two-fifths of the crop or any other proportion which had been agreed upon. The mukāsama system certainly continued to be prevalent in 'Irāk and the Iranian lands, for even under the Mongol Khān Ghāzān (694-703/1295-1304) and the subsequent Il-Khānids, much of the khanādghāz was thus raised (I. Petrushevsky, in De Baladhuri, Futūḥ, 86-7, art. 3). A discussion of Ebu Suūd should not be taken at face value; rather, he reasoned that this system is a rather ancient one in Anatolia and the Balkans, although proofs of this are not readily available. It is to be noted that the agrarian kānsūn (O. L. Barkan, XVI. aslarda Osmanlı imperatorluğunda sütun ekonomisinin hukuku ve möle esasları, I. Kanunlar, Istanbul 1943) present a variable picture. Usually the term used is ʿushr, but occasionally both mukāsama and ʿushr are used interchangeably (Barkan, Kanunlar, 326, art. 1). A discussion of Ebū Suūd Efendi's treatment of the term mukāsama may further help to elucidate this problem. Ebū Suūd most forcefully held the opinion that kharadž mukāsama and ʿushr were coterminous with ʿushr and ʿistīʿ resmi (see Budin kanunnamesi ve Osmanlı topkapı mezesi, ed. Sadiç Albayrak, Istanbul 1973, 111 and passim). Moreover, he had in fact issued several fetwās strongly denouncing those using the terms ʿushr and ʿistīʿ resmi, which he considered "a gross mistake of the common people" (Şehitlik Ebussu Efendi fetveleri, ed. M.E. Düzdağ, Istanbul 1972, 839). But it is noteworthy that Barkan was of the opinion that this view of Ebū Suūd should not be taken at face value; rather, he reasoned that Ebū Suūd was in fact trying to reconcile the kānsūn and the ʿartīʿa, so as to make the former system more acceptable to Ottoman kānsū (Barkan, Kanunlar, 347). It stands to reason, however, that new terms were in part new, emanating from new needs, and only in part a continuation of the classical Islamic terms.

MUKĂSAMA

subject of a tax-farming contract (see kharadž, i, ii, and F. Lokkegaard, Islamic taxation in the classic period, Copenhagen 1950, 102 ff.). In effect, the cultivator liable to mukāsama payments was a share-cropper.

Mukāsama was primarily levied on cereal crops such as wheat and barley rather than on fruits and vegetables or date-palms, and seems to have been extracted by the state's agents on the actual threshing floor (cf. Misikawagh, in Eclipse of the Abbāsīd caliphate, i, 62). In fixing the percentage rate, factors like the ease or difficulty of bringing irrigation to the land were taken into account. As in many other areas of Islamic financial terminology, usage was not always precise or valid for all times. The encyclopaedist al-ʿAʼrāzī, [q.v.], Maḥāth al-ʿulūm, 59, defines al-ʿīstān as mukāsama; Lokkegaard, op. cit., 87, points out that, although this is in fact true, ʿīstān properly equals taxa-

The first refers to the fixed amount or land tax may be de-

The land taxation system that evolved under the Islamic terms.

Mukāsama may further be a polite synonym for musādara [q.v., Mafdiḥ al-

The com-

It is noteworthy that for Syria and Palestine in the 10th/16th century we find the first tax under the term of kānsū, not tribe. This was found for example in northern Palestine, and it came to a fifth, sometimes as much as a third, of the produce. It was considered that this was a direct continuation of the old Muslim kharadž mukāsama, well-known to be in vogue also under the Mamluks (B. Lewis, Notes and documents from the Turkish archives, Jerusalem 1952, 16, 52, A. M. Amedroz, Supplement, Glossary, 1250-1900, London 1939, 65-7). The question which is of particular interest in an Ottoman context is whether the tithe and the ʿistīʿ resmi are really to be considered as continuations of kharadž mukāsama and ʿushr. Despite the apparent continuation in the case of Syria and Palestine, it seems that the typical Ottoman land system (theoretical ownership held by the government; actual occupation in the hand of small peasants in lieu of land tax and con-

The combined outcome was obviously strikingly similar to the old Islamic terms. It is not.
MUKASAMA — MUKATIL B. SULAYMAN

Bibliography: In addition to sources cited, see H. Gerber, The social origins of the modern Middle East, Boulder, Col, and London 1987, 55, 195; Horâbîn al-Halâbî, Muğâbâ al-âhâbûr, İstanbul 1309, 89-90; H. İnâlkî, Osmanlı tarihinde fıkûrâtı masalâhât, in Belleten, xxiii (1959), 575-610; M.Z. Pakalm, Osmanlı tarihî devletler ve terimleri, i, İstanbul 1971, 734 ff.; 'Abd al-Rahmân Wefîk, Tektâlî fikraâtî, İstanbul 1328, i, 21-3. (H. Gerber)

MUKÂSHÂFA [see KASHF].

MUKÂTÂBA (v.), the verbal noun of the form III verb kâ'â'a, with the basic meaning "to come to an agreement on the basis of a certain sum". This might be in regard to a peace agreement, sulh, mukâdilen, cf. the Glossarium on al-Balâdhûrî, Fâtîh, 90; or for the collection of a tax, a kâbâl [q.v.] contract; or for the carrying-out of a certain piece of work, cf. al-Khûrâza'mî, Mafdtih al-â'ulum, 70, where a special measure, the azâla, is the basis of a piece-work agreement for the excavation of canals and other irrigation works. In general, see the citations from the sources in Dozy, Supplément, ii, 369, and BGA, Glossarium, 329.

1. In the mediaeval caliphate.

In regard to the taxation system here, mukâda'a was used for the sum handed over by a tax farmer, the mukâdilen for the collection and management of the revenue from a given province or district. The implication from the texts is that this was a permanent arrangement than an ikâsî [q.v.] agreement, when land and its financial yield were handed over for a lengthy, often undefined period, whereas a mukâda'a might be for a fixed period only. By a simple transfer of meaning, mukâda'a could denote "the yield of a source of income derived from a certain agreement", as in Ibn Hâwkal, ed. Kramers, 353, tr. Kramers and Wiet, 346, where the mukîda'a of a customs-post at Khûnâdjoy between Ardâbîl and Rayy, where dues were levied on the transit trade in slaves, beasts and other merchandise between Âdharbâyjân and northern Persia, is specified.

Bibliography (in addition to the references given above): F. Lekkegaard, Islam's taxation in the classic period, Copenhagen 1950, 102-8. (C. E. Bosworth)

2. In the Ottoman empire.

This term denoted tax farm, especially used by the Ottomans in connection with taxation imposed on the traffic in commodities in and out of the empire or at the entry to the big towns. Taxes on trade constituted one of the main sources of revenue for the Ottoman empire as soon as its major inroads into the Balkan Peninsula had turned it into a great power of the eastern Mediterranean. Being a land rather than a sea power, the Ottoman Empire faced a major technical problem of how to tax commerce effectively. The solution which it found was that of the mukâda'a: in large Ottoman towns, public weighing scales were installed and it was proclaimed that it was illegal to trade in any commodity brought into the city unless that commodity was first weighed in the public weighing scales special to it and the proper tax on it paid. Every commodity had a special such basis, and at an early date, the Ottomans started to auction the right to collect each of these taxes to a tax farmer who would undertake to pay to the government a sum agreed upon, no matter how much actual tax was eventually collected. An example may be given of the mukâda'a extant in 11th/17th-century Bursa. One finds here the mukîda'a of the silk-weighing scales, mukâda'a of the grain market, mukâda'a of the wine paid by non-Muslims, mukâda'a of textiles; mukâda'a of dried fruit; mukâda'a of sheep, etc. Other places may have had mukâda'a with other names, clearly according to local peculiarities: Several mukâda'a in Bursa at this time were not administered by way of tax farming, but rather by way of emânî, literally "trust", and ultimately dispensed of by an official for a fixed salary. This was mainly the case of several mukâda'a of an administrative nature, such as the ihtisâb tax farm, a sort of real estate tax imposed on shops, and the mukâda'a of the Bedî al-Mâlî, which had charge of collecting the estates of people dying with no known inheritor. Such mukâda'a were an important basis for the financial structure of the Ottoman empire. It appears that the Ottomans, rather than gathering in all the sums collected by the mukâda'a to the Treasury, used a roundabout way which successfully overcame the lack of banks or an efficient road system. They paid for many of their expenses through the institution of "assignment" (baâdîa), whereby the official in charge of a certain service would come to a mukâda'a-holder and present an "assignment" entitling him to draw a certain sum of money from the revenue of the mukîda'a. The firmân bearing this assignment would then be left inside the safe of the mukîda'a. This system was an ingenious one for a vast and decentralised state like the Ottoman empire, and it thus seems quite clearly that the institution of mukîda'a was one of the most important bases for its financial functioning.


MUKÂTÂBA [see 'ABD].

MUKÂTIL B. SULAYMAN B. BÂSHIR AL-ÂZDI AL-KHÂRÂSAAN AL-BÂRÂQI, Abu '1-Hasan, traditionist and commentator on the Qur'ân, was born in Balkh and lived in Marw, Baghda'd and Ba'sra, where he died in 150/767 at an old age according to some biographers. He is also said to have taught in Mecca, Damascus and Beirut.

Mukâtîl's prestige as a traditionist is not very great; he is reproached with not being accurate with the iânâd. His exegetics enjoys even less confidence. The biographers vie with one another in telling stories which illustrate his mendacity and particularly his professing to know everything. Contempt is poured on his memory by stories of ludicrous questions which were put to him about the most impossible things and to which he either gave fantastic answers or could make no reply. His elaborations of Biblical elements in the Qur'ân and his translation the "People of the Book" heightened his disrepute in later centuries. Overall, his exegetical work is infrequently cited; al-Tabârî [q.v.] makes no use of the work, for example.

The association of Mukâtîl with sectarian Muslim leanings is widespread, as is the accusation of extreme anthropomorphism. He is frequently associated with the Murji'î [q.v.] in theology and the Zaydiyya [q.v.] in politics, but all these attributions are likely further condemnations of his authority on any matter without any necessary historical basis. Certainly, there is little or no evidence for any of these stances in his extant works.

Three texts of Qur'ânic interpretation ascribed to
Mukattil exist and have been published; they are of great significance because of their likely (although not undisputed) early date. Tafsir Mukatil b. Sulayman, ed. 'Abd Allâh Shabâb, Cairo 1970 (5 vols. 1973-78), provides an interpretation of the entire text of the Kur'ân; the work is characterised by its desire to elaborate as fully as possible all the scriptural narrative elements with very little emphasis on issues of text, grammar or the like. It is likely that it presents versions of the stories told by the early khulûs [see kûsh]. Kitâb Tafsir al-khams mi'ah dya min al-Kur'ân al-âlîm, ed. I. Goldfeld, Shâhârâm 1980, organises Kur'ânic verses under legal topics and provides some basic exegesis of them; the content of the book suggests a direct relationship to the larger Tafsîr. The significance of this text lies primarily in its early attempt at a legal classification scheme and the documentation of all the elements on the basis of scripture alone. Al-Âshâb wa l-nazâ'ir fi l-Kur'ân al-âkîm, ed. 'A. M. Shahâta, Cairo 1973, studies Kur'ânic vocabulary by providing the number of meanings or aspects (ma'âsh, usually called muğbîk) of each word and a gloss for each meaning and then by providing the parallel passages or analogues in which the word is used in that sense (nâzâ'îr). An additional text ascribed to Mukatil which deals with exegetical ('constant') themes was included in al-Malati, Kitâb Tafsîr al-Kur'ân al-âkîm l'âlîm l-jâmi'â, ed. Dedering, Istanbul 1936, first noted and published by L. Massignon, Recueil de textes inédits concernant l'histoire de la mystique en pays d'Islam, Paris 1929, 194-210, but its place within the actual œuvre of Mukatil is uncertain.


MUKÂTTA'TÂT (âta) is one of the names given to the mysterious letters placed at the head of 26 sūras of the Kur'ân, see al-kur'ân, d. d.

Under kîtâa, there is a cross-reference to mukattâa'a, with reference to the fragments of or extracts from a prose or verse work made by a compiler or anthologist, but a detailed consideration of these may be found under the heading mukattâa't. Finally, it has been judged useful to reprint the article kîtâa from EI since it is essentially concerned with the use of this term in mathematics. In this connection, reference may also be made to M. Souissi, La langue des mathématiques en arabe, Tunis 1968, 286-9. (Ed.)

AL-MUKÂTTÂM, the eocene limestone plateau that borders the city of Cairo to the east, between Tura and the Nile. In the works of Qâdî 'Abd Allâh al-Ahmâr in the north, the Red Mountain which is near the modern quarter of 'Abbâsiyya. In Islamic tradition, the Mukattâm is considered as a sacred mountain. Before Islam, in Christian tradition, al-Mukattam, like all the desert mountains of Egypt, was associated with monasteries, oratories and caves for meditation and seclusion. 'Abû Sâbîb the Armenian, who wrote in the early 7th/13th century, designates it, perhaps under Muslim influence, as sacred (63).

In al-Makrîzî's Kitab (i, 123 ff.) which brings together most of the traditions and geographers' accounts known at this time, al-Mukattâm is described—following Ibn Hawkal's geography—as starting in China, passing through Farghânâ, Persia, 'Irân and Syria to reach the shore of the Red Sea, where it is interrupted, starting again on the Egyptian shore where its name becomes al-Mukattâm. It borders the Nile up to Nubia in the south, from there it turns westwards via Siqilimâsa down to the Ocean. According to one tradition, the mountain was named after Mukatyât al-Hakim, a saint and alchemist who used to practice in the mountain at the time when Mîsrâyim, the great-grandson of Noah, came to Egypt.

Another tradition which identifies the name Mukattam with that of a son of Mîsrâyim, is reported by 'Abû Sâbîb (loc. cit.) and refuted by al-Makrîzî, who denies the historic authenticity of a person called Mukattam, stating that the name Mukattam derives from kitâma meaning "to cut". It was so-called because the mountain was showing off some vegetation. Ibn Zahîra gives a different interpretation, the hill having been called so because its edges look cut off (191). According to another tradition, the name is not Mukattam but Mukatbat (Kramers, EI, art. al-Mukattam, quoting Tagãl al-urrûs).

Among the legends associated with the sanctity of al-Mukattam, some deal with Moses: God having announced that he would appear to a prophet on a mountain, all mountains grew higher to be chosen by God, except Zion which preferred to decrease its height and thus gained God's preference. As a reward, God ordered all other mountains to give up their vegetation in favour of Zion, which explains why al-Mukattam is bare.

According to early Qur'ân interpretations, al-Mukattam is Moses's mountain, where God spoke to him. The mountain referred to in the Qur'ân as al-Tûr ( sûrã XIX, 52) and the wa'dât muqaddas (XX, 12) should be identified with al-Mukattam (Ibn Mamâtî, 82; al-Makrîzî, i, 124).

Following Ibn Hawkal, several prophets were buried in al-Mukattam, among whom the heads of the tribes of Israel. There is also an al-Mukattam legend associated with Christ, who is said to have told his Mother that this place would one day acquire a cemetery for the people of Muhammad. Such legends must have been produced after the location of the cemetery was chosen.

Al-Mukawkîs [q.v.], the Coptic Patriarch during the Arab conquest, having read in old books about paradise vegetation hidden in the hill, is reported to have asked 'Amr b. al-As to sell him al-Mukattâm for 70,000 dinâr. 'Amr wrote to the Caliph 'Umar b. al-Khattab at Medina asking for advice, to which 'Umar replied that the Believers are the vegetation of Paradise, therefore al-Mukattâm should not be sold but rather dedicated to Muslim burial. Since then it became the cemetery of al-Fustât and later al-Kâhîra. To satisfy the angry al-Mukawâkas, however, 'Amr let him have a piece of land near Birkat al-Habagh to be used as cemetery for the Christians (Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, 156 ff.; al-Makrîzî, loc. cit.)

In Christian times, there was an important monastery on al-Mukattam called al-Kusâyr and
attributed to a Byzantine emperor. There, Khumarawayh, the son of Ahmad b. Tulun, had a belvedere, where he enjoyed sitting to watch the panorama of the city; it was later destroyed by the caliph al-Hakim (al-Makrizi, ii, 502; Abu Sahlîh, 63 f.). Abu Sahlîh speaks of 6,000 monks living in caves of al-Mukattam in the Fâtimid period (66). He also refers to the legend of Noah's descendant (through his son Ham), who learned alchemy from Hermes and made gold from lead and a white golden stone on the mountain of the Mukattam hill. Abu Sahlîh further reports that the place called tannîr was, as the name indicates, the oven where glass was produced from sand. Maqṣûd al-Tannîr is mentioned by al-Makrizî as having been erected on the site of Tannîr Fara'un, a place where in Pharaonic times fire was lit to guide travellers at night. At this place, Yahûdî, brother of Joseph, the Prophet of the Old Testament, was said to have stopped on his way to meet his brothers. For this reason, Ahmad b. Tulûn built a mosque there (al-Makrizî, ii, 455). Under the Fâtimids, a domed mausoleum, which still stands, was erected at the foot of al-Mukattam to commemorate Joseph's brothers (Index of Islamic monuments, no. 301, 6th/12th century; Raghib, Deux monastères). A further report that the place called tannîr was also said to have been a site of the monastery of Kusâyîr (not to be confused with the city on the Red Sea) to confirm the association of the但由于的是，al-Mukattam was a factor of pollution for the city of al-Fustâṭ (al-Makrizî, ii, 399 f.; 'Abd al-Lâlîf, 'Abd al-Lâlîf b. Ahmad, 5) because it prevented the escape of unhealthy vapours emanating from, among others, the multitude of furnaces of steam baths, and which accumulated between the city's high buildings and the hill. Therefore, the healthy residential areas of al-Fustâtat were towards the hill, whereas in al-Kâhirâ they were along the ponds and canals. In this context, a legend attributes Šâlih al-Dîn's choice of al-Mukattam as the location for his Citadel to its fresh and clean environment and the availability of meat, which maintained its freshness for two full days. Within the city, it deteriorated after one day (al-Makrizî, ii, 205).

Al-Mukattam witnessed important building activity during the Middle Ages. There was the Kûbât al-Haua'î [q. v.], as its name indicates a belvedere on the site later occupied by the Citadel, where Ahmad b. Tulûn used to watch the panorama of his city and the palace (al-Makrizî, ii, 202). Mosques and oratories were constantly being built at all times, among others the Lu'â' or 'Pearl', a small oratory of al-Hâkim, ruins of which still stands (Index, no. 515, 406/1016), and the maqâbîd or memorial mosque (Index, no. 304, 478/1085) of Badr al-Dâmâlî, the Armenian vizier of al-Mustânîr. This part of the mountain was later known as Djabal al-Dîuyûshî after the vizier's title Amir al-Dîuyûshî.

With its caves used for meditation and retreat since the remotest past, al-Mukattam was also a place of seclusion for Şûfîs. Shaykh Shâhîn of the Khalwâtî order [see KHALWÂTIYYA] built there a mosque that has survived, although in ruins (Index, no. 212, 945/1538), where he used also to practice alchemy (al-Shârânî, i, 184). The Bektâşi order [q. v.] in the Ottoman period has a tekâye there that existed until modern times. As for the role of al-Mukattam in Cairo's urban development, it has been of some importance. The mediaeval city has always grown northwards, because the Nile to the west and al-Mukattam to the east have prevented an extension on either side, so that the trade routes as well as political factors have always dictated the city's expansion to the north.

al-Mukawkis, the individual who in Arab tradition plays the leading part on the side of the Copts and Greeks at the conquest of Egypt. 'Abbas Mahmud al-'Akkad has written that it is difficult to find an individual as controversial as al-Mukawkis in the whole history of the world (Smar, 92). This might be an overstatement, but one could still subscribe to what A.J. Butler wrote in his classic The Arab conquest of Egypt: "... it was impossible ..., to write about the conquest until one had determined to tradition, al-Mukawkis also sent with his reply to the Prophet many gifts, including two Coptic concubines, Mariya. This would then have given the Arabic form al-Mukawkis. It is in the fragments published by E. Amelineau (365 ff.); KfepoC IlKfelOC (ed. Coquin, 110). Already H. Zotenberg had in his edition and translation of John of Nikiu's Chronicle pointed out that the activities of Cyrus as described by John could be found in the partial translation in Cramer and Bacht, Etude, 103 ff.; Coquin, Livre, 56; and the partial translation in Kramer and Bacht, Der antichalkeonische Aspekt, 329 ff.). The Coptic recension of Livre de la consecration gives KptoC IlKfelOC (ed. Coquin, 110). Already H. Zotenberg had in his edition and translation of John of Nikiu's Chronicle pointed out that the activities of Cyrus as described by John could be found in the partial translation in Cramer and Bacht, Der antichalkeonische Aspekt, 329 ff.). The Coptic recension of Livre de la consecration gives KptoC IlKfelOC (ed. Coquin, 110). Already H. Zotenberg had in his edition and translation of John of Nikiu's Chronicle pointed out that the activities of Cyrus as described by John could be found in the partial translation in Cramer and Bacht, Der antichalkeonische Aspekt, 329 ff.). The Coptic recension of Livre de la consecration gives KptoC IlKfelOC (ed. Coquin, 110). Already H. Zotenberg had in his edition and translation of John of Nikiu's Chronicle pointed out that the activities of Cyrus as described by John could be found in the partial translation in Cramer and Bacht, Der antichalkeonische Aspekt, 329 ff.)
and Shirin/Sirm. This story alludes, in the present writer’s opinion, to another story relating how the Emperor Khusraw II (590-628) had two Christian wives, Shirin, a Monophysite, and Maria, the daughter of the Byzantine Emperor Maurice. Besides this alleged al-Mukawkiš avant le lettre, another apocryphal depiction is also mentioned in connection with his name. In 643 arrived the first Byzantine (Fu-lin) embassy to China sent by the King of Fu-lin, Po-to-li. This Po-to-li was, according to H.H. Schaeder, the Patriarch (Po-to-li = πατριάρχης or πατριαρχὴς of Alexandria, Cyrus, al-Mukawkiš of the Arabic sources, in Abä, G W. Götz, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 3 F., No. 10 [1934], 55-8).

After this excursion, we have to return to the real, historical al-Mukawkiš of the Arabic sources and to consider those facts that support the view that the Arabs originally meant to refer to Cyrus when they wrote of al-Mukawkiš. There are several pieces of what may be called decisive evidence for the identity of these two individuals, although this legend no doubt mixes up the activities of several other persons under the name al-Mukawkiš. As a rule, we can notice that the main features of the activities of al-Mukawkiš as depicted by the Muslim Arab historians correspond to the activities of Cyrus in the Christian (Arabic, Coptic and Ethiopic) sources. Several texts where either both names are used to indicate the same individual or combined to form one name, Cyrus al-Mukawkiš, are of special importance. In the History of the Patriarchs by Severus of Ashmūnayn, the Patriarch and Governor of Heraclius is named both as Cyrus and al-Mukawkiš(2) (ed. Evetts, in PO, i, 489 f.; ed. Seybold, in CSCO, 106; ed. Seybold, in Veröffentl. aus der Hamburger Stadtbibliothek, 98). The Hamburg ms. is of special interest because, besides being the oldest surviving version, it has Mukawkiš at a point where the two other editions have Cyrus. Then we have three different texts where the names Cyrus and al-Mukawkiš are combined to denote one individual. In the so-called Apocalypse of Samuel of Kalamün we have Kabirus (sic) al-Mukawkiš (ed. Ziadeh, in ROC, 377); in Kitāb Ṭakrīs haykal Bīnayūn (sic), a text preserved in both a Coptic and an Arabic version, we can in the incipit recognize the name of Cyrus al-Mukawkiš as the Coptic has correspondingly ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ (ed. R.-G. Coquin, 110); at the Coptic Orthodox Patriarchate in Cairo there is an unedited ms. with the incipit Khabar Kārub al-Mukawkiš... ms. Ta’rīḫ 54, f. 158a; = ms. 611 in Graf, GCAL, i; = ms. 659 in Marcus Simaika Pasha, Catalogue of the Coptic and Arabic manuscripts... of Egypt, ii, Cairo 1942). This last, unedited source does not add anything new to our knowledge concerning al-Mukawkiš. The facts are the same as in other Monophysite sources like Severus’s History or the Synaxar, but this source leaves no doubts concerning the identification of Cyrus with al-Mukawkiš as the adversary and oppressor of the Monophysite Copts and their Patriarch Benjamin. All this, taken together, must place it beyond cavil that Cyrus is the historical al-Mukawkiš of the Arabic sources and to the Arab historians show that they themselves used the name very open-handedly. While keeping in mind that al-Mukawkiš was originally applied to Cyrus, and then after his death also to Benjamin, we may notice that the Arab lexicographers considered al-Mukawkiš to be a title given to the ruler of Egypt (al-Kānūn, TA).

Some words should be said concerning the names given to al-Mukawkiš in the Arabic sources. We encounter three different names, with variations and mixed genealogies: Djūraydī as a personal name, Minā and Kurkub as the father’s name, and the last one also as the grandfather’s name. Now if one accepts the above-mentioned identification of Cyrus with al-Mukawkiš, there is no need to pay any attention to these names. They could be reminiscences of some other individuals included in the term al-Mukawkiš, or, as the present writer believes, expressions of what A. Noth has so strikingly called the Namenmanie of the Arabs (Quellenkritische Studien zu Themen, Formen und Tendenzen fruhislamischer Geschichtsquellen, Teil I: Themen und Formen, Bonn 1973, 115-17).

There is also another, totally legendary figure known in Arabic historical and pseudo-historical writing as al-Mukawkiš. We meet him for the first time in the so-called Pseudo-Wakidi’s work, a tendentious Volkroman that dates from the epoch of the Crusades. There are several Fustāḥ works circulating under al-Wakidi’s name. This one, usually called simply Fustāḥ Miṣr or something corresponding, was already in 1825 edited by H.A. Hamaker as incerti auctoris liber. The real author seems to be a certain Ibn Išāk al-Umawi (cf. ms. Ta’rīḫ Taʾmīr 1058 and 2068 in the Dār al-Kutub, Cairo; lithographed ed., Cairo 1275 A.H.; V. Rosen, Notices sommaires des manuscrits arabes du Musée Asianique, i, St.-Petersburg 1891, 91-2; Brockelmann, S I, 208). The work is completely without value as a historical source. The main reason for mentioning it is that it has met the approval of some orientalists as well as of many Arab writers. Some consider it as the work of the Ibn Išāk, others as that of al-Wakidi. Two historical novels, at least, have been inspired by this Pseudo-Wakidi and have al-Mukawkiš, with his alleged daughter Armanusa, as main characters: Dūrgūṯi Zaydı̇n, Armānūsät al-misrīyya, Cairo 1896, and C. H. Butcher, Armēnos of Egypt, Edinburgh and London 1897.

Biography: Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam, Fustāḥ Miṣr wa-akhkhāhiba, index; Taβarī, i, index; Baladhiṯ, Fustāḥ, index; Eutychius, Annales, ii, 302; Severus of Ashmūnayn (b. al-Mukaffā’s), History of the Patriarchs, ed. C.F. Seybold, in CSCO, ser. iii, tom. i, 106 ff.; ibid., ed. B. Evetts, in PO, i, 489-95; ibid., ed. Seybold in Veröffentlichungen aus der Hamburger Stadtbibliothek, iii, 98 ff.; Abä Sāliḥ, Taʾrīḵ, ed. B.T.A. Evetts in Anecdota Orientalia, Semitic Series, vii, 30/21, 38/100 f., 101/230, 110/244 (cf. Charalambia Coquin, Les edifices chrétiens du Vieux-Caire, i, Bibliographie et topographie historiques, IFAO, Biblioth. et. opt., xi, p. ix, concerning the real author of this History attributed to Abū Sāliḥ); ms. Taʾrīḵ 54 at the Coptic Orthodox Patriarchate in Cairo, fols. 158a-164b; L’Apocalypse de Samuel, supérieur de Deir el-Qalamoun, ed. J. Ziadeh, in ROC, xx (1915-17), 377; Livre de la consécration du Sanctuaire de Benjamîn, ed. R.-G. Coquin, in IFAO, Biblioth. et. opt.,
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just once as a halting place on the Tihama—or lowland—road from Aden to Mecca. Al-Hamdani, Sifa, 74, does not mention just once by de Barros (Asia, Dec, ii, Book vii, ch. 1), but it grew in importance after Aden had been attacked by Albuquerque in 1513 [see ADAN] and after the Ottoman Turks, who considered themselves as successors to the Mamluk spheres of influence, appeared in the Red Sea. Due to their exactions and the two fortresses protecting the roadstead, described by Niebuhr more than two hundred years later, may well date from this period, as well as some fortified places on the road to actual Musa.

During this 10th/16th century, before the arrival of the Europeans, al-Mukha was frequented by merchants from many parts of the Middle East and from India. The Indian merchants sailed thither with the first easterly winds, and left towards the end of the period, as well as some fortified places on the road to actual Musa.

In 1013/1604-5 the Ottoman general Sinan Pasha was governor of al-Mukha. His biography is found in al-Shawkani's Sirat al-Islam, and across al-Mukha.

In 1630 the Zaydi Imam al-Mu'ayyad b. illah Muhammad ibn al-Kasim [q. v.] attacked al-Mukha, where the Ottomans, at least in 1609, kept a garrison. In 1636 they gave over al-Mukha, Zabid and Kamaran by dhow. In 1621 Dutch ships attacked craft at al-Mukha by dhow. In 1630 by a joint Ottoman expedition by land and sea. In 1630 two armed vessels from the factory at al-Mukha (De la Grelaudiere, Relation). A commercial trade was set up, a factory opened, and coffee bushes procured to be planted in Reunion. Offended because their goods were paid for only by remittance of future customs dues, the French bombarded al-Mukha in 1737.

In 1580 William Revett reported that al-Mukha's buildings were very much ruined for want of repairing. Notwithstanding this, the Ottoman customs of the port amounted to £37,500 in 1611. In 1610 Sir Henry Middleton sailed to al-Mukha. He was imprisoned, but escaped and extorted compensation. In 1616 while he was there, a caravan of 1,000 camels arrived. At his return from San'a, he traded profitably in the port. In 1620 he had to leave his goods at Aden, whence they were taken to al-Mukha by dhow. In 1621 Dutch ships attacked craft from India; the Ottomans then took the officials and their stock at the factory at al-Mukha as a reprisal.

The factor, Willem de Milde, died a prisoner. The Dutch then traded from their ships, sometimes going in 1616. While he was there, a caravan of 1,000 camels arrived. At his return from San'a, he traded profitably in the port. In 1620 he had to leave his goods at Aden, whence they were taken to al-Mukha by dhow. In 1621 Dutch ships attacked craft from India; the Ottomans then took the officials and their stock at the factory at al-Mukha as a reprisal. The factor, Willem de Milde, died a prisoner. The Dutch then traded from their ships, sometimes going to Assab for supplies. For the attack of the Dutch against al-Mukha in 1659-60, see Serjeant, The Portuguese, 176.

Coffee is not mentioned in the English East India Company's sale lists until 1660, although by that time the commodity had already become by far the most important export of al-Mukha. The first important cargo of coffee was sent to Holland in 1663. Having been closed off and on, the Dutch factory was opened again in 1708 and the Dutch were given the right to export 600 bales of coffee annually free of duty. But by that time coffee was being grown in Java.

After a private French voyage to the east had been made in 1529, Beaulieu sailed along the south coast of Arabia in 1619-20. Later, Colbert wanted to revive the Red Sea trade with the help of the Ottomans and to have consuls in the ports, but nothing came of his plans. In 1711-13 the French Company's sale lists mention just once by de Barros (Asia, Dec, ii, Book vii, ch. 1), but it grew in importance after Aden had been attacked by Albuquerque in 1513 [see ADAN] and after the Ottoman Turks, who considered themselves as successors to the Mamluk spheres of influence, appeared in the Red Sea. Due to their exactions and the two fortresses protecting the roadstead, described by Niebuhr more than two hundred years later, may well date from this period, as well as some fortified places on the road to actual Musa.

During this 10th/16th century, before the arrival of the Europeans, al-Mukha was frequented by merchants from many parts of the Middle East and from India. The Indian merchants sailed thither with the first easterly winds, and left towards the end of the period, as well as some fortified places on the road to actual Musa.

In 1013/1604-5 the Ottoman general Sinan Pasha was governor of al-Mukha. His biography is found in al-Shawkani's Sirat al-Islam, and across al-Mukha.

In 1630 the Zaydi Imam al-Mu'ayyad b. illah Muhammad ibn al-Kasim [q. v.] attacked al-Mukha, where the Ottomans, at least in 1609, kept a garrison. In 1636 they gave over al-Mukha, Zabid and Kamaran to the Imam. In spite of some interventions of Arab tribes (see below), the port, governed by a dola in the name of the Imam at San'a, was to remain in the hands of the Zaydis until 1849.

The conquest of Hadramawt brought the Zaydis into confrontation with the rising maritime power of 'Uman [q. v.] in 1711. The Imam got rid of the Ottomans by making a truce with 'Uman in 1711-13. The Ottomans evacuated it on terms. In 1713-14 a joint Ottoman and Zaydi attack on the Red Sea coast was made, but the Zaydis were victorious. In 1716 the Zaydis accepted the truce of Aden, which gave them control of the Red Sea coast.

In 1620 the Zaydi Imam al-Mu'ayyad b. illah Muhammad ibn al-Kasim [q. v.] attacked al-Mukha, where the Ottomans, at least in 1609, kept a garrison of only 40 men. The Zaydi troops were expelled by Ottoman gunfire from the roofs and from ships in the harbour. After an Ottoman relief force, sent from Egypt, had deserted, the Tihama was recovered in 1630 by a joint Ottoman expedition by land and sea under Ahmed Kawsakh, but when the Imam invaded it in 1635, the Ottomans evacuated it on terms. In 1636 they gave over al-Mukha, Zabid and Kamaran to the Imam. In spite of some interventions of Arab tribes (see below), the port, governed by a dola in the name of the Imam at San'a, was to remain in the hands of the Zaydis until 1849.

The conquest of Hadramawt brought the Zaydis into confrontation with the rising maritime power of 'Uman [q. v.] in 1711. The Imam got rid of the Ottomans by making a truce with 'Uman in 1711-13. The Ottomans evacuated it on terms. In 1713-14 a joint Ottoman and Zaydi attack on the Red Sea coast was made, but the Zaydis were victorious. In 1716 the Zaydis accepted the truce of Aden, which gave them control of the Red Sea coast.

In 1620 the Zaydi Imam al-Mu'ayyad b. illah Muhammad ibn al-Kasim [q. v.] attacked al-Mukha, where the Ottomans, at least in 1609, kept a garrison of only 40 men. The Zaydi troops were expelled by Ottoman gunfire from the roofs and from ships in the harbour. After an Ottoman relief force, sent from Egypt, had deserted, the Tihama was recovered in 1630 by a joint Ottoman expedition by land and sea under Ahmed Kawsakh, but when the Imam invaded it in 1635, the Ottomans evacuated it on terms. In 1636 they gave over al-Mukha, Zabid and Kamaran to the Imam. In spite of some interventions of Arab tribes (see below), the port, governed by a dola in the name of the Imam at San'a, was to remain in the hands of the Zaydis until 1849.
on the one hand, and the inhabitants of al-Mukhã on the other are described in Serjeant, The Portuguese, 121 ff.; cf. idem, Semt, index.

In 1107/1696-6 Imâm al-Nâşir Muhammad, known as Şâhîb al-Mawâkîb, sent Ibrîhîm Bâshâ to Zayla' [q. v.], the port on the African coast which since 1630 had been dependent upon the governors of al-Mukhã. A large port, a mosque and town wall were built there; slaves were exported to the Yemeni port. Al-Manûsir bîllâh, who proclaimed himself Imâm in 1120/1710, sent a dola to al-Mukhã in order to control the port revenues.

In Niebuhr's days (1763), an English East Indian ship came every second year to load coffee, while the French had not been there for seven years and the Portuguese had since long disappeared. Port taxes were at 10%, but the Europeans paid only 3% and furthermore were permitted to put their goods into their own factories; the remaining 7% had to be paid by the Arab buyers. For coffee export, the Europeans also paid 3% only, and, if loading a big European ship full with coffee, they received a premium of 400 dollars from the dola. Although the Portuguese economic blockade of southern Arabia in the 17th century had caused a decline of the glass industry on the Aden litoral, Niebuhr speaks of the quite recent establishment of a glass-factory at al-Mukhã. His companion Von Hagen died here, and in August 1763 the Danish traveller sailed from al-Mukhã to India.

In 1801 the port was visited by Sir Home Popham, who had been sent to the Red Sea to attempt to revive the once extensive trade between the Yemen and the English East India Company's possessions. Viscount Valentia, casting anchor at al-Mukhã in 1801, saw there only two minarets, the round dome of the main mosque, many lubbâs [q. v.], the palace of the dola and the great serail built by the Ottomans (Voyages, ii, 327). His description, however, shows a town in decay. Date liquor and palm wine, made by Jews, were sold to European sailors, who often misbehaved, even after becoming Muslim (cf. Grohmann, Sudarabien, 1, 102). American ships now also called at the port, high colliers, the round dome of al-Mukhã and the main mosque, many lubbâs [q. v.], the palace of the dola and the great serail built by the Ottomans (Voyages, ii, 327). Niebuhr speaks of the quite recent establishment of a glass-factory at al-Mukhã. His companion Von Hagen died here, and in August 1763 the Danish traveller sailed from al-Mukhã to India.
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In 1801 the port was visited by Sir Home Popham, who had been sent to the Red Sea to attempt to revive the once extensive trade between the Yemen and the English East India Company's possessions. Viscount Valentia, casting anchor at al-Mukhã in 1801, saw there only two minarets, the round dome of the main mosque, many lubbâs [q. v.], the palace of the dola and the great serail built by the Ottomans (Voyages, ii, 327). His description, however, shows a town in decay. Date liquor and palm wine, made by Jews, were sold to European sailors, who often misbehaved, even after becoming Muslim (cf. Grohmann, Sudarabien, 1, 102). American ships now also called at the port, high colliers, the round dome of al-Mukhã and the main mosque, many lubbâs [q. v.], the palace of the dola and the great serail built by the Ottomans (Voyages, ii, 327). Niebuhr speaks of the quite recent establishment of a glass-factory at al-Mukhã. His companion Von Hagen died here, and in August 1763 the Danish traveller sailed from al-Mukhã to India.

MUKHADDIRAT [see AFYON; BANDH].

MUKHADRAM (a.), a term denoting a person who was mentioned as a poet by the author of an earlier work, whether in times of Islam or after. It has been applied in particular to poets, al-mukhadramin constituting the class of pagan poets who died after the proclamation of Islam. The meaning has been extended to poets living in the Umayyad period. There are several monographs by Arabic scholars investigating the influence of Muhammad’s preaching on contemporary poets and studying their political commitments. However, except for occasional allusions to the new religion and the introduction of Islamic subjects into the verses of his followers, e.g. Hassan b. Thabit and Ka'b b. Zahrayr [q.v.], no changes with regard to conventional genres and motifs are recorded. The question has been approached from a different aspect in western research. By analysing early Islamic texts from a literary point of view it has been established that famous mukhadramin, e.g. al-A‘shā Maymūn, Labīd, Abū Ḟūrā‘ayb and al-Ḥuṭayra‘a [q.v.], deviated from tradition in several respects, both on the formal and on the conceptual level, thus introducing some of the innovative features attributed to Umayyad poets. It is to be assumed that these changes in poetic convention are due to the socio-economic factors which favoured the rise of Islam. The following aspects have been noted: (a) structural changes in the polythematic ode; (b) the emergence of ḡazal poetry; (c) individual narrative units, sometimes introduced as similes; (d) a change of attitude towards love and the beloved; and (e) a new experience of time (cf. R. Jacobo, Al-‘Arabīsca Dichtung, in: Grundriss der arabischen Philologie, ii. ed. H. Gätje, Wiesbaden 1987, 28-31).

3. Mukhadrām 1-dawlātayn. The designation is first attested in the title of a lost book by Yahyā b. ‘Ali al-mukhadrām (d. 300/913), K. al-Bahār fi ạṣghār ạṣghār ‘a‘lamu’l-‘ulūm (oh. part.) (a) a change of attitude towards the new religion in the Book of Fihrist (143), where the poets belonging to that group are enumerated, starting with Bāshār b. Būr (q.v.). Parts of the book are preserved in the K. al-Aghnā’i (cf. M. Fleischhammer, Reste zweier Dichterbücher im Kitāb al-Aghnā’, in: Wiss. Zeitschrift der Univ. Halle, xvii [1968], 77-85). The term is used occasionally in the Aghnā‘i, e.g. with regard to Bāshār (ii, 20) or Ibn Mayyā‘a [q.v.], but is not generally accepted for classification. Poets of that period are usually included in the class of the ‘moderns’, as evidenced by the Tabakāt al-‘uṣūrā‘a al-muduqāhān of Ibn al-Mu’tazz [q.v.].

MUKHALLEFAT (A.) "things left behind (at death)", an Ottoman financial-judicial term alluding to the property of deceased officials and of those who were convicted. The Treasury also approved the expenditure of the money for them. All of these estates appeared in the lists of sources of revenue as mukhallefat, things left behind. The movable and immovable goods left behind were recorded in a register known as the mukhallefat deferi by a clerk, mukhallefat me'maru, whose responsibility comprised inscribing these goods and then liquidating them. Mukhallefat aktisi referred to the money accruing from the liquidation. The sub-department of the Ottoman bureaucracy which registered these revenues was called mukhallefat kalem, and the titles of the clerks working in this department was mukhallefat kahtesi.

Bibliography: Seyyid Mustafa Neri, Neta'dg al-unvaka'i, Istanbul 1327, i, 148; TOEM, xix (1911), 70; Gibb and Bowen, i/1, 133, i/2, 28; M. Z. Pakalin, Osmanlilar tarih degiimleri ve terimleri sozlugu, Istanbul 1953, 564-5.

(F. MUGE GOCEK)

AL-MUKHAMMIS [see AL-MUSAMMAT].

MUKHAMMISA (A.), Pentadists is the name applied to a doctrinal current, rather than a specific sect, among the Shi'is. It seems to have been at that time. The doctrine of the Mukhammisa, who regarded themselves as the godhead, a rank attributed by the Mukhammisa to Muhammad, who appeared in only four persons and reduced the number of the imams, was held to correspond to a higher divine pentad where the deity of his followers. The exterior aspect (zdhir) of the imamate and they accepted him. The interior aspect (manas) is Muhammad. The elect of Allah to a mere servant and messenger of the godhead, who appeared in five shapes and forms. Opposed to the Mukhammisa were those who recognised these tahanun (tendsuk). The spirits of the deniers would be transferred in seven human bodies like 'shirts (abmisa)' during seven cycles, each lasting 10,000 years. Ever rising in their gnosis they would, at the end of the great cycle (kaur), reach the level of fully perceiving Muhammad in his luminous nature.

Imami sources further name as a Mukhammis and founder of an extremist doctrine Abu '1-Kasim b. Ahmad al-Kufi, who claimed to be a descendant of the imam Musa al-Kazim [q.v.] and who died in Karmi near Fasa in 352/963. He is described as a distinguished author of Imam! books who in his later life became a ghiy. Al-'Allama al-Hilli defines the doctrine of the Mukhammisa in the context of al-Kif! s vita as implying that the pentad of Salman, al-Mikdad, 'Ammar b. Abü Dharr and 'Amr b. Umayya al-Dami was 'entrusted with the welfare of the world (muwakkalin bi-masahih al-`ilam).' Whether this pentad was held to correspond to a higher divine pentad of the ah! al-kuft? is uncertain. According to al-Nadjiyy, the ghiy' attributed high spiritual stations to al-Kif! Nothing is known, however, about the identity of his followers.

Bibliography: Sa'd b. Abd Allah al-Kummi, al-Makalat wa 'l-firak, ed. M. Djawad Mashkur, Tehran 1963, 56-60; Abu Hätim al-Razi, K. al-Zina, ms. Tehran University, unfol. (the account of Shahrestanî, 134, is based on Abu Hätim al-Razi's but the name Mukhammisa is omitted); Kashshi, Shahrastam, 134, is based on Abu Hätim al-Razi's but the name Mukhammisa is omitted; Kashshi, Bâyâyîr al-ma'rifat al-nilgât, ed. Mahdi Radjâ'i, Kunuz al-`ulamâ wa 'l-sa`âdât, Tehran 1974, 701-2; Heilslehre der fruhen Ismd^iliya, Wiesbaden 1978, 157-62; idem, Das Buch der Schatten, in Ist., lv (1978), 229-60, lviii (1981), 15-86; idem, Die islamische

(W. M. Pols)  

MUKRÀDJA (A.), together with its synonyms mukana, munkada, and mukhdama, connotes the idea of the division of various objects done in various ways amongst two or more persons; but the word mukhdtara by itself and the other terms followed by the expression bi ʿl-asabi** amongst two or more persons; but the word mukhdama, conveys the idea of used to designate the beneficiary of some disputed two players. This procedure is a game of chance, and micatio, This game is played all around the shores of the Mediterranean, and also in Arabia and ‘Irāk, and consists of two players, facing each other, and, at a signal given by one of them, they simulta- neously put up the right hand, with one or more fingers bent back and the rest raised, whilst at the same time announcing together a number less than ten; the winner is the one who guesses the exact number represented by the outstretched fingers of the two players. This procedure is a game of chance, and in principle Islam forbids it, especially as it is often used simply as a way of the beneficiary of some disputed object, to divide up a sum of money, to provide the reply to a wager, etc.

Bibliography: The Arabic dictionaries do not give any precise details about the mode of playing mukhardja and merely give synonyms for the term. A description of the game in question is given in the article ‘Ukd al Fr. A. M. de Saint-Elie al-Karmali, in Māraq, iii (1900), 123; see also J. G. Lemoine. Les anciens procédés de calcul sur les doigts en Orient et en Occident, in REI, 1932/1, 7-8. (Ed.)

MUKHARIDA, ‘Abu ‘l-Muḥanna MUKHARIDA B. YAHYA B. NAWWS, one of the greatest singers of the early ‘Abbāsids.

He belonged to Madina (although some say to Shūfa) and was the son of a butcher. ʿAtika bint Shūfa, a famous singer and lutenist, whose slave he was, noticed that he possessed a good voice, and taught him singing. By her he was sold to Ibrahim al-Barmakī after his failure to secure the caliphate, he said “Were Ibrahim fit to reign, the empire had devolved by right to Mukharik, Zāzal and Mārik (= Ibn al-Mārīkī), the court musicians. These lines alone show the eminence to which the great artist had arrived during this period. Ibn al-Taghrībīrī said that whilst Ibrahim al-Mawṣilī and his son Ishāk sang well to the accompaniment of the lute, in pure vocal work Mukharik outshine them both. The best testimony comes from al-Fārābī (d. 339/950) who only mentions two musicians of the ‘Abbāsid period, Ishāk al-Mawṣilī and Mukharik. Among his best known pupils were Ibrāhīm b. Abī ‘l-ʿĀla and Hamdūn b. Ishāk b. Dāwūd al-Kātib, the begetter of a family of good musicians.

Bibliography: Kitāb al-Aghānī, ed. Balākī, xxi, 220-1, and Guidi’s Index; Ibn ‘Abd Rabbīh, al-Ḥād al-fardī, ed. Cairo, 1887-8, iii, 190; Ibn Khalīkīn, tr. of Slane, i, 18, 205 (wrong kunya); Kosegarten, Lib. cant., 30 (wrong kunya); Farmer, Hist. of Arabian music, 148; D’Erlanger, La musique arabe, p. 12. (H.G. Farmer)  

MUKHÂTARA (A.), a term—familiar in medi-eval European mercantile circles in its Latin garb mohatra—technically used to denote a legal device, or stratagem (hiya [q.v.]), having as its purpose the circumvention of that established rule of substantive Islamic law which prohibits any form of interest on a capital loan. The device, also commonly termed ‘ina or bay‘al-sina, “sale on credit”—and, by way of euphemism, mu‘amala, “transaction”—is a form of bay‘a, “two sales in one”, or “a double sale”, aimed at masking the reality of a usurious transac- tion behind two perfectly valid and, to all appearances, discrete transactions. In simple general terms it was calculated to provide a legal means of effecting an illegal purpose.

The practical application of mukhâtara may be illustrated by a straightforward example. A prospec-tive lender, L, agrees to make a prospective borrower, B, a loan of, say 1,000 dinars for a period of 12 months at a rate of interest of 25 per cent. B will then first sell to L some object of which he is the lawful owner for 1,000 d., immediately payable in cash. This forms the subject of one contract of sale. In a second and immediately ensuing contract of sale B will buy back from L the same object of which he was the lawful owner for 1,000 d., payable in 12 months’ time. Since deferred pay-ment is permissible under the provisions of Shārī‘a
law, B places himself under an enforceable obligation
to pay L the last-mentioned sum upon the expiry of
the specified period. As will be clear, the difference
between the two figures represents interest on a capital loan. The difference
between the two forms of double sale will be seen to
amount to the difference between a secured loan and an
unsecured loan.

Mukhtara, a practice as old, at the very least, as
Mâlik b. Anas (d. 179/796 [q.v.]), is known to have
been prevalent in Medina.

Bibliography: J. Schacht, An introduction to
Islamic law, Oxford 1964, 78 f., 153, 241 f. (bibliography
including primary as well as secondary sources), 301; N.J. Coulson, A history of Islamic law,
Edinburgh 1964, 139; idem, Conflicts and tensions in
(J.D. Latham)

Mukhattam (a.), a term frequently appended to
mediaeval Islamic textiles, from silks to woollen
cloth forming quadrangular compartments, i.e.
checks (Dozy, Supplément, i, 352). Such cloths seem to
have been woven almost everywhere in the Islamic
lands; see R.B. Serjeant, Islamic textiles, material for a
history up to the Mongol conquest, Beirut 1972, index s.v.
(En.)

Mukhtar (a.), literally ‘chosen person’. In
the late Ottoman Empire and some of its successor
states, the term mukhtar refers to the headman of a
quarter (mahalle) or village. The first mukhtars were
appointed in 1245/1829-30, exclusively for Istanbul and its “three towns” or suburbs, Üsküdar, Galata, and
Eyübi. Each quarter had a first and a second
mukhtar. As recorded by the official historiographer,
Ahmed Lutfi, this was done in connection with a
counting and registration of the male population of the
city (Der Şadetle Bilâd-i Külteh-i Qâbiqür
İstebâ-i sadûl ve defter edilerek... her mahalleye... ikiser nefer
ömekûr alıncısı, ta’sînî kölmemêhûrûn). At this point, the mukhtars’
role lay primarily in controlling the migration into the
city of lone males or “bachelors” (bi-kâr), many of
whom had wives and children in the provinces but
were impelled towards the city because of being “with-
out work” (bi-kâr in the literal sense; Lutfi, Ta’vîkî, ii, 172-3). The appointment of mukhtars has been interpreted
as a centralising and secularising measure,
aimed at restricting the role of the “ulama” in
administration (Lewis, Emergence, 394-5); Lutfi
(Ta’vîkî, ii, 173) does indicate that the imams had
neglected the population control matters that the
mukhtars were to take in charge. An alternative inter-
pretation links the introduction of mukhtars to the
abolition in 1826 of the Janissaries [see Nahişet],
who had previously held much of the responsibility
for maintaining law and order in the capital (Ortayh,
Yönêtim, 101).

The appointment of mukhtars in the provinces began in
the Anatolian sanjak of Kastamonu in 1249/1833,
when the people of Taşköprü kâdî complained about
the excessive tax demands to the sanjak’s top administrative official (mütesellim), Dedê
Mutafa Ağha. He suppressed a revolt by the notable
in question and then introduced the system of mukhtars
as found at Istanbul. Although Lutfi Efendi says that
the mukhtars at Istanbul were appointed (ta’sînî kölmemêhûrûn). About the same time, the Kastamonu
mukhtar suggests—elected by the populace of each
quarter. When news of this innovation reached Sultan
Mahmîd II (1808-39 [q.v.]), he approved and
ordered the implementation of the same measures in the
other kada’s and villages of Anatolia and Rumelia.
In a number of Anatolian provinces, this was done in
1833, although there were delays in some places (Çadirci, Muhtârîk, 410-12). Until the enactment of
the law of 1281/1864 on provincial administration,
hence, villages and quarters inhabited by non-
muslims continued to be administered by their
religious leaders acting together with the leading men
(kołabagh) of the community (Ortayh, Yönêtim, 102).

The circumstances of its implementation at
Kastamonu illustrate how the system of mukhtars coinci-
cided with Mahmîd II’s efforts to eliminate the local
notables and centralise administration. There, every
mukhtar was required to keep a list of all people of his quarter; the imam was required to do likewise for the
mukhtar, as were the leading personalities of each province (ta’sînî-i wekilêviyê) for one another. Those elected mukhtars were to be registered in the kadi’s register, with notice to the higher-level authorities responsible for the district; they had to be soluble in
the defter nizîrê, who was supposed to have been appointed in each sandjak following the census of 1831, and the
defter nizîrê in Istanbul, who was supposed to submit
the names to the sultan. The mukhtars were to receive
seals from the Mint (Darkhâmê). In the interests of order, the mukhtars were to question the intentions and
examine the internal passports (mîrûr ta’sêlkerêleri; Pakalan, OTD, ii, 583) of strangers who came into
their quarters or villages, turn away any whose papers
were not in order, help legitimate migrants find housing,
see that someone from the quarter stood surety (kefil) for the newcomer, and record his name in the quarter’s register. Anyone from the quarter or village who wanted to go elsewhere was supposed to get a sealed pass (mukhtarî pasuêla) from the mukhtar, identifying the holder and stating where he or she wanted to go and why; the recipient would then have to take the seal to the defter nizîrê to get a mîrûr ûmgêrêsi. The mukhtar was to record births, deaths, and
movements into or out of his district day by day and keep the defter nizîrê informed of them. The mukhtar had to attend the şarîa court to take part in inheritance
cases, help prepare semi-annual expense records and
 collaborate with the imam in the apportionment of tax
obligations. When any resident of his quarter or village suffered wrong, the mukhtar was to take the
matter up with the appropriate authorities, thus serv-
ing as the first link between the populace and the
government (Çadirci, Muhtârîk, 413-15).

Inadequate to solve the problems that had caused
the breakdown of order in the countryside or to
reverse the influx of the unemployed into Istanbul
(Ortayh, Yönêtim, 103), the system of mukhtars nonetheless persisted with remarkable continuity, sur-
viving under the Turkish republic and some of the
Arab successor states. Administrative acts of late
Ottoman times chart stages in this history. During the
attempt of ca. 1838-40 to replace tax farming with
direct collection of revenues, for example, village
mukhtars were listed among the members of the coun-
cils (mejlîs) that the tax collectors (muhasîbî [q.v.]) were supposed to appoint (Zornrumpf, Territorialver-
saltung, 41; Kaynar, 239). About the same time, mukhtars and council members were assigned salaries;
these could not be maintained and soon lapsed (Ortayi, Yönetim, 103).

Several decades later the provincial administration laws of DJumâda II 1281/November 1864 (arts. 5, 54-66) and Şawwâl 1287/January 1871 (arts. 59-60, 107-11) laid the bases on which the system of mukhtar continued for the next century and more (Kornrumpf, Territorialsverwaltung, 76, 81, 111-2; Dîstür, first series, i, 608-51; Young, Corps, i, 36-69; Baer, Fellaâ, 109-10, 131). The 1864 law provided that in each village, every "class of people" (shîfi'a kullı, art. 54) was to elect two mukhtar, or one for a community of fewer than twenty households; the kâ'im-makäm of the kadâ would then formally appoint these mukhtar to their offices. The context of the law, and general Ottoman practice, indicates that "class" (şifî) meant the different religious classifications of the populace; later, in some locales the same term effectively meant the larger kinship groups. In towns, every quarter (mahâlet) with at least fifty households should have the same institutions as a village.

An important innovation in 1864 was the formation of a council of elders (ilkhârî mezâligî) for each religious community of the village, with the religious leader as a member ex officio. The mukhtar's responsibilities included revenue collection, public works, supervision of the village constable (hekî) and watchman (korîcî), announcement of laws and regulations communicated to him from higher echelons, reporting births and deaths and assisting the court in inheritance cases. The council's duties included apportioning and collecting the taxes that fell to their communities, maintaining the cleanliness of the village, arbitration of disputes, selection of village constables, building schools and taking measures to promote agriculture and commerce. The council had the right to monitor the mukhtar and, in the event of abuse, to request the kâ-im-makâm of the kadâ to dismiss him. Mukhtar and council members were to be elected once a year; only Ottoman subjects who had reached specific ages and paid set amounts in tax were eligible. Experience showed that the mukhtars and councils seldom realized all these goals. The biggest problem was that the councils were part of the system of taxation; officials of the state had the right to import duties, and officials of the state exercised their own authority in order to raise revenue. In addition, the villagers' difficulties in meeting their public works needs resulted in their continual appeals to the central government to solve these problems (Ortayi, Yönetim, 107-8).

The provincial administration law of 17 Rabî' II 1331/March 1913 annulled the provincial administration laws of 1281/1864 and 1287/1871 and, by making no provision for villages or urban quarters, implicitly abolished the mukhtar; however, other acts continued to refer to them and expand their functions (Dîstür, second series, V, 186-216; Siddik Tümenkan, Belediyeler, 372-3). Under the Turkish republic, the "village law" (kây kanunu) of 8 March 1924 again specified administration by an elected mukhtar and council of elders (Szyliowicz, Political change, 36-49). A law of 10 June 1933 did abolish mukhtar and councils of elders within municipalities (belediyeler). The difficulties that resulted from this change led to restoration of mukhtar and councils in the quarters of cities and towns by a law of 5 April 1944 (Tümenkan, 373-6).

A century after the Ottoman vilayet laws of 1864 and 1871, then, elected mukhtar and councils still formed the lowest link, for both villages and urban quarters, between local and central government in Turkey (Batatu, Social classes, 196). In more recent times, loss in the mukhtar's relative prominence seems to correlate with the decline of traditional kinship-based structures of social dominance within the village, growth in villagers' access to opportunities outside the village and the increasingly burdensome workload expected of the mukhtar (Baer, Fellaâ, 140-1).

In Egypt, the figures most nearly comparable to the mukhtar is the umda [q.v.]; however, the role of the latter varies in ways reflecting differences in the history and ecology of the Nile valley (Baer, Fellaâ, 134-5).

Bibliography: Ahmed Lutfi, Tuğrâî-i Lutfî, ii, Istanbul 1862; R. Scendedo, in: Dodd, Democracy, 81, 126). The functions expected of the mukhtar illustrated the dif-

ficuity of this dual role. He was supposed to announce and carry out Ankara's laws and policies; collect the village's taxes, to render monthly accounts to the council; arbitrate disputes; report suspected criminals, deserters and suspicious persons; co-operate with tax-collectors and other officials who came to the village; register vital statistics; report outbreaks of infectious disease; assemble military conscripts; supervise projects decided on by the council, mobilizing the compulsory labour (imtiar) that the law required of the villagers to carry out the projects; and travel to higher administrative headquarters for consultation when summoned. Manipulation of the office of village mukhtar by powerful, oppressive local figures—or alternatively its relegation to weak men who were powerless in the face of such tyrants—did not help to fulfill this complicated programme (Szyliowicz, Political change, 44-7; Ibrahim Yasa, Haçanoplan, 148-63). The mukhtar's problems were also compounded in villages where there was no imâm or schoolteacher to provide part-time clerical assistance (Dodd, Politics and government, 264-5). Under the republic, Turkish mukhtar again received compensation from the village budget; various forms of compensation for mukhtars were also noted in mandatory Palestine and in independent Syria and 'Irâk (Baer, Fellaâ, 134-5).

Mukhtar and councils thus also survived in some of the empire's Arab successor states. This was true in Syria, both under the French mandate and at least to the 1950s (Khoury, Syria, 192-3, 213, 217, 293-4; Baer, Fellaâ, 134, citing Khallî, al-Tanzîm al-idârî, 139). Jordan's legislation of the 1950s on mukhtar and village councils echoed features of the Ottoman system, while adding new functions (Antoun, Low-key politics, 103-4). In Palestine, the mukhtar tended to represent the large clans (hâmâlû), rather than religious communities. There, too, however, a variant situation might appear, where the influential residents would dominate the village from behind the scenes, while a nonentity or front man would hold the office (Baer, Fellaâ, 137-41). Everywhere, some mukhtar's chief interest lay in using the powers of the office for personal gain at the expense of the municipality.

Wherever found, the mukhtar's history appears to have been part of a long-term trend that tended over two centuries to erode the influence of local leadership figures while increasing that of the central government. Not only had this been the original reason for transplanting the office of mukhtar from Istanbul to Anatolia in 1249/1833, in order to supplant the local a'în [q.v.], but a parallel effect appeared in the later introduction of mukhtar into Palestinian districts that had been dominated, up to that point, by shaykh al-nâbiya. This phenomenon perhaps explains the unfavourable comparisons sometimes drawn between shaykh and mukhtar (Baer, Fellaâ, 131-4; Batatu, Social classes, 196). In more recent times, loss in the mukhtar's relative prominence seems to correlate with the decline of traditional kinship-based structures of social dominance within the village, growth in villagers' access to opportunities outside the village and the increasingly burdensome workload expected of the mukhtar (Baer, Fellaâ, 140-1).

In Egypt, the figures most nearly comparable to the mukhtar is the umda [q.v.]; however, the role of the latter varies in ways reflecting differences in the history and ecology of the Nile valley (Baer, Fellaâ, 134-5).

AL-MUKHTAR B. ABI ʿUBAYD, al-Thakafi, leader of a pro-ʿĀlid movement which controlled al-ʿUkāfa in 66/6785-7. He claimed to be acting as the representative of the son of ʿAli, Muhammad b. al-Hanafiyah [q.v.], and his movement is often classified as an early manifestation of extremist ʿShi‘ism. This article, which draws mainly on the detailed narratives given by al-Ṭabarî, al-Baladhurî and Ibn ʿAbd Allâh al-Kufi, concentrates on his life and involvement in the events of his time. For further discussion of the importance of al-Mukhtar’s movement in the development of Muslim sectarianism, see KAYSANIYYA and ʿKHĀSHABIYYA.

He is reported as being descended from the Thakafi clan of ʿĀfil b. Kaši, one of the ʿAbālī Ṭhakīfī, and is said to have been born in A. D. 622. In 46/660-1, however, he is referred to as a “young man” (ʾaqilīm ʿaḥīb) and it was suggested by Levi Della Vida that the birth year has been supplied by tradition to provide a parallel with that of his adversary ʿAbd Allâh b. al-Zubayr [q.v.]. Al-Mukhtar’s father having been killed at the battle of the Bridge [see gūr] in 13/634 in the early stages of the Arab advance into the Ṣaḥāri empire, he was brought up by his uncle Saʿd b. ʿAbd Allâh, who became governor of al-Ṭalâbān under the caliph ʿAllī.

Upon the death of ʿAli and Muḥādiyya’s entry into al-ʿUkāfa (40/660-1), it is reported, al-Mukhtar suggested to his uncle that he convey favour with the new authority, and thereby obtain security for himself, by handing over ʿAli’s son al-Ḥasan who had been wounded near al-Ṭalâbān and had taken refuge in the house of the governor there. This is said to lie behind the suspicion and hostility which many of the ʿShī‘a felt towards him and his leadership. In 717-2, ʿAbd Allâh al-Mukhtar was regarded as an ʿUthmānī [see al-ʿUthmānīyya] by the ʿShī‘a. It could be that this story reflects al-Mukhtar’s subsequently proclaimed support for Ibn al-Hanafiyah and the hostility towards him felt by the supporters of the ʿĀlid b. Fātimah. It may be noted that, although he himself is not generally portrayed as hostile to the ʿFātimid line of descent (revenge for al-Husayn is said to have been at the centre of his propaganda), some of the sects associated with him regarded ʿAlī-ṣṣ and al-Ḥusayn as usurpers of the rights of ʿAbd Allâh b. al-Hanafiyah [see KAYSANIYYA].

Although al-Mukhtar’s subsequent opposition to Umayyad rule was eventually rewarded by his refusal to testify to Ziyād b. ʿAbīh against Ḥudjir b. ʿAbd Allâh [q.v.] in 51/661 and by that of his role in connection with the rising of Muslim b. ʿAṣîl [q.v.] in 61/660, he was criticised by the supporters of the ʿAlīids for his weak behaviour in the affair of Muslims. We are told that Muslims, who had come to al-ʿUkāfa to prepare the way for the appearance there of al-Ḥusayn, stayed in al-Mukhtar’s house and the latter attempted to mobilise support for him. At the critical time, however, al-Mukhtar was away on his estate at Khurṣiyya, failed to proclaim his support for Muslims, and tamely submitted to the Umayyad authorities. This apparently supine behaviour may perhaps be explained by the fact that Muslim had come out in revolt earlier than had previously been agreed upon and it may be that he was dissatisfied with the Umayyad governor’s reported behaviour towards al-Mukhtar after he had submitted to him. In spite of his denial of any involvement with Muslims, and of the intercession of a number of influential men, al-Mukhtar is said to have been imprisoned and wounded in the eye by a blow from the enwrapped governor, ʿAbd Allâh b. Ziyād.

Kept in prison until after the death of al-Ḥusayn at Karbalâ (10 Muharram 61/10 October 680), he is said to have been released through the intervention of his brother-in-law, ʿAbd Allâh b. ʿUmar, who persuaded the caliph Yazīd I to order Ibn Ziyad to let him go. Thereupon he left for the Ḥijdâz, where ʿAbd Allâh b. al-Zubayr, in Mecca, was publicly proclaiming his opposition to Yazīd’s caliphate. Al-Mukhtar is said to have offered to give the ṣab’a to Ibn al-Zubayr in exchange for a prominent position in his movement, but Ibn al-Zubayr insisted that he would only accept the ṣab’a from him on the same terms as he was taking it from others. At one point al-Mukhtar is reported to have left Mecca and stayed for several months in al-Tâ’if, before returning and participating alongside Ibn al-Zubayr and others in the defence of Mecca against the Syrian army commanded by al-Ḥusayn b. Numayr [q.v.]. He is said to have fought bravely and prominently. After this he returned to al-ʿUkāfa, of his own volition and intending to exploit the unsettled situation there, according to the detailed account reported from Abû Miṣkhiḥa. There are, nevertheless, occasional indications that al-Mukhtar might have tried to make it appear that he was cooperating with Ibn al-Zubayr, and al-Maṣ’udī even reports that he was sent to al-ʿUkāfa by Ibn al-Zubayr as his governor. That seems unlikely, but it is conceivable that al-Mukhtar would have tried to win support from as many quarters as possible and for as long as possible, narrowing his options only when necessary.

Al-ʿUkāfa at this time (Ramaḍān 64/April-May 684) was the scene of the movement of the Tawwâḇûn [q.v.] led by Sulaymān b. ʿUṣāf, and Abû Miṣkhiḥa’s account tells us that al-Mukhtar began to compete with Ibn al-Zubayr for the leadership of the pro-ʿĀlid party there. He claimed that he had been sent by the ʿImām al-mahdi, he disparaged Ibn ʿUṣāf as lacking in military and political acumen, and he appealed for
support as the one most likely to achieve success. The town was under the dual authority of 'Abd Allah b. Yazid al-Khāsimi and Ibrāhīm b. Muhammad b. Tāliba, both acting on behalf of Ibn al-Zubayr. Al-Mukhtar was only moderately successful in his propaganda and the majority of the 'Alid supporters still backed Ibn Ṣurad, although the latter blamed Al-Mukhtar when much of the support he had been promised failed to materialise. Some of the aṣḥāf, nevertheless, are said to have seen al-Mukhtar as a greater threat than the Tawwādbūn and they denounced him to the two governors. Again he was arrested and imprisoned, although al-Khāsimi is shown as quite sympathetic to him.

It is possible that there is some confusion or duplication of the tradition here, for once again we are told that al-Mukhtar owed his release to 'Abd Allah b. 'Umar, who wrote to the two amin and persuaded them to let him go. While he was still in prison, however, the remnants of the defeated Tawwādbūn returned to al-Kūfa from 'Ayn al-Wardā (late 65/ spring 685?), and he is reported to have contacted them and won their support. Evidently his imprisonment was something less than rigorous, for we are told that he was constantly visited by his supporters and could even afford to turn down their offer to release him. His eventual release, on the intercession of Ibn 'Umar, was conditional upon his taking an oath that he had no hostile intentions against the authorities, but he is shown as taking this oath in a cynical manner—"if the greater good demanded that he break his oath, he would do so and perform kaffāra" [q.v.].

Ibn al-Zubayr replaced 'Abd Allah b. Yazid and Ibrāhīm b. Muhammad over al-Kūfa and sent 'Abd Allah b. Mu'ti in their stead. His arrival in the town is dated Ramadan 65/ May 658. Opposition to Ibn Mu'ti on the part of some of the tribal notables was manifested on the occasion of his introductory khutba, when his favourable references to Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmān were met with demands that he follow the siwa of 'Ali, and support for al-Mukhtar continued to grow. In what again may be a confusion or duplication of the tradition, we are told once more that he was constantly visited by his supporters and could even afford to turn down their offer to release him. His eventual release, on the intercession of Ibn 'Umar, was conditional upon his taking an oath that he had no hostile intentions against the authorities, but he is shown as taking this oath in a cynical manner—"if the greater good demanded that he break his oath, he would do so and perform kaffāra" [q.v.].

Although they are rarely referred to explicitly or by name in the accounts of the fighting, it seems that al-Mukhtar's forces included a significant number of the Hamdānī leader Ibrāhīm Ibn al-Aṣhtār al-Nakhaqī [q.v.]. The reports about this again indicate a certain amount of duplicity on al-Mukhtar's part and, again, a recognition of this by the person being duped who, nevertheless, eventually threw his support behind the trickster. A key role in influencing Ibn al-Aṣhtār is ascribed to a letter purporting to have been sent to him from Ibn al-Hanafiyya but really written by al-Mukhtar himself. A number of al-Mukhtar's leading supporters testified on oath to the authenticity of the letter, but 'Āmir al-Shābī, who is cited by Abū Mīkhnaf for this episode, did not testify. Ibn al-Aṣhtār himself understood what was going on, but, nevertheless, did not prevent him from giving his allegiance to al-Mukhtar.

The revolt had originally been planned for Muharram 66/August 685. This was then changed to 14 Rabi' 1 66/19 October 685, but it seems to have been precipitated a day earlier by an incident in which Ibn al-Aṣhtār killed the chief of Ibn Mu'ti'sṣurtā, Iyās b. Muḍārīb. The battle cry of al-Mukhtar and his men is given as "Vengeance for al-Husayn!" and ya Manṣūr amīr! This last phrase was subsequently to be used by the Ḥāshimīyya at the end of the Umayyad period. Ibn al-Aṣhtār led the fighting on behalf of al-Mukhtar, while prominent among Ibn Mu'ti's command was Shabath b. Rib'ī of Tamīm and Rāshīd b. Iyās b. Muḍārīb of Bakr. The death of the latter in the fighting seems to have marked a turning point. The names given of those involved in the fighting on both sides are always invariably of leading Arabs. The names given of those involved in the fighting on both sides are always invariably of leading Arabs. Some of the aṣḥāf remained loyal to Ibn Mu'ti while others supported al-Mukhtar. The opposition to Ibn Mu'ti from some of the Kūfān aṣḥāf is expressed in their statements of loyalty to the memory of 'Ali and their demands of vengeance for al-Husayn, but it is open to question whether their revolt was primarily a pro-'Ālid movement. The version of the Abū Mīkhnaf tradition which appears in Ibn Aṭṭāram al-Kūfī does tend to portray it in that way, but al-Tabarī's version of that tradition seems more ambiguous. It may be that the emphasis on support for Ibn al-Hanafiyya became more pronounced after the defeat of Ibn Mu'ti but that the tradition anticipates this development. An economic interest is hinted at when Ibn Mu'ti promised not to collect the surplus fay [q.v.], a tax which had been levied by the 'Abābas (i.e., the Arab warriors') consent, but it may be that resentment about this had already developed to such an extent that it could not easily be defused.

Al-Mukhtar is shown as conducting his propaganda in a type of rhyming prose which is grandiloquent and obscure at the same time and is, presumably, intended to convey a claim to some sort of inspiration. Some of the concepts which he used, such as that of the mahrāt [q.v.], which were to become so important in pro-'Ālid movements, also occur in the propaganda of the Tawwādbūn, but they seem to receive more prominence and to be developed further in Mukhtar's movement [see Al-Mahdī].

Although they are rarely referred to explicitly or by name in the accounts of the fighting, it seems that al-Mukhtar's forces included a significant number of non-Arab mawādī, presumably prisoners of war and renegades from the time of the conquests and their descendents. At one point Shabath b. Rib'ī attempted to rally his men by accusing them of fleeing from their slaves, and the story is told of Shabath killing a mawādī but sparing an Arab of the Banū Hanīfa among the prisoners he had taken. In an address to his men, Ibn Mu'ti warned that if they lost they would have to allow a renegade to those who had no right to it, and he told them that he had heard that al-Mukhtar's forces included "500 of your freed slaves
Al-Mukhtar b. Abi Ubayd

under a commander of their own. He continued, "If they increase in ... home and Al-Mukhtar's forces were subsequently virtually destroyed at Harura, Al-Mukhtar himself being forced to take

mean the passing away of your power and authority and the alteration of your religion." Kasr of al-

others obtained a safe conduct from Ibn al-Ashtar and others, escaped by night, while Shabath and the others, said to have been given on "the Book of God a war". Violators of God's law djihad against the Sunna of the Prophet, seeking vengeance for the weak and mutual support in peace and war.

Al-Mukhtar then appointed governors over the territories dependent on Al-Kufa: Armenia, Adharbayджан, Al-Mawṣil, Al-Madā'in, Bihkubadā' (Upper, Middle and Lower), and Hulwan. The previous governor of Al-Mawṣil on behalf of Ibn al-Zubayr, Muhammad b. Al-Aṣhrāf al-Kindi [q.v.], fled to Takrit but eventually came to Al-Kufa and submitted to Al-Mukhtar. Basra and its territories remained under Zubayrid control in spite of an attempt by one of Al-Mukhtar's supporters to win the town over for him. Command of the gurta in Al-Kufa was given to an Arab of Hamdān, but, significantly, we are also informed that Al-Mukhtar had his own personal guard (hara) of mawlid led by a mawlid, Kaysān 'Abū 'Amra [q.v.]. Sometimes we find the expression shurta Allah, apparently as a designation for Al-Mukhtar's active supporters in general.

Antagonism between the different groups in Al-Kufa remained, however, and eventually resulted in conflict. Some of the aṣhrāf took advantage of rumours of a defeat of Al-Mukhtar's army in Mesopotamia and of the advance of a Syrian army under 'Ubayd Allah b. Ziyād on Al-Kufa to begin a revolt. They were mainly previous supporters of Ibn Muṭḥind, although mention is also made of at least one previous adherent of Al-Mukhtar and of a supporter of the Alids who had connected by the idea of revenge for Al-Husayn. Shabath b. Rib'i and Muhammad b. Al-Aṣhrāf are named among the leaders. The complaints of the rebels centred on what they saw as Al-Mukhtar's too favourable attitude to the mawlid, his making them recipients of fay, and his freeing of the slaves of Arabs (for inclusion in his own force of non-Arabs). They also denied the truth of his claim to represent Ibn Al-Hanafiyya.

While Ibn al-Ashtar was away on campaign in the north, Al-Mukhtar was forced to temporise with the rebels, but when, having been called back, Ibn al-Ashtar arrived in Al-Kufa, he was able to crush them in fighting which centred on the Djabbānāt al-Sabī'. Many of the defeated leaders, including Shabath and Ibn al-Aṣhrāf, escaped by fleeing to Basra, where they took refuge with Muṣāfāb. Al-Zubayr. The fighting at Djabbānāt al-Sabī' is dated to 25 or 24 Dhū 'l-Hijjah 66/21 or 22 July 686. The victory over the dissident aṣhrāf was the opportunity for a purge to be carried out in Al-Kufa. Several men who had been, or were alleged to have been, involved in the killing of Al-Husayn and his family at Karbala were seized and killed, the most prominent of them being 'Umar b. Sa'd b. Abi Wakkās in spite of a written promise of safe conduct. Others he had obtained from Al-Mukhtar. As well as a means of liquidating possible sources of hostility in Al-Kufa, the purge was used by Al-Mukhtar to demonstrate his loyalty to Ibn Al-Hanafiyya, to whom the heads of some of those slain were sent. Ibn Al-Hanafiyya's attitude to Al-Mukhtar remained seized on by critics, however, to have remained distant and non-committal. He is said to have been willing to accept help from al-Mukhtar in the form of money and men when the latter sent the Khashabiyya to Mecca to deliver the mahdi from the confinement in which Ibn al-Zubayr had put him. But, having been released by the coming of the Khashabiyya, he proved unwilling to go to Al-Kufa to join the man who claimed to be his representative and he retired, instead, to Al-Tā'if.

Following the defeat of the rebellion in Al-Kufa, Ibn al-Ashtar was again sent to the north to meet the Syrian army which, with 'Ubayd Allah b. Ziyād by now having established some control in Mesopotamia, was marching south to attack Al-Kufa. At the battle on the river Khāzir [q.v.] near Mawsil, Al-Mukhtar's army defeated that of the Syriants, and 'Ubayd Allah, who is portrayed in the tradition as the man ultimately responsible for the killing of al-Husayn at Karbala, was killed along with many others. Tradition often dates the battle to the very anniversary of Karbala, 10 Muharram 67/6 August 686.

In the accounts of Al-Mukhtar's seizure of power and his domination of Al-Kufa, there are frequent references to ideas and practices with which Al-Mukhtar appears to be invalid from a later Sunni or Shi'i point of view. Not only are there the many allusions to the belief in Ibn al-Hanafiyya as the mahdi, but there is at least one tradition which seems to indicate that Al-Mukhtar himself was regarded as ma'sūm (whatever that might mean in this context [see 'isma]) by some of his followers, and other reports which say that he claimed to be visited by the angels Gabriel and Michael. In the prelude to the battle on the Khāzir we find various stories concerning an empty chair which some of Al-Mukhtar's partisans transported on a mule and venerated in the manner, we are told, of the Israelites and the Ark of the Covenant (al-tābit) or, more derogatively, the Golden Calf. In the way in which this information is presented, some of it could be dismissed as an attempt to portray Al-Mukhtar as a trickster and his followers as credulous 'extremists'. However, taken together, such reports convey the impression that the movement led by Al-Mukhtar was one with distinctive but not easily analysable religious ideas. Presumably, in preparing the way for the coming of the mahdi, Al-Mukhtar and his followers saw themselves in an apocalyptic role, and this view of his movement was shared by the contemporary Christian Syriac writer, John of Phenek (Bar Penkaya), who saw the rise of the ethnically diverse gurta as an act of God intended to overthrow the rule of the Ishmaelites and usher in the end of time.

Following the great victory on the Khāzir, the collapse of Al-Mukhtar's power seems to have been remarkably swift. Incited by the aṣhrāf who had fled to Basra, and taking advantage of an apparent estrangement between Al-Mukhtar and Ibn al-Ashtar who now remained in Mawsil, the governor of Basra, Muṣāfāb. Al-Zubayr, launched an attack on Al-Kufa. The Basran forces were led by al-Muhallab b. Abī Ṣufra [q.v.] who had proved so effective in combating the Khārūjītes, and he achieved a major victory over Al-Mukhtar's army at Al-Madhr on the Tigris. This was probably in the late summer of 686. The advantage gained there was pressed home and Al-Mukhtar's forces were subsequently virtually destroyed at Harūrā, Al-Mukhtar himself being forced to take
refuge in the kasr of al-Kufa. There he was besieged for some months and deserted by most of his followers. Eventually he and a handful of remaining supporters came out to fight and he was killed. His head was cut off and hung at the gate of the mosque, one of his wives who refused to condemn him as an impostor was executed, and many of his followers were slaughtered by the victorious Zubayrid authorities and the returning ashraf. The most generally accepted date for al-Mukhtar’s death is 14 Ramaḍān 67/3 April 687, but variants are given in the sources.

Questions about sincerity and motives are probably unanswerable, and any general interpretation of al-Mukhtar and his movement is difficult, given the nature of the source material. The importance of the man and the movement seems to lie in three main areas, however. In the first place, it seems clear that this was the first episode since the establishment of Arab rule in which the mawāli played a decisive role. One must distinguish between the nature of these mawāli and those who were to become a problem later for the Umayyad caliphate, and one should not portray the support for al-Mukhtar as coming only from them. But that they constituted a major and distinctive element in the movement which he led seems clear and confirmed by the witness of Bar Penkaya. Secondly, there appear to be links between, on the one hand, the movement led by al-Mukhtar and, on the other, the Ḥāshimiyya which was eventually to overthrow the Umayyad caliphate. These links consist in the fact that the ‘Abdāsīds claimed to have inherited the imāmat from a son of Ibn al-Hanafiyya, Abū Ḥāšim [q.v.], who had the support of a part of the movement which al-Mukhtar had led and which survived his death, and they are evident in the use by the Ḥāshimiyya of some of the same ideas and terminology which occur in the accounts of al-Mukhtar’s career. Finally, it seems that it was among the supporters of al-Mukhtar that some of the ideas which were to become regarded as typical of Ẓāhirī Islam, and not only in its “extremist” (ghuluw) forms, were first manifested. There has sometimes been a tendency to regard this as the result of the corruption of a pure Islam by the influence of the non-Arabic religious and cultural backgrounds, but this begs many questions about the nature of Islam before the time of al-Mukhtar. Perhaps one can say, however, that his movement was an important part of the background from which a more clearly definable “classical” Islam would eventually emerge.

Bibliography: The most detailed historical sources for al-Mukhtar are Tabari, ii, 520-37, 598-695, 699-750 and index; Baladhuri, Anṣāb al-ṣāfiq, v, Jerusalem 1936, 214-73; and Ibn Aṭṭār, Al-Rabbih, iii, 122-5, who calls him Yahyā b. al-Ḥākīm [q.v.], whom he met in Mecca, followed to Hadramawt and recognised as Imām. When the latter decided to occupy the Holy Cities, he sent to the north an army of a thousand men commanded by Abū Ḥamza. The sequence of events is not clearly established, but it seems that the rebel occupied Mecca easily by taking advantage of the ceremonies of the pilgrimage (129/August 747). It was in these circumstances that he pronounced a famous khutba in which he summarised, according to the Kharidjite perspective, the history of the beginnings of Islam, made an apology for the Prophet and the first three Um¯ays, showed himself rather rapid with regard to ʿAlī, then attacked violently the Umayyads and Shīʿis before eulogising his own companions (see al-Dschibāy, Bayān, ii, 122-5, who calls him Yahyā b. al-Mukhtar; cf. al-Tabari, ii, 2009; the Aṭṭār, ed. Beirut, xxiii, 130-4, contains further sermons). Many are the sources in Arabic, see Caentani, Chronographia islamica, 64AH §13, 65AH §§ 66, 66AH §§ 7-9, 12, and 67AH §§ 2, 4, 42, and the secondary literature given below. For references in the heresiographical literature, see the articles KAYSANIYYA and KHASHABIYYA and Wadad al-Kadi, Cairo, al-Kaysaniyya fi Ṭarīḳa wa Ṭ-aḍab, Beirut 1974. For a translation of the contemporary references by Bar Penkaya, see S.P. Brock, North Mesopotamia in the late seventh century. Book xo of John Bar Penkaye’s Rīš Melle, in JSAI, ix, 1987, esp. 63-67, 73. H.D. van Gelder, Możdro de valsesque Prophet, Leiden 1888; G. van Vloten, Recherches sur la domination arabe, le Chiisme, etc., Amsterdam 1874, 38 ff.; J. Wellhausen, Die religio-politischen Oppositionsparteien im alten Islam, Berlin 1901, 74-89 (Eng. tr., The religio-political factions in early Islam, Oxford 1975); W.M. Watt, Shiʿism under the Umayyads, in JRAS (1960), esp. 162-5; ʿAlī Husnī al-Kharbizī, al-Mukhtar al-Thakafi mir`dt al-awṣar al-umawi, Cairo, Wadi’s al-Kadi, Beirut, xxiii, 135-9, places this khutba in Medina and, in comparison with the Bayān, gives an appreciably different text of it, which was translated by G. van Vloten, Recherches sur la domination arabe, le Chiisme, etc., Amsterdam 1874, app. iv, 75-8, and reproduced notably by Ibn Abi’l-Hadid, Sharh Nāṣir al-bayān, i, 456; the version of the Bayān was translated by Ch. Pellat, Mille, 212-13; the Aṭṭār, xxiii, 130-4, contains further sermons of Abū Ḥamza).

Once master of Mecca, Abū Ḥamza dispatched one of his lieutenants, Baladh b. Ḥākīm al-Thakafi, to Medina, which he eventually seized. It is probably at this time that Abū Ḥamza pronounced at least one of the khutbas which the Aṭṭār ascribes to him. Marwān II was not slow to send a strong army of Syrians, under the command of ʿAbd al-Malik b. Muhammad b. ʿAtiyya al-Saʿdi, who encountered the rebel troops in the Wadi ʿI-Kura and cut them to pieces (Djumada I 69, 128 AH). As for Abu Hamza, he moved to confront Ibn ʿAtiyya, who was the leader of the Ibadis of Basra, he became, at the instance of Abū ʿAbd al-Malik Muslim b. Abī Karīma, alias Karzin, a traditionist who was the leader of the Ḥāthās of Baṣra, he became, from 128/745-6 onwards, a supporter of Abū Ḥāfīz b. Yahyā, surnamed Tāhī al-Ḥākī [q.v.]. Second, there appear to be links between, on the one hand, the movement led by al-Mukhtar and, on the other, the Hashimiyya which was eventually to overthrow the Umayyad caliphate, and one should not portray the support for al-Mukhtar as coming only from them. But that they constituted a major and distinctive element in the movement which he led seems clear and confirmed by the witness of Bar Penkaya. Secondly, there appear to be links between, on the one hand, the movement led by al-Mukhtar and, on the other, the Hashimiyya which was eventually to overthrow the Umayyad caliphate, and one should not portray the support for al-Mukhtar as coming only from them. But that they constituted a major and distinctive element in the movement which he led seems clear and confirmed by the witness of Bar Penkaya. Secondly, there appear to be links between, on the one hand, the movement led by al-Mukhtar and, on the other, the Hashimiyya which was eventually to overthrow the Umayyad caliphate, and one should not portray the support for al-Mukhtar as coming only from them. But that they constituted a major and distinctive element in the movement which he led seems clear and confirmed by the witness of Bar Penkaya.
Turkish general and statesman, was born in Bursa on 30 November/1 December 1839, the son of himself during campaigns in Herzegovina and emerged in 1861 as staff captain. He distinguished himself during campaigns in Herzegovina and Montenegro (1861-3) and was appointed instructor in the "art of war" at the War College when he was wounded. He was promoted to the rank of major in April 1864 and sent as staff officer to Derwish Paşa, who was engaged in carrying out reforms in Kosoz. Mükhtar served as tutor to Prince Yusuf ʻiz al-Din (1865) and was included in the Sultan's entourage when ʻAbd al-ʻAziz visited Europe in 1867. (During these years, he established close relations with the Ottoman household, relations which he maintained until his death.) In 1868, he was head of a border commission in the Montenegro-Herzegovina region; the following year he became a colonel and a member of the local military council (Şair-i-ʻAşker). Due to illness, he resigned from the commission and returned to Istanbul in 1870.

Ahmed Mükhtar rose to the rank of brigadier-general in 1870 and was sent to serve under General Redif Paşa in Yaman. He distinguished himself in the campaign, the conduct of which he took over in 1871 as General of a Division (Ferî) with the title of Paşa. He remained in Yaman until May 1873, acting as the governor (âdîd) and commander of the Seventh Army, when he was appointed Minister of Public Works and ordered back to the capital. In the years that followed, he was governor of Crete and Erzurum, and given the commands of the Second and Fourth Armies respectively with the rank of Müşir or Field Marshal. He was recalled to Istanbul in December 1875 and sent to Bosnia and Herzegovina with great dispatch. With the outbreak of the rebellion which had recently broken out in the Balkans. After some initial successes, he was defeated in April 1876 at Duga Pass in Herzegovina. When Russia declared war in April 1877, Mükhtar was given supreme command of the Caucasus front. He fought valiantly against great odds and won the title ʻUṣûl; the Ottoman army collapsed because, as Mükhtar Paşa complained, Sultan ʻAbd al-Hamîd II [q. v.] refused to send reinforcements, preferring to keep his reserves for the defence of the capital.

Mükhtar was recalled to Istanbul and given the task of organising the defence of Istanbul and Cataldîja against the invading Russian army, though he disagreed with the Sultan over strategy. He was appointed Commander-in-Chief of Artillery (Topkâhâ-i-ʻAṣâr-ı Müşirî) on 24 April 1878 and in September sent to Crete to restore order. Following the signing of the Treaty of Berlin, he led the commission to demarcate the new Greek-Turkish border but with no success. He was then appointed commander of the Third Army and governor of Monastir (27 March 1879). The following year, on 31 August, he was made vice president of the High Commission for Military Inspection over which ʻAbd al-Hamîd personally presided, advising the latter on military matters. Following the British occupation of Egypt, Mükhtar was appointed High Commissioner (Peşkatâ'âde Komiser) on 6 March 1882 and sent to Cairo to negotiate a British withdrawal. Instead, he was forced to remain in Egypt as the Ottoman High Commissioner until the constitutional revolution of July 1908. During these years he lived in the state of political inactivity which did not suit his ambitious temperament. During these years, he wrote a book on the reform of the Islamic calendar in which he advocated a uniform Hijira solar year for all Muslims.

Mükhtar Paşa returned to Istanbul in September 1908 and was appointed to the newly-created Senate whose vice-president he became. The following year he resigned as High Commissioner of Egypt as well as from the Council of Military Affairs, and retired from the army. The abortive counter-revolution which broke out in the capital on 13 April 1909 gave him the opportunity to satisfy his political ambitions. He was prominent in the National Assembly which met at San Stefano (Yeşilköy), denouncing ʻAbd al-Hamîd in bitter terms. He led the delegation which announced the accession of Mehemmed V [q. v.] as the new Sultan-Caliph and brought him to the War Ministry to receive the oath of allegiance. Contemporaries noted how close he remained to the Sultan in the hope of being appointed Grand Vizier. But that was not to be, at least not for the moment, and he had to be satisfied with the presidency of the Senate (14 October 1911). His moment came in July 1912 when the army forced the resignation of the pro-Unionist cabinet of Sa'id Paşa and led to Mükhtar Paşa's appointment on 22 July. When the news of his appointment was brought to him, he was excited and exclaimed "It's been forty years; finally it has happened today!" He formed what came to be known as the "Great Cabinet" because it included three former Grand Viziers, or as the "Father-Son Cabinet" because his son General Mahmûd Mükhtar Paşa was given the portfolio of Minister of the Navy. Mükhtar Paşa came to power at a very difficult time: the country was at war with Italy, Albania was in a state of rebellion, and the internal political situation was confused and volatile. He could do little to remedy any of these problems. He was finally dismissed by the Commission of Ministers on 29 October 1912 and made way for the Anglophile Kâmil Paşa who was expected to regain British sympathy for a beleaguered Turkey. Mükhtar remained in the Senate until 1918 and died in his eightieth year on 21 January 1919. He was buried in the courtyard of the Fatih mosque in Istanbul with all the pomp and ceremony befitting an honoured soldier and statesman.

Bibliography: M. Cavid Baysun's İA art. Muhtar Paşa provides an extensive bibli., as also G. Jâsche's El art. Some of his more important works are: Islâh al-takwûm, Cairo 1307/1889-90, Fr. tr. La reforme du calendrier, Leiden 1893; Taksim-i saîl, Istanbul 1326/1909; Serîgul-ânes-i hayât-îmîl, dîjd-i islahîî, Istanbul 1327/1909; Anadolu'da Rus muhahereî, Istanbul 1328/1911. See also contemporary accounts relating to Mükhtar Paşa: Hâjjîdî Ahmed Râhîd, Yemen we Sanâ′î târîkhî, ii, Istanbul 1291/1874; ʻAtîf Paşa, Yemen târîkhî, ii, Istanbul 1296/1908; Mahmûd Dîjâl al-Dîn Paşa, Mir′î-i bakkâ, 3 vols., Istanbul 1326/1908; Ahmed Midhat, Uss-i inkülâb, Istanbul 1294-5/1877-8; Mehmed ʻArif, Basgîzma geleneler, Istanbul 1328/1910, said to have been inspired by Mükhtar Paşa; ʻOthînî Nûnî, ʻAbd al-Hamîd-în tâhît we dawr-i sâhibî, Istanbul 1327/1909; Feizî Efendi, Khaṭârîsî, iii, Istanbul 1299/1911; Kâmil Paşa, Kâbirîsî, Istanbul 1329/1911; Dîjmâl al-Dîn Efendi,

Eventually, the rebels built their main towns: al-Mana'î ("the Strongly-defended") and al-Mansûra ("the Victorious"), both to the northwest of Baṣra, and then al-Mukhtâra ("the Chosen one") to the southwest of the city. Al-Mana'î (the town of Sulaymân b. Mûsâ al-Shârânî) was situated in Sîk al-Khâmîs on the Barâštîk canal; it was defended by walls and moats. It seems to have been fairly important since al-Tabârî, iii, 1963-4 and passim, stresses that 5,000 Muslim women captives were able to be released here. Al-Mansûra (the town of Sulaymân b. Djâmîz) was situated in Tahîṭîh. It was likewise fortified (fast fëstînê) and as many mosques, and must have been even bigger than the first one, since 10,000 women and children captives were found there (al-Tabârî, iii, 1970-2 and passim; it is not however known how far the recorded figures correspond to reality).

If, in regard to al-Mana'î and al-Mansûra, one might well ask oneself whether it was not simply a question of fortresses built at the side of existing towns, this is nevertheless not the case regarding the Zandî capital, al-Mukhtâra. This was indeed a very large town, completely constructed by the rebels (from Radja 256/June-July 870 onwards) in a spot chosen for its inaccessibility (it was from there that raids were sent out, and the rebels returned thither in order to feel secure). At the outset, it seems to have borne the name of Mu'âskar al-Îmâm ("the Imam's camp"); see G.C. Miles, Trésor de dirhems du IX* siecle, in Mémoires de la Mission archéologique en Iran, xxvii [1960], 73). There are many items of information in al-Tabârî on this subject, but they are more useful for elucidating the course of events in the warfare than for giving information on the town itself (F. al-Sâmîr, Thawrat al-Zandj, 135-44, has brought together the sparse pieces of information on this last in ch. 6 of his study).

It is clear that we only know its location approximately; it was situated on the two banks of the Abu 'l-Khâṣîb canal, a western affluent of the Tigris, and was intersected by several other canals. The entrance of the main canal was closed by an iron chain and two stone barrages and had two bridges over it. Two other bridges on the Abu 'l-Khâṣîb canal connected the two parts of the town and two further bridges on the Mânkâ canal are also mentioned. Walls, with various kinds of engines of war mounted on them, circled the whole of the town. The greater part of the houses must have been constructed of sun-dried brick and palm branches, but many palaces of leading figures, notably that of 'Ali b. Muhammad, were built of fired brick; the portal of his palace had been carried off from Baṣra. This palace was situated in the western part of al-Mukhtâra (in the angle formed by the Tigris and the Abu 'l-Khâṣîb canal) and gave on to the field where races were held. In the same part of the town were likewise to be found the houses of various chiefs and commanders of the rebels: Ibn Samâ'n, Sulaymân b. Djâmîz, Ankalây, al-Kâlûsî and al-Dhubbâ', as well as the Friday mosque, a prison and the al-Maymûna and al-Husayn markets. In the eastern part are mentioned the houses of al-Karnabâ', Muṣîlî al-Zandjî and Abû 'Isâ; the palaces of al-Handâmî, Bahbûbî b. Abîd al-Wâhîhâb and al-Muhallâbî; the al-Muhârâka market and the market for the sale of animals, in addition to another prison. But there further existed other buildings (offices of the different departments, workshops for minting coinage, etc.) and other mosques in the town.

Al-Mukhtâra was thus the true capital of the Zandî "state", being its political, administrative and commercial centre. It will probably never be possible to rediscover its exact site, in part because of the complete change in the beds of the watercourses, and in part because of the destruction wrought at the time of the reconstruction of the town by the Abbasîd government, when it was taken quarter by quarter and its palaces, buildings and markets destroyed and burnt successively.

mentary) that survives in two partial mss. (cf. K. al-Ikhtiydrayn, ed. Kabawa, Damascus 1974, 5-6). The book contains over fifty poems not included in any other anthology, which it is presumably based. Inflation at the hands of a transmitter was not uncommon; already the Fihrist speaks of the poems in the *Mukhtdrdt ashlar al-^arab* as "now greater, now smaller in number" (cf. Lyall, *The Mukhtdrdt, Arabic text*, Oxford 1921, p. xxvii).

Seven groups of seven *kasidas* make up the *Hamdsa*, compiled by Abu Tammam and later expanded by Abu 'l-Khdt^ab al-Kur^adhi (q. v. in Suppl.), an obscure scholar who probably flourished in the latter part of the 3rd/9th Islamic century and may have lived into the 4th/10th.

Later anthologies principally devoted to pre-Islamic and early Islamic *kasidas* rather than *mukhtdrats* are the *Mukhtdrdt shu^ard^ al-^arab* (q.v. Djamharat ashlar al-Damat al-A^rabiyya) and the *Mikall, d. 436/1044, cf. Brockelmann, SI, 501*) writes that the verses in the collection are suitable for use in private or official correspondence. In the introduction to his *DiuAIN al-mu^adin* (d. 1000/1648), he warns that he who would use culture to open doors to the assemblies of the great must be ready for the question, "What are the finest verses on the subject of...?" Such anthologies can be quite small (e.g., *al-Tha^alib^i's A^ksan ma sami^tu*; some, like Abu Hil^al's, are sizable. It should be noted that *ma^adin* in Abu Hil^al's title is not a precise technical term; the citations range from well-turned conceits to long passages (as for instance from al-Nab^agha's and al-Bub^ur^i's poems of apology) that illustrate the fine handling of larger themes. (Note also that while the anonymous *Mukhtdrdt ashlar al-mu^adin* is an anthology of a similar sort on a smaller scale, *ma^adin* in some titles refers to the simple elucidation of sense, e.g., the *Ma^adin l-^tib^ir* by al-Ugn^an^d^ani, d. 288/901.)

The *Yatim^at al-dahr* of Abu Mans^ur Tha^alib^i (d. 429/1038) is the first anthology extant in which poetry and, to a lesser degree, art prose by the author's contemporaries, the so-called near-contemporaries *ma^adin* is also that while the anonymous *Mukhtdrdt al-mu^adin* is an anthology of a similar sort on a smaller scale, *ma^adin* in some titles refers to the simple elucidation of sense, e.g., the *Ma^adin l-^tib^ir* by al-Ugn^an^d^ani, d. 288/901.)

The *Yatim^at al-dahr* of Abu Mans^ur Tha^alib^i (d. 429-1038) is the first anthology extant in which poetry and, to a lesser degree, art prose by the author's contemporaries, the so-called near-contemporaries *ma^adin* is also that while the anonymous *Mukhtdrdt al-mu^adin* is an anthology of a similar sort on a smaller scale, *ma^adin* in some titles refers to the simple elucidation of sense, e.g., the *Ma^adin l-^tib^ir* by al-Ugn^an^d^ani, d. 288/901.)

The *Yatim^at al-dahr* of Abu Mans^ur Tha^alib^i (d. 429-1038) is the first anthology extant in which poetry and, to a lesser degree, art prose by the author's contemporaries, the so-called near-contemporaries *ma^adin* is also that while the anonymous *Mukhtdrdt al-mu^adin* is an anthology of a similar sort on a smaller scale, *ma^adin* in some titles refers to the simple elucidation of sense, e.g., the *Ma^adin l-^tib^ir* by al-Ugn^an^d^ani, d. 288/901.)

These texts (many of them, though by no means all, are the *Hamdsa* or *Mukhtdrdt ashlar al-Damat al-A^rabiyya* or excerpts) thematically arranged under ten headings—was devised by the poet Abu Tammam (d. 542/1147) in its *Mukhtdrdt ashlar al-Damat al-A^rabiyya* (Syria especially richly represented) is a rich record of a century of great creativity. It represents poets from Khurasan to Andalusia. Al-Hamasa, rather than *al-Damat al-A^rabiyya*, is a rich record of a century of great creativity. It represents poets from Khurasan to Andalusia. Al-Tha^alib^i himself wrote a sequel, the *Taimmat al-yas^ina* of its edited successors, mention may be made of the *Diyar al-Qasr* of al-Bakkar^i (d. 467/1075) (q. v.); the *Khdt^ira l-^kay* by 'Imad al-Din al-Kht^ab (d. 569/1272) of the parts dealing with Egypt, Syria, Iraq, and North Africa, Sicily and Andalusia); the *Ruh^aylan al-ulb^ab* of Shi^ib^a al-Din Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Khata^fi (d. 1069/1659) (q. v.) (especially strong on Egypt and Syria); its sequels, the *Nafhat al-rayh^ina* by Muhammad Amin al-Mub^ib (d. 1111/1699) (q. v.) (Syria especially richly represented) and the *Sul^af^at al-ar^i* by Ibn Ma^^um al-Madan^i (d. 1104/1692) (strong on the Hij^az, Mecca and Medina). The notices in the first two of these works tend to be quite sparse; later, as they come to serve as display windows for the anthologist's rhymed prose, they become longer. It is symptomatic that the author of the *Khdt^ira* should quote a phrase of al-Har^i's to describe a personage ('^arid^a, *Kisam ashfar* al-sh^am, ed. Fayyaz, 1971, p. 9, 93.)

Among anthologies concerned with particular regions, outstanding are several works devoted to the poetry and art prose of the Muslim West, such as the
great al-Dhakhira fi maḥāsin ahl al-dajza by Ibn Bassam al-Šanṭarimī (d. 543/1147 [q. v.]) who in his preface shows himself an ardent advocate of Andalusian culture, the Kašid al-‘ṣaḥān and the Matnaḥ al-anfaṣ by al-Ṭayḥ b. Khākān (fl. 6th/12th century [q. v.] and the anthology of Sicilian poetry by Ibn al-Katātī (d. 515/1121) the K. al-Durr al-khawṭīn min al-muwaṣṣaṭ al-dajza, only parts of which have survived in small anthologies extracted from it [see Ibn al-Kaṭātī, al-Dhakhira]. al-Shantarmi (d. 543/1147 [q. v.]) who in his... often a volume of prose texts by more than one author; khuldsa is especially applied to a selection made from an exten-

and

(90704.1404) A late example is al-Muntakabāt fī ṣiṣam al-marāṭibī wa l-khwāṣ by Fakhir al-Dīn al-Dīn al-Mulk (d. 609/1211) in which Ibn Sana′ al-Dīn published a selection of Andalusian muwaṣṣaṭ al-muṣbātī. The same remark is found in al-Husri’s (q.v.) preface to the Zakr al-adāb. Some authors of anthologies accepted gifts from contemporaries whose work they included; occasionally (as in the case of al-Fath b. Khākān) this may have coloured their use by old poets and new. Ibn Saʿīd (d. 568/1260 [q. v.]) Ibn Saʿīd could draw on material in the historico-biographical works written by himself and members of his family when he compiled his anthology, the Unwān al-muṣīrūdī wa l-musrīt (see above) and the Rūḥ al-mubārubīn. Ibn Kātīb, ‘choosing the best’, was not a casual matter. In the preface to the K. al-Muwaṣṣaḥī, primarily a discussion of elegance and love, al-Wastahī [q. v.] quotes the adage that a man’s tayyār discloses his quality of mind. The same remark is found in al-Husri’s (q.v.) preface to the Zakr al-adāb. Some authors of anthologies accepted gifts from contemporaries whose work they included; occasionally (as in the case of al-Fath b. Khākān) this may have coloured judgment. The compilation of anthologies of mediaeval poetry has continued in modern times. Remarkable examples are the Muḥājarāt of al-Bārūdī (d. 1904 [q. v.] and the Divān al-dhīr al-arabi by ‘Ali Ahmad Saʿīd (b. 1930). Bibliography. Detailed historical prefaces accompany the modern editions of many of the works cited in the text. For further titles, commentaries, translations and modern studies, see especially G. S. W., ii, 46102, 43911, 66871. On the great classical muḥājarāt of kasidas, see also Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Asad, Maṣādir al-dhīr al-dhāshī, Cairo 1962, 57391; Blachere, HLA, 13952; and A. Araz, La réalité et la fiction dans la poésie arabe ancienne, Paris 1989, 2351. (A. Hamori) 2. In Persian literature. In Persian, the term muḥājarāt was not commonly applied to an anthology: the title of the Muḥājarāt-nāma (translated by Hellmut Ritter as ‘Buch der Auswanderung’; cf. xii-xiv [1961], 195) a thematically arranged selection from Farid al-Dīn ʾAṭṭār’s (q.v.) quatrains, is a rare conception. Although the cognate term tayyārī is based on an anthology of... systems of prose texts by more than one author; khuldsa is especially applied to a selection made from an exten-

collections of poems that had been set to music. Of this type—but vastly extended—is the K. al-Aghānī by Abu l-Farādī al-ʾIṣfahānī, this monumental work uses the core collection of songs as an excuse for offering rich historical and literary information about the poets (and much else) and many samples of their work. That the K. al-Aghānī is based on an anthology of poetry is coincidental. Works of literary scholarship and adab partake of the nature of anthologies. In the K. al-Saʿīdīa ʾl-ṣaʿīda ʿl-arabi, for instance, Ibn Kutayba (q.v.) frequently heads situations with a “choice passage by him is…” or similar phrases. The encyclopedic adab book by Ibn ʿAbd Rabbī (d. 328/940 [q. v.]), the Ṭah, includes an anthology of funerary elegies in one of its sections. Not surprisingly, the Raḥ al-tawrī faʿṣāf al-khawmīr by Raḥīf (or Ibn al-Raḥīf) al-Kayrawānī (d. after 418/10278 [see Ibn al-Kaṭātī, al-Aghānī]) includes an anthology of passages from wine poetry. Al-Kāfī’s (d. 556/957 [q. v.]) Amāl mingles philological information, etc., with selections of poetry, frequently under thematic headings. There is no hard and fast line between an anthology with much historical material, like the Dhakhira (see above), and a tabākāt work about people who, among their other accomplishments, wrote poetry or art prose, like al-Ḥalī al-iṣrāṣ (q.v.) by the Andalusian Ibn al-Abbār (d. 658/1260 [q. v.]). The anthologies of poetry, the Unwān al-muṣīrūdī wa l-musrīt (see above) and the Rūḥ al-mubārubīn. Ibn Kātīb, ‘choosing the best’, was not a casual matter. In the preface to the K. al-Muwaṣṣaḥī, primarily a discussion of elegance and love, al-Wastahī [q. v.] quotes the adage that a man’s tayyār discloses his quality of mind. The same remark is found in al-Husri’s (q.v.) preface to the Zakr al-adāb. Some authors of anthologies accepted gifts from contemporaries whose work they included; occasionally (as in the case of al-Fath b. Khākān) this may have coloured judgment. The compilation of anthologies of mediaeval poetry has continued in modern times. Remarkable examples are the Muḥājarāt of al-Bārūdī (d. 1904 [q. v.] and the Divān al-dhīr al-arabi by ‘Ali Ahmad Saʿīd (b. 1930). Bibliography. Detailed historical prefaces accompany the modern editions of many of the works cited in the text. For further titles, commentaries, translations and modern studies, see especially G. S. W., ii, 46102, 43911, 66871. On the great classical muḥājarāt of kasidas, see also Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Asad, Maṣādir al-dhīr al-dhāshī, Cairo 1962, 57391; Blachere, HLA, 13952; and A. Araz, La réalité et la fiction dans la poésie arabe ancienne, Paris 1989, 2351. (A. Hamori) 2. In Persian literature. In Persian, the term muḥājarāt was not commonly applied to an anthology: the title of the Muḥājarāt-nāma (translated by Hellmut Ritter as ‘Buch der Auswanderung’; cf. xii-xiv [1961], 195) a thematically arranged selection from Farid al-Dīn ʾAṭṭār’s (q.v.) quatrains, is a rare conception. Although the cognate term tayyārī is based on an anthology of... systems of prose texts by more than one author; khuldsa is especially applied to a selection made from an exten-
sive work; bayads ("blank book"), ajungs and safinas (both meaning literally "a boat") are informal notebooks with poetical fragments. It is hazardous, however, to distinguish these terms very neatly. They appear to have been used for volumes of varying sizes and mixed contents, including both prose texts and poems. Finally, the term tadhkira should be taken into account, even if it only refers to the biographical material contained in the genre of anthologies concerned.

Persian anthologies have so far not been studied as a special category of books. Yet the role which they played in the workings of literature was quite substantial. Very different types are to be considered under this heading. Their diversity reflects the multiple services which anthologies could render both to writers and readers. They were useful as private files of literary miscellanea, but also furthered the distribution of texts, especially of poems. If they were based on careful selection and were properly arranged, they could assist in the formation of a corpus of canonised poetry. Their contents were an important source for writers who needed poetical quotations for their prose compositions or for anyone who wanted to add polish to his conversation. As far as the history of literature is concerned, the widespread interest in the collection and recording of poems, fragments and single verses of extant or lost books is of prime importance in the Persian tradition of poetry which did not survive through the channels of the diwans, even if this was not always a primary aim. Not only proper anthologies but also biographical works, dictionaries and textbooks of literary theory saved a substantial amount of Persian poetry from oblivion. Anthologies also deserve our attention in their own right because they provide valuable insights into the production of books.

A rough division could be made between, on the one hand, collections made for the private use of the compiler or a patron of his, and, on the other hand, public works designed according to certain generic rules and intended to be put into circulation under an author's name. At the lower end of the former class are the private notebooks which were filled at random with extracts of books and poetical contents. The pages are usually highly mixed and may even include poems and verses in more than one language. Although they are nearly always anonymous, there are some exceptions. The personal taste of a prominent poet is reflected in Bayad-i Mirzâ Bîdîl, containing the choice made by Bîdîl [q. v.] from the works of his predecessors (Rieu, Catalogue, ii, 737-8).

A special group consists of private volumes which exhibit a much greater care of presentation and legibility than the simple notebooks. Ornamentation is not uncommon and may even include the illustration by miniatures. These were obviously manuscripts which were made to order, as is occasionally confirmed by a colophon. A remarkable specimen is the Djalâl al-Dîn Iskandar b. Umar Shaykh. The manuscript was aptly styled "a pocket library" as it contains a most diverse selection of Persian texts (Rieu, op. cit., 868-71). To the same class belong the finely executed anthologies of lyrical poetry which are to be found in several collections of manuscripts (see, e.g., Rieu, op. cit., 734 ff.; Ethé, Catalogue India Office, no. 103; Chester Beatty Library, Catalogue, nos. 105, 124 and 127). There are volumes especially concerned with the production of books, or a special genre (e.g., ghazals, rubâis, mu'amâs, satire or religious poetry); others focus on certain periods or subjects of special interest to the compiler. The arrangements found in these collections are sometimes based on subjects and literary themes, sometimes on formal criteria like metre and rhyme or on the alphabetical order. Only rarely is a title or the name of the compiler mentioned.

Quatrains have frequently been the subject of specialised anthologies like the aforementioned Muhtâr-nâma; several volumes containing quatrains were listed by F. Meier, Die schönste Maksâat, Wiesbaden 1963, 117 ff. ("Quellenevzeichnien"). More comprehensive are the scope of the Mu'ânis al-abrâr, a collection of poetry in various forms completed in 741/1341 by Muhammad b. Badr Djalâlî [q. v. in Suppl.]. The author made a choice from the works of about two hundred poets, most of whom lived in the 7th-8th/13th-14th centuries. The poems are arranged according to genre, verse form or subject matter into thirty chapters. A comparable collection from the 8th/14th century, including also Arabic poems, is 'Abd al-'Azîz al-Kâshâî, Ra'adat al-nâzîr wa-nu'chát al-khâtiir (cf. Ateş, Farşa manzum eserler, no. 350).

Extensive ma'mauwîs were often distributed in excerts. Such selections were made, for instance, from Ferdowsî's Shâh-nâmâ (notably, the extracts with connecting prose texts by Tawakkul b. Tâlib made in the 17th century; see, e.g., Rieu, op. cit., 539-40; Ethé, Catalogue India Office, nos. 802 ff.). The Tadhkira-i 'Umarî of Djalâl al-Dîn Rumi (cf., e.g., Ateş, op. cit., passim). Manuscripts of lyrical poetry sometimes do not contain the complete output of the poet concerned but only selections from a more comprehensive diwân.

As books produced for a wider circle of readers, many Persian anthologies belong to the genre of the tabâkit, or "memorial" of the poets, which is characterised by a combination of biography and anthology. The history of the genre may go back as far as the early 6th/12th century, if it is correct to regard the lost Manâkib al-ghur'arâbayrâ by Muwaffak al-Dawla Abî Tâhir al-Khâtûni—a mustaufi in the service of Gâwhar Khâtûn, the wife of Sultan Muhammad b. Malik-Shâh (498-511/1105-18)—as a true tabâkrit. The oldest work of this type is the Ma'mauwî of Abu Tâhir (cf. Ateş, op. cit., 734 ff.; Ethe, Catalogue India Office, no. 13,026; Storey, i/2, 783, n. 1; A. Gulsîn-i Ma'ânî, Tahâkîâ-i tabâkit-yi farsi, ii, 294-302).

The oldest work in this category still extant, the Lu'dab al-abâh by Muhammad 'A'mfî [q. v.], was completed in 617/1220-1 at Lahore. The author regarded himself as the creator of a new genre of Persian literary scholarship, meant to parallel the works on the "classes" (tabâkit) of Arabic poets written by Ibn Sallâm, Ibn Kutayba, Ibn al-Mu'tâz, al-Thâlîbî [q. v. and others]. The Arabic tabâkit works were anthologies compiled with a critical intent. Quality was of primary importance in the selection of the poems. The number of poets in each class, or generation, was often restricted to a fixed number (cf. K. Abu Deeb, in The Cambridge History of Arabic Literature. "Abhâsid belles-lettres, ed. Julia Ashtiany et alii, Cambridge 1990, 11-6). A further aspect is the subdivision, based on social distinctions as well as chronology. Poems written by non-professionals, like rulers, officials and
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The tadhkira actually derived its name from the Tadhkira-yi shu'arâ' of Dawlat-Shâh [q.e.], finished about 892/1487. Like the Lubáb al-âlbâb, the principles adhered to in this work are the rules of the Arabic tababat. Dawlat-Shâh even followed the numerical restriction of that formula, as each of his seven classes does not comprise more than twenty Persian poets. A preliminary section deals with Arab poets and the work is concluded by a brief khâtimah on contemporaries of the author. Dawlat-Shâh devoted considerably more space to biographical information than Awfi did. It is not surprising, therefore, that his Tadhkira has always been regarded in the first place as a work of literary history.

In most of the numerous tadhkiras produced in the fourteenth century there was a similar emphasis on biography that can be noticed. As far as generations of poets previous to their own times are concerned, the authors mainly compiled data from earlier works, but they nearly always provide valuable information about contemporary literature. Only the most important tadhkiras can be mentioned here (for more extensive lists, see the bibliography).

Only slightly younger than Dawlat-Shâh's work is 'Ali Shâr Nawâ'î's [q.e.] Maqâlîs al-nafa'is (896/1490-1), written in Caghatay Turkish, but also dealing with poets who wrote in Persian. It has been translated more than once into Persian. To the same period belongs the Bahâristân of Djâmi [q.e.], the seventh chapter of which contains an anthology of the tadhkira type. The Tadbir-yi Tâhir Nasrâbd-yi [q.e.] is especially concerned with the poetry of early Safavid poets. Toward the later half of the same century belongs Tâkit Kâshî's voluminous Khuldsat al-ash'âr wa-zubdat al-qâfr, which is still unpublished. Amin Râzi's geographically-arranged Haft hâkin (1002/1593-4) is mainly a biographical work, which sphere of interests extends beyond literature. In Muhammad Sufi Mâzдачиdârâni's Bâh-khâna, on the other hand, the anthology predominates. Other notable works from the Safavid period are: Tâkit Awahdi, 'Arâfah al-širfin wa-araasat al-'âzighân (1024/1615) and Muhammad Tâmir Nasrâbdâ. Tadhkira-yi Tâhir-i Nasrâbdâ (1083/1672-3). 'Abd al-Nabi Fakhr al-Zâmam Kazwîni's May-khdna (1028/1619) is devoted especially to poets who wrote short majnânis in the sâki-nâmâ genre.

The poetry of the 12th/18th century in Persia was recorded by Muhammad 'Ali Hazin in his Tadhkira al-ma'âshirin (1165/1752) and by Lu'if 'Ali [q.e.] Beg Adhar in Atashkâda (1174/1760-1 ff.). The latter tadhkira is a first-hand source on the bâzãgah-i adabî, the return to the stylistic ideals of mediaeval Persian poetry which took place in the middle of that century. The two-volume Majnûn al-fusâlîd (1288/1871) of Râdî-Kulî [q.e.] Khân Hidwât encomiates the entire tradition of the tadhkiras since Awfi, adding to it new information about the earlier poets and their works. It was his first anthology to be released in Persia in a printed (lithographed) form. The Rawdat al-širfin by the same author is an anthology of mystical poetry.

The genre of the tadhkira also flourished on the Indian subcontinent. Outstanding works from the Indo-Persian tradition are Mîr 'Ali al-šâyâ'î (1102/1690-1) by Shîr Khân Lîldî, the three tadhkiras of Ghulâm-'Ali Azâd Bîlgirmî, Yâsî-bîyâ'î (1148/1735-6), Sârû-î âzâd (1166/1752-3) and Khusâna-yi 'amrâ (1176/1762-3) and 'Ali-Kuli Khan Wâlin, Riyâd al-shu'arâ' (1360/1747).

Until the present time, a great number of local tadhkiras were compiled, dealing with poetry from various regions in Persia. The tradition also lives on in modern scholarship. Some histories of Persian literature published in Persia, like Bâdî' al-Zâmâm Furûzânfâr's Sukhan wa sakhânawân (1308-12 sh./1928-33) and Dâ'îlûl Allah's Tâhirî-i adabrâyrd dar ûrân (1358 sh./1939 ff.), still contain extensive selections from classical literature. Two anthologies by Safâ, Gangi-sukhan (on poetry) and Gangina-yi sukhan (on prose), played an important part in modern academic education.

Since the beginning of the 20th century, Persian poets began to publish their works in periodicals which often had only a limited circulation. Anthologies of a new type could, therefore, still serve both the needs of circulation and of critical selection. Anthologies of a new type could, therefore, still serve both the needs of circulation and of critical selection. Other anthologies like the repeatedly printed Dâruşshâh Shâhîn, Râhîm-î 'ârî-yi mu'âsir and Muhammad Hukkîl, Shî-î-nâw az 'âzâh tâ imrâz (1335 sh./1974), continued to appear serving both the needs of circulation and of critical selection. Modern prose was anthologised by Sâ'id Nafisî, Shâîkhârâ-yi nathr-i farsi-yi mu'âsîr (1330-2 sh./1951-2), Farîdîn Kâr, Sukhâb-yi dâwîd (1336 sh./1957) and Muhammad-'Ali Sîpânîl, Bâz-î-farîn-yi dâwîd (1349 sh./1970).

Since the beginning of the 20th century, Persian poets began to publish their works in periodicals which often had only a limited circulation. Anthologies of a new type could, therefore, still serve both the needs of circulation and of critical selection. Other anthologies like the repeatedly printed Dâruşshâh Shâhîn, Râhîm-î 'ârî-yi mu'âsir and Muhammad Hukkîl, Shî-î-nâw az 'âzâh tâ imrâz (1335 sh./1974), continued to appear serving both the needs of circulation and of critical selection. Modern prose was anthologised by Sâ'id Nafisî, Shâîkhârâ-yi nathr-i farsi-yi mu'âsîr (1330-2 sh./1951-2), Farîdîn Kâr, Sukhâb-yi dâwîd (1336 sh./1957) and Muhammad-'Ali Sîpânîl, Bâz-î-farîn-yi dâwîd (1349 sh./1970).

Bibliography: Specimens of the various kinds of anthologies mentioned in the article are described in Ch. Rieu, Catalogue of the Persian manuscripts in the British Museum, London 1881, ii, 734-40 and passim; H. Ehê, Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the Indian Office Library, London 1903, nos. 1739-58 and passim; A.J. Arberry et alii, The Chester Beatty Library: A catalogue of the Persian manuscripts and miniatures, Dublin 1959-62 and A. Ateq, Istanbul kâtibehanelerinde farşâ manzum eserler, Istanbul 1968; other catalogues of Persian manuscripts are also to be consulted. The tadhkiras were treated comprehensively by Storey, i/2, 781-922, and by Ahmad Gulcîn-Mâzânî, Târîh-i tadhkirmârâ-yi Farsi, 2 vols., Tehran 1348-50 sh./1969-71. On individual works, see N. Bland, On the earliest Persian biographer, by Muhammad Awfi, and some other works of the class called Tashkira-i Shâhâr, in JRAS (1848), 111-76; Browne, A literary history of Persia, i-
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3. In Turkish. The first samples of this genre in Classical Turkish literature stem from the 9th/10th century onwards. The word makbûrât is not used in any period of Turkish literature, and the term medjmûâ was used till the Tanzimât period to represent this genre. After the Tanzimât, muntekhâbât ("selections") was used till the Republican period. Starting from then, antoloji has been used up to the present time, but ântolóji ("anthology") has also been used alongside it.

Medjmûâ (lit. "what has been collected together") denotes a collection of either verse or prose or a mixture of both. Medjmûâ's are given a name according to the subjects they contain, such as medjmûatu 'l-êde'ýar (or medjmûatu 'l-êde'ýar, medjmûatu 'l-êde'iye, medjmûatu 'l-êde'ýar, medjmûatu 'l-êde'ýar, etc. Although medjmûâs might contain Arabic and Persian poems along with Turkish ones, the selections may also be exclusively Turkish. After the Tanzimât, the medjmûâs meant a periodical or journal, but dergi is now used to convey this meaning in modern Turkish. As a result, there is sometimes a confusion between the classical meaning of medjmûâ as "selection" and the modern meaning of "periodical".

Before passing to the classification of medjmûâs, it is worth touching on the importance of medjmûâs in classical Turkish literature: (1) they might contain works whose existence is known by various sources, but which are themselves no longer extant; (2) they might contain a work which is totally unknown to the literary world and not mentioned in any sources, such as the kăsîde (eulogy) entitled Çerkes-nâme, which is considered one of the first products of Dîvân literature and which expounds the religious and mystical thoughts of a Dîvân poet. The kâsîde is to be found in a medjmûatu 'l-êde'ýar entitled Dîvânî 'l-ñezâr 'r; (3) one can find poems which some poets do not want to include into their dîvân (collection) for some reason or other, such as the famous elegy for Prince Muştafa, the son of Süleymân I. Tâshkhlîlî Yahây, the famous poet of the 10th/16th century, wrote an elegy after Muştafa had been killed by his father but did not dare to put this poem into his dîvân; nevertheless, it appears in some medjmûâs; and (4) medjmûâs allowed the poems of poets who had no dîvân of their own to be collected and studied, possibly constituting an important contribution to literature.

If we classify classical Turkish medjmûâs, one sees that anthologies of pastiches (medjmûatu 'n-nezâr 'r) are the first systematical medjmûâs. Then, medjmûâs that contain various selections on a certain subject, like anthologies of poems (medjmûatu 'l-êde'ýar), anthologies of prayers (medjmûatu 'l-êde'ýar), anthologies of folk-medicine (medjmûatu 'l-êde'iye), anthologies concerning various treatises (medjmûatu 'r-ñezâl'îh, anthologies of anecdotes (medjmûatu 'l-êde'ýar, and anthologies of models for letter-writing (medjmûatu 'l-mânêh 'arî), made their appearance. Apart from this classification, there are medjmûâs called by their compiler's name, as well as medjmûâs whose language and subject-matter are mixed.

Anthologies of pastiches include:

1. Meajmuatu 'l-ñezâr 'r. The only extant copy is located in the library of SOAS under the number 27689. In this medjmûa, which was compiled by Òmer b. Mezîd in 840/1437, there are 397 poems of 84 poets, including its compiler's pastiches. This medjmûa was brought to light by S. Nüzzet Ergun and was published in 1982 by Mustafa Canpolat (transcribed with an index). (An abridged copy of the medjmûa with 309 folios is extant in the Library of the Turkish Language Society.)

2. Dâmiatu 'l-ñezâr 'r. The only extant copy is located in the Beyazit Devlet Library in Istanbul, section Umumi 5782. It was compiled by Hâddîjî Kemâl of Eğirdir in 918/1512. It is made up of 496 folios and contains pastiches of 266 poets. The compiler gives some information in the preface (mukaddâmâ) about how he put the medjmûa in order, adding also his own poems. From this preface we learn that the medjmûa originally contained 29,461 couplets. But in view of the fact that the Çerkes-nâme of Ahmed Fakîh is defective at the end and the redde'de (catchword) of that folio does not correspond to the first word of the next folio, it is clear that some folios of the medjmûa are missing. The number of couplets in the poem is noted in the index as one hundred. Mehmed Khîlîd Bayrî (in Millî Meajmuâ's, vii [1927], 89) and Fuat Köprüî (in Millî edebiyât dergânînâtesi, 3, milli mühîthileri, Istanbul 1928, 60-2) gave information about this medjmûa, but since it has not yet received scholarly publication, one cannot know whether there are any other parts missing. This medjmûa is as important as the first one, from the point of view both of its poems and its linguistic characteristics, and because it contains the work of poets of the 8th/14th and 9th/15th centuries.

3. Medjmûatu 'l-ñezâr 'r, compiled by Nazmî of Edirne in 950/1523. There are 3,356 gazels of 243 poets in it, and it was made known by Fuat Köprüî in op. cit., 63. The important copies of the medjmûa are located in Topkapi, Ahmet III 2664, the Nuruosmanîye 4222 and the Millet, Ali Emiri, manzum ejderler 683 (the first volume), 684 (second volume).

4. Pervâne Bey Medjmûatu 'l-ñezâr 'r called after its compiler, and compiled in 968/1560 by Perwânê b. 'Abd Allâh, one of the slaves of Süleymân I. The only extant copy of it is in Topkapi, Bağdat 406. The first folio of the Medjmûa, which is composed of 641 folios, is missing. Some poems by Ahmed I and other sultans were added in the margins later on.

5. Meajmuatu 'l-ñezâr 'r (2 vols.), compiled by Khisâli of Budin. The autograph copy of it is to be found in Nuruosmanîye 4252-3. Although it is not known when it was compiled, there is no doubt that this was done before 1062/1651, the death-date of Khisâli.

Apart from these chief classical Turkish anthologies of pastiches, it is further possible to come across other anthologies of the same kind in libraries both in Turkey and outside Turkey. In classifying the medjmûâs, anthologies of poems, prayers, folk-medicine and letter-writing have been mentioned; these may be found in all Turkish manuscript collections. (Library catalogues (delfer) published in the reign of 'Abdî 'l-Hamîd II, called der-i Hamîdî kataloglar, have a special chapter under the heading Medjmûa at the end of each catalogue of each collection, with a list of the number of works in each manuscript together with their folio numbers and titles.) Examples are as follows: Menâhîjî 'l-insâhî, which contains private and official correspondence, compiled by Yahây b. Mehmed el-Kâtîb in the
In the Republican era, work on compiling anthologies gathered speed, and anthologies on different literary forms like poetry, short stories, and novels were published. While some of these were compiled as text-books to be used in high schools and universities, others were aimed at a much wider group of readers. Some of the most important anthologies compiled then are the following: Ali Canib Yönem, Türk edebiyatı antolojisi (Istanbul 1930); Fuat Köprüllü, Divan edebiyatı antolojisi (Istanbul 1931); idem, Türk sazu şirleri antolojisi (Istanbul 1940, 1962, 1965); Saadettin Nihat Ergun, Halık ve Nübet antolojisi (Ankara 1938); Ne'meddin Halil Onan, Izahî divan şiri antolojisi, (Ankara 1940); Ismail Habib Sevik, Edebî yemîlganîz (Istanbul 1940); Pertev Naili Boratav and Halil Vedat Fıratî, Izahî halk şiri antolojisi (Ankara 1943); Şükür Kurgan, Izahî eski metinler antolojisi (Ankara 1943); Yasıf Mahir Kocatürk, Tekke şiri antolojisi (Ankara 1955); İhsan Bagöz, Izahî Türk halk edebiyatı antolojisi (İstanbul 1956); Kenan Akyüz, Bata teşrihde Türk şiri antolojisi (Ankara 1953, 1958, 1970); Cevedet Kudret, Türk edebiyatında hîkaye ve roman (2 vols., Istanbul 1966-7), 17 Turkish and 36 Persian ones are given in this volume.

Alongside anthologies called münâtekhabât from the Tanzimat period, there are other anthologies prepared under different titles. The most important of these is certainly Diya'î (Ziya) Paşa’s three-volume anthology which he called Kharâbatî, published in Istanbul 1291-2/1874-5 and severely criticized by Nişâhî Kemâl in his Tahrîhrî Kharâbatî: A Preface (muqaddame) of 765 couplets precedes the anthology. In the first volume of Kharâbatî there are kaşîlîs (eulogies) of 22 poets in Turkish, 38 poets in Persian and 37 poets in Arabic, arranged according to the poets’ names. In the second volume there are poems of 393 Turkish, 374 Persian and 345 Arabic poets. The third volume is reserved for mâgevârîs, and samples of 17 Turkish and 36 Persian ones are given in this volume.

Apart from the Kharâbatî, anthologies from the Tanzimat and Meğrûtiyyet (constitutional government) periods can be arranged in the following order: Nevâdîrî ‘l-‘âhîr (‘Remarkeable remains’) by Redžî-zâde Ahmed Djewdet (Bülük 1256/1840); Munâtekhabât-i Mîr Nazîf (‘Selections from M. N.’) by Ahmed Bâlât (Bülük 1261/1845); Nûmânî-yi edebiyât-‘î ‘Othmânîyye (‘Examples of Ottoman belles-lettres’) by Ebu ‘Ziya Tewâfî (Istanbul 1296/1879, 1302/1885, 1306/1889, 1308/1890 and 1329/1911); Munâtekhabât-‘î dîjîdî (‘New selections’) by Mustaфа Reşhd (2 vols., Istanbul 1302-3/1885-6; the first volume is in prose, the second in verse); ‘Othmânî edebîyyât nâmênelerî (‘Samples of Ottoman belles-lettres’) by Mehmed Djêlî (Istanbul 1312/1894); and Munâtekhabât-i bûldîjû-‘î edebîyye (‘Fine selections of belles-lettres’) by Belgürütszuade Reşhd (2 vols., Istanbul 1325-6/1907-8).

4. In Urdu. Anthologies of various types—of poetry, prose or both, and of single or several authors—are extremely numerous in Urdu; a short article can do no more than indicate background, motives and trends, giving a few examples. The term maqâmâr (‘aust) has seldom been used in this connection; an example from Madras given below may be regarded as exceptional though not unique. The commonest terms used are musâtakhabât- ‘î and intikhâb, but there are many others, ranging from the obvious to the fanciful. These include bahârîs (‘spring’), sârûyâ (‘stock’), murâkkâs, bayâd, kaqkal (‘album’), gulgulda (‘bouquet’), dâwâkhir (‘pearls’), tûzâk (‘memoranda’), maqâmâ’î, maqâmâ (‘compendium’). In addition, some examples of the tadkhîrî might be classed as anthologies, though the form is frequently no more than a juxtaposition of well-known metres of belles-lettres with scanty biographical information about each poet, with a quotation or two from his poetry. However, a few
tadhkiras give extended examples, including whole poems, and these may be justly regarded as anthologies. Amongst these are Snātākī-i-zakhmān by Mahbūb All Ḥusain [q. v.], and Āb-i-haqqāt by Muhammad Ḥusayn Azād [q. v.]. But the latter work is very much sui generis: it could be equally well described as a history of Urdu poetry with copious examples, or as an anthology of Urdu poetry liberally interspersed with historical and biographical information (for detailed accounts of these two and other tadhkiras, see Fātehpūrī, op. cit. in Bibl.).

In a sense, the notion of the Urdu poetical anthology can be traced back to the early 18th century. Until the end of the century, the only printing presses in India were those set up by Christian missionaries purely for the dissemination of religious literature [see Māṭrās, 4. In Muslim India]. During this period, Urdu poetry was transmitted by oral teaching and learning by heart, and, for the few who could afford them, by manuscripts written by the poet or his pupils. After a few years, a successful poet’s collected verse might be gathered together in a single manuscript and called his diwān. After further intervals, his second and subsequent diwāns might follow; Mīr Tākī Mīr [q. v.] had six. But a diwān seldom contained every poem composed in the period concerned, and could thus be considered a “selection”. Not only might a poet’s preferred good works be omitted by the poet or editor, but whole classes of poetry were frequently excluded. Poets tended increasingly to concentrate on ghazal, and it was quite common for a whole diwān to be devoted to this genre with perhaps a few other short poems added. Poems in other major forms such as the kāvida [see Māṭrās, 4. In Urdu] and madih [q. v. 4. In Urdu] would be compiled separately, two or more by the same poet being perhaps grouped together in a single manuscript.

No doubt manuscript anthologies of the works of two or more poets were produced in the 18th century. They certainly existed in Persian, as Saksena [op. cit. in Bibl., 50] tells us that the poets Mazhar (Mīrzā Dānīnzād [q. v.]) compiled a selected collection of Persian poetry entitled Khaṣṣa-yi diwānshīr. The same poet’s official Persian diwan consisted of 1,000 verses selected from 20,000. A similar—if not so drastic—process of elimination must surely have occurred with Urdu poetry.

Nevertheless, the spread of Urdu printing provided a major stimulus for the development of the anthology. Leaving aside those set up by the missionaries, the first Urdu press was in Fort William College, Calcutta, at the end of the 18th century. It published the works of John Gilchrist and the munīsīs [q. v.] who worked under his supervision. The moveable type used did not favour with Urdu speakers and it was in any case expensive. Lithography was the answer, and is still even today the favoured system. In the 1830s there were lithographic presses in Dili, Cawnpore and Lucknow, where there were twelve private presses by 1848. It was there that Munṣī Nāwāl Kīhghār estab-

lished his press, which was to play an important part in publishing Urdu literature, including anthologies.

In 1830 Urdu replaced Persian as the Indian language. The British authorities encouraged the language, which they usually called “Hindustani”, the term Urdu (i-mu‘allād) being at first reserved for the high literary form. Hindustani could be printed either in the Arabic/Persian/Urdu script for Muslims, or the Devanagari script for Hindus. (There was a third script, Roman Urdu using the English alphabet with slight modifications, but it had little impact on literature.) A system of examinations was established for expatriate and other officials, to encourage their command of the medium of the “Hindu
dustani”. At the highest level, these examinations included prescribed literary texts for study. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries a selection of letters by Ghālib (Mīrzā Asad Allāh) [q. v.] was prescribed under the title of Urdu-i-mu‘allād. For the Degree of Honour examinations, selected poems by Ātīgh [q. v.] were set. But in 1909 this was replaced by the Nāz-m-i-mountakbsh, ed. Dā’īr Shairī and Sagdījād (Calcutta). This consists of selected verse by nine poets from Ātīgh to Hālī. The Preface (p. i.) suggests that one aim of the work is to “wet the reader’s appetite for Urdu poetry”. There is a short account of each poet, usually one page in length, mostly taken from Āb-i-haqqāt.

Another stimulus towards anthology compilation was the spread of education and the consequent need for text-books. Macaulay’s minute of 1835 influenced Lord William Bentinck to decide in favour of English education for India. After the Indian Mutiny (1857-8), universities were opened on the English model in Calcutta, Madras and Bombay, then later in the Pan-
dāb and at Allāhābād. But this by no means nullified earlier efforts to support education through the medium of the vernaculars, especially in middle forms of the medium—scientific or literary. Anthologies, especially in Urdu and other languages. Alongside these transla-
tions, original Urdu compilations were published, including some anthologies. In this connection, special mention must be made of Delhi College, opened in 1825 (see Mālik Rām, Kadim Dilli Kāāds, New Delhi 1976). In 1843, the then Principal, Felix Boutrons, founded a “Society for the Promotion of Knowledge in India through the Medium of Ver-
nacular Languages”. Its raison d’être was to organise the translation and publication of English text-books, mostly scientific. But amongst its earliest publications was an anthology of Urdu poetry by twelve leading poets, ranging from Wali Dakhāni to Mu’āmin [q. v.],Inṭikhāb i-diwan i-shārā‘i-mu‘azzār i-shāhīn-i-Urdu, etc., compiled by Īnām Bakhsh, a teacher at the Col-
lege (publ. Dilli 1844). (For detailed accounts of these two and other anthologies, see Māṭrās.)
catalogues compiled by J.F. Blumhardt. In the first, A catalogue of Hindi, Panjabi and Hindustani manuscripts in the British Museum (London 1899), items Hindustani 82, p. 45) is a selection of poems of the works of approved authors, probably dating from 1836. In that year, the anonymous compiler met a Captain Mágan (? Morgan), and at his suggestion compiled a bayyíd (bayz) in four parts. Part I contains ghazals by Inghā; Part II kásidas by Sawdā and masudāsá by Dürürat; Part III mánquātāt and ruðāt by various poets; and Part IV, Persian and Hindustani ghazals. Blumhardt’s second work, A catalogue of Hindustani manuscripts in the Library of the India Office (London 1926), includes two 19th century mss. (pp. 121-3). The first is an Anthology of Dakhani poems relating to Muhammad, the Caliph 'Āli, and the martyrdom of his sons. While Blumhardt assigns this to the late 19th century, it is worthy of mention as an anthology of poetry in the Dakhani dialect of Urdu.

The selection of poems by a single poet is a form which particularly proliferated from the beginning of the 20th century. The fact that many of them were published in university and other educational centres suggests that they were intended as textbooks. They were also targeted at the poorer literate classes—bāhīz (clerks), primary schoolteachers and others who, with a monthly wage of only a few rupees, could not afford to purchase a whole dīwān of the type (collective verse) of some particular poet. In any case, with many leading poets, particularly the more prolific ones, definitive kūlīyāt have only been published in the last 50 years. Examples of these single-poet selections are Intikhab dawāwīn Mu’mín Dihlawi and Intikhab dīwān Hasat, both published 4 Alīgah 1915, edited by Hasrat Māhānī. For some lesser-known poets, such selections might be the only published source of the poet’s verse. This may apply to the licentious poet Bākīr ʿAlī Cīrkīn, a selection of whose poems was published in Lucknow (Intikhab dīwān Cīrkīn, 1924).

The influence of printing on Urdu prose was probably even greater than on poetry. In the 18th century such secular prose as existed was ornate (muraṣa’t-d-musāhlah); even the epistolary style was not exempt. Fort Williams publications made a start towards simplification. Dihlawi’s letters showed that a natural style could make interesting—even exciting—reading. But the advent of newspapers and periodicals aimed at a wider readership was crucial. At the same time, the English education, already mentioned, led to the adoption and adaptation of English literary forms—essay, short-story and novel, and later, theatrical work.

By the end of the 19th century—thanks, in no small measure to the ʿAlīgah Movement of Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Kāhn [q.v.], and despite the deep-seated prejudice in favour of poetry—sufficient prose-writers of distinction had gained acceptance to warrant the compilation of anthologies containing a mixture of prose and poetry. A good early example is Tūṣāk-i-Ārdhwa by Muhammad Ismā’īl (Meerut, printed Agra 1890). The English title-page describes the work as “Selections from Urdu Literature or Tūṣāk-i-Ārdhwa, Course for Anglo-Vernacular Middle Classes, prescribed by the Director of Public Instruction, N(orth) W(est) P(rovince) and Oudh.” In his preface (diḥṣā), the compiler justifies the inclusion of prose on its merit, the foundations having been laid by Ghālib and Sir Sayyid. In selecting both prose and poetry he has sought what is stylistically admirable and morally uplifting for adolescent readers. In both sections contemporary authors (historical novelists such as Mīrzā Aḥmad Ahdūk) are included, not forgetting the compiler himself! Of the 12 prose

writers, the earliest chronologically is Mīr Aḥmad Dīhlawi, one of the best-known of the Fort William translators. The 21 poets include 18th century poets such as Mīr Tāki Mīr, Mīr Hasān and Mūḥāfīz [q.v.].

Other joint prose and verse anthologies followed, for example, Sayyid Ahmad Aḥγarā Aḥγarā, Sarmaγya- ʾī Ārdhwa (“new edition”, Allahābād 1923). Sandwiched between its prose (16 extracts) and poetry (18) sections is a short section entitled Rub’āt (a collection of letters) containing four examples, two of them by Ghālib. The work is described on the title page as “prescribed for High School examinations”. More recent general anthologies seem to have been intended for school and college use, whether explicitly or implicitly. They include later writers, but otherwise do not break fresh ground. Mābūl Anwar Dāwīd’s Dīwān-i-pārā (4th ed., Lahore etc. 1963) is intended, according to the Preface (p. 5), not only for students but also for lovers of literature (adab dist). Murakka’i- tah, ed. Hamīd Ahmad Kāhn and others, Lahore 1976, was published by the Panjab Text-book Board for 11th and 12th classes. A seemingly revised edition of 1985 turns out to be a totally different work, Murakka’ii- tah: tabīb-i-nau (Lahore, ed. Khāda M. Zakariyya). Among the complete change of contents’ justifications are: to make it suitable for science and commerce students as well as arts students; to suit Pakistan as an Islamic state: to include extracts about the Pakistan Movement; and to concentrate on the modern language, especially prose. All the short accounts of authors—which had become an essential element in anthologies—have been eliminated. Another anthology published by the Panjab Text-book Board is Ārdhwa nisāb (Lahore 1979, ed. Abu ʾl-Layth Siddīki and others), also intended for 11th and 12th classes.

During the last forty years there has also been a spate of anthologies of a less general nature, though embracing both prose and poetry, but aimed at a wider readership. Thus Munkatkhagh-i-tah, ed. Iḥtiḥām Husayn and Ghulām Rabbānī Tābīn (Lucknow 1952) is a 4/8-page selection of Urdu literature published during the year 1951. It comprises 10 essays, 12 short stories, 14 ghazals and 25 other poems, two humorous pieces and a one-act play. In their Introduction, the editors highlight the wealth of new material available, and the problems of selection, by listing (10-12) 28 “important and interesting essays of the year”, from which they had to select 10 for want of further space.

The last 100 or so years have seen many anthologies restricted to prose. Several have consisted of extracts from one of the many magazines which appeared in the second half of the 19th century and the early part of the 20th (see Sadiq, 400-5, and Saksena, 271, 375, for information on some of these magazines). One of the best literary magazines was Māhāzān, and selections from it under the title of Intihāb-i-Māhāzān were published in Dīhlī in 1909 and in Lahore in 1918 and 1923. The magazine Dīghuḍāz was founded in Lucknow in 1087 by the distinguished Urdu historical novelist ʿAbd al-Halim Šarār. In 1918 a selection, Intihāb-i-Dīghuḍāz, was published there, ed. M. Sirāḏj al-Hakk. Sir Sayyid Ahmad Kāhn founded the celebrated ʿAlīgah periodical Tahbīgh al-ʿakhkhākhī in 1870. Several selections from it have been published. Sir Sayyid’s own essays, many of which were first published in that magazine, run into several volumes in his collected works. Needless to say, many selections have been published, including Intihāb-i-Māhāzān, by Sir Sayyid (Lahore 1932). The task of selection might seem difficult, but in fact a comparatively small
number of his essays have become familiar classics which recur in selections and in general anthologies. Finally, a word must be said about Urdu drama [see Agha Hashar Kashmiri in Suppl.]. Despite auspicious beginnings, the theatre in Urdu has not become firmly established as an artistic and literary institution. After the First World War, dramatists found an outlet in the thriving Indian film industry. The advent of radio and television provided further opportunities, and since independence the Urdu drama has found an outlet in the thriving Indian film industry. Admittedly, during the last years of his life, Mukhtar! made a brief journey to Transoxania and Samarkand, to the court of the Karakhanid Alâ‘! al-Dawla Arslân Khân Muhammad b. Sulaymân Bughra Khân (regn. 495/1102-30), also called Tamghâ‘ Khân, and praised that ruler and a number of his officials; he also journeyed to Khurâsân. Since no poem in the Diwâ‘n can be dated later than 513/1119-20, he probably died some time before 515/1121-2, but in any case not at the much later dates (534/1139 and after) given in the tadhkiras. Humâ‘i suggests, on the basis of the Hunar-nâmâ and of his biographical narrative by Agha Hashar Kashmiri, that Mukhtar! is credited with originating this type of poetry. In libraries where they are no longer part of the repertoire, and these are in any case available in print.

**Bibliography:** There appears to be a complete lack of studies of the subject. The present article is the result of the author's private researches, delving into libraries, catalogues, and bibliographies in books about individual authors. In the body of this article, details have been given of various anthologies which are either important in themselves or typical of types and trends. In libraries which have title catalogues, other anthologies can be identified by any of the terms for "anthology" given in the body of the article. Anthologies of single authors—especially poets—are so numerous that it would be difficult to decide where to begin and end. As usual for articles on Urdu literature, there are two general sources in English: Ram Babu Saksena, A history of Urdu literature, Allahabad 1927, and Muhammad Sadiq, A history of Urdu literature, London 1964. For the tadhkiras, the most detailed and exhaustive study is Farman Fatehpur, Shah, shârâ‘ ke tadhkire awr tadhkira nigâr, Lahore 1972. (J.A. HAYWOOD)

**MUKHTÂRîGHZÂNAWI, ABû‘UMAR ‘UThMÂN b. UMÂR, Persian panegyric poet of the later Ghâzânawid period, born around 467/1074-5 or 468/1075-6, died between 513-1119-21. The tadhkiri Muktârî was probably derived from the title Mukhtâr al-sha‘r! which poet enjoyed a brief period of prosperity; he composed thirty panegyric kasîdas in praise of the ruler, who appointed him mukhtâr al-sha‘r! and rewarded him lavishly. After Malik Arslân was deposed by his brother Bahram Shâh in 511/1117, Mukhtârî seems to have fallen out of favour; Bahram Shâh is said to have wounded him by a sword thrust, and an entry in a tadhkira states that he later died (the one brief kasida dedicated to Bahram Shâh, Diwân, 500-1, thanks him for saving the poet's life when he was wounded by the "arrow of fate"); which may be merely a metaphorical figure.

During the last years of his life, Mukhtar! made a brief journey to Transoxania and Samarkand, to the court of the Karakhanid Ali‘! al-Dawla Arslân Khân Muhammad b. Sulaymân Bughra Khân (regn. 495/1102-30), also called Tamghâ‘ Khân, and praised that ruler and a number of his officials; he also journeyed to Khurâsân. Since no poem in the Diwân can be dated later than 513/1119-20, he probably died some time before 515/1121-2, but in any case not at the much later dates (534/1139 and after) given in the tadhkiras. Humâ‘i suggests, on the basis of the Hunar-nâmâ and of his biographical narrative by Agha Hashar Kashmiri, that Mukhtar! is credited with originating this type of poetry. In libraries where they are no longer part of the repertoire, and these are in any case available in print.
proceeding to the four elements, humours and seasons and the three kingdoms (mineral, plant and animal), and asserting the superiority of Adam over the rest of creation. Following the treatises of the Companions, the pro-
phets, and Muhammad, the poet tells of his desire to achieve human perfection, the cause of his lengthy travels in pursuit of knowledge. Having experienced only disappointment, he encounters an astrologer who advises him to seek entrance into the service of Ismā’īl b. Gīlākī and, in order to test his worth, asks him a series of riddling questions whose answers point to the prince taken as the model of human perfection. The poem concludes with further praise of the manmadī and the poet’s plea for favour.

The Šahāryūr-nāma, long ascribed to Mukhtārī and thought to have been inspired by Mas’ud III’s Indian campaigns, was included by Humā’ī in his edition of the Dīwān, but was later shown by him to be spurious. Its style, and in particular the many prosodic errors which mark it, suggests that it was composed much later, perhaps in the 10th-11th/16th-17th centuries, by an unknown poet probably in India. Only fragments of the work survive; an imitation of Fir-
dawī’s Šahā-nāma and including many materials not in that work, it deals chiefly with Šahriyūr, the great-grandson of Rustam, and his adventures and battles in India.

Mukhtārī’s kasīdas show the influence of earlier Ghaznavīd poets such as Ūsunrī, Farrukhī [g.v.] and Azrākī; many take up topics employed by those poets, or imitate the prosodic scheme of an earlier work (for example, the kasida dedicated to Muham-
mad b. Khatīb echoes Farrukhī’s kasida Sannātīyya as well as a description by Manūchehr of a night journey through frozen deserts). Mukhtārī is known for his use of badi’ and for his many riddling poems (dišāna), as well as his extensive use of description. Many poems reflect the revival by Malik Arslān of Persian festivals such as naurūz and mihrāb, neglected under the Ghurids, and begin with (tashbib), often consisting primarily of an kasida (or an abridged manual, usually condensed from a longer work). Approximately equivalent terms are iḥtisasra (the verbal form in the rhyme has nothing to do with the world of books and their format (Dīwān, ed. Macartney, no. XXX, v. 24). Thus one is probably dealing here with a cultural phenomenon that is limited to the ’Abbāsid period.

The iḥtisas concerns many areas of the cultural activity: belles lettres, religious sciences, history, phi-
losophy (with the sciences) and theology (kalām); in all these iḥṭisas has been used and abused. It is important to note that we are not dealing here with vulgarisation; on the contrary, these abridgments were aimed at an audience of specialists, scholars and educated people. This audience was overwhelmed by a flood of works about everything. Antedating the humanists of the Renaissance, they had a deep desire to know as much as possible in the shortest possible time. This curiosity of the impatient mind led to the appearance of the mukhtasar. The main preoccupation of the authors of these works was didactic. By abridging they relieved the educated readers from all the lengthy discussions, chains of transmitters and endless append-
dices; they offered them the essentials; the specialised work became more accessible. Such is the justification which the authors of the abridgments normally give in their prefaces (see e.g. Rauzl al-akhyar min râbi al-âdrâr, 2; al-Mirī, Mukhtasar raunak al-magājiil, Cairo 1322, 2; al-Suwâysi, Mukhtasar al-faṣâd al-madâhiyya, Cairo 1318, 2). It was Ibn Khaldûn who, more than anyone else, had the ability to evaluate the didactic usefulness of abridgments. According to him, in any scientific discipline there are basic books; since some of these works may contain parts that are too long and prolix,
it is permitted to arrange a new work, in which the original text is abridged, while taking care not to leave out any essential matter (al-Mukhtadīna, iii, 247).

Without denying the priority of the didactic aspect, it is important to consider also the cultural aspect of the abridgments. The perfect man, as conceived in Abbasid society, had to be an adil; as such he had to know something, possibly representative, of every discipline of culture. This necessity is characteristic of other classical societies. Fuhrmann has shed light on the origins and evolution of this phenomenon in Greek and Hellenistic society; he has described how Roman society, with its Hellenistic contemporary, adopted from the Stoics the idea of the perfect man; this ideal became prevalent in the various areas of knowledge. The resort to abridgments had become inevitable (Fuhrmann [see Bibliography, 160 ff.]). It is thus quite probable that the Greek background played a decisive role in this respect. In the fields of philosophy and related sciences, the Arabic abridgments may be seen as a direct continuation of that background (see below).

In Arabic literature the fashion of mukhtasars spread gradually and became ever more evident. In the 2nd-3rd/8th-9th centuries the phenomenon seems to have been rather limited. From the 4th-5th/10th-11th centuries scores of works entitled mukhtasar, talkhis, mukaddimah, and mukhtasar appear in succession with an increasing frequency.

The success of the abridgments appears to be fully justified in light of the services they rendered; by making accessible, to specialists and people of general education alike, works which had been considerably shortened, the mukhtasars enabled their readers to acquire comprehensive knowledge. Eventually the technique became more complex, with the appearance of abridged abridgments. An example from the field of rhetoric is provided by the Miṣbah al-walim by al-Sakkākī (d. 626/1229). First, al-Kazwīnī (d. 739/1338-9) made an abridgment, entitled Talkhis al-mifṭah. At a later stage this abridgment was epitomised by a number of authors, namely in the Mukhtasar al-mukhtasar by Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Ṣāḥib (d. 788/1386), by Ibn Ḥādīmī (d. 919/1513), by al-ʿAyyūsī (d. 983/1478), by al-Tuḥfī (d. 980/1475), Hamza b. Ṭurghād (d. 962/1554) and Parviz al-Rūmī (d. 987/1580). This treatise was the origin of the composition of al-Mabsut of al-Shaybānī (al-Sarakhsi, al-Mabsut, 1, 18 ff.), in the five basic mukhtasars; obviously, they eclipsed the original and are the only ones to be studied.

A similar phenomenon may be discerned in the field of historiography, the mukhtasar in religious sciences. Abridgments have a considerable share in these sciences. They are attested foremost for Kūtānic exegesis (al-Tabarī’s commentary was abridged by Sulaymān b. Ḥalāf al-Tuğjī, d. 473/1081, in the Mukhtasar min tafsīr al-Tabarī, Cairo 1970, etc.), in the corpus of hadith (the Sahīh of al-Bukhārī was epitomised by al-Zubaydī (d. 893/1488), Mukhtasar al-Zubaydī, Cairo 1378/1958, 5, where the author claims to have regrouped the traditions collected by al-Bukhārī by omitting the ābdīs and the repetitions; al-Mustadrak by al-Hākim al-Naysabūrī was epitomised by al-Dhahabī under the title of Tahāl al-mustadrak, Haydārābād 1343-44, Sūfi treatises (e.g. Muḥammad fi istīlāḥāt al-ṣūfīyya, Cairo 1283, of Ibn Ḍarūb and Muḥammad raʿūd al-ra'yāšīn fi maqābīl al-ṣāliḥn by al-Yaḥṣī, Cairo 1302) and theological treatises (e.g. Muḥammad al-mindāghī, Cairo 1374, by al-Dhahabī being an abridgment of Minhāj al-sunnah by Ibn Taimiyah). The process is similar with regard to all schools. In the case of the Hanafīs, for example, it is al-Mabsūṭ, this work was compiled by the kadi Muhammad b. Ḥasan al-Shaybānī (d. 1089/684). This illustrious disciple of the Imam al-Aṣwām assembled there the teachings of his master: fi-nuḥāra ḍama'a l-mabsūṭ li-targhib al-muṣālimin wa-tāstir al-ṣāliḥīm ("[al-Shaybānī] compiled al-Mabsūṭ in order to awaken the desire of the students [to study the doctrine] and to make it easier for them") (al-Sarakhsi, al-Mabsūṭ, Cairo 1331, i, 3-4). This treatise was the origin of the composition of five basic mukhtasars, as shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Al-Mabsūṭ of Al-Shaybānī</th>
<th>Mukhtār 1</th>
<th>Mukhtār 2</th>
<th>Mukhtār 3</th>
<th>Mukhtār 4</th>
<th>Mukhtār 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al-Tābi`i</td>
<td>al-Tahwī (d. 321/933)</td>
<td>al-Kudura (d. 428/1037)</td>
<td>Muḥ. b. Ahmad al-Marwawi (d. 448/1056)</td>
<td>al-Marghūnīn (d. 593/1196)</td>
<td>al-Nasafī (d. 708/1310)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quite rapidly they became the spearhead of the mukhtasar and have come to be called al-Mukhtasar al-khamsa. All of them were the outcome of one precondition: to do away with length and repetitiveness which produced tiresome detailed books of numerous volumes; obviously, they eclipsed the original and are the only ones to be studied. A similar phenomenon may be discerned with
respect to the Malikis, where the Mukhtasar by al-Shaykh al-Khalil b. Ishâk (d. 767/1366) constitutes the terminus ad quem of the chain of abridgments of which the Mudawwana is the beginning (al-Mudawwana al-kubra is the epitome of an original Mudawwana, nicknamed al-Asadiyya because it was composed by Asad b. al-Furâat; see Khalîl al-Djundi, Djaqâfirî al-iklîl, Cairo 1370/1950, i, 4). This first abridgment was followed by the Mukhtasars by Ibn Abî Zayd al-Kayrawânî (d. 386/996), Ibn Abî Zamanayn (d. 390/1000), Abu Zayd al-Barâdî (entitled al-Tahâfûs, the author lived in the 4th/10th century, see al-Dirâsî, 112; al-Târîf bi-îbn Khâldûn, 19, who calls it Mukhtasar al-mudawwana), Ibn `Aṭâ’ Allâh (d. 498/1104-5), Abû Hasan al-Lakhmi (entitled K. al-Tahâfûs, see al-Târîf bi-îbn Khâldûn, 32), Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Rûghî (printed on the margin of the Mudawwana, Cairo 1324) and Muhammad b. `Abd Allâh al-Mâznî (Mukaddima, iii, 10-12, 248; Khalîl al-Djundi, loc. cit.). All these abridgments eclipsed the foremost source of the Malikî school (Mukhtasar al-Shaykh al-Khalil, introd., 6). To gain an idea of the place occupied by these epitomes it is sufficient to consult Ibn Khâldûn’s autobiograph; describing how he studied to become a Malikî kâthî he never mentions the treatise of Ibn Şâhnîn or the Risâlî of Ibn Abî Zayd; yet he did study the mukhtasars of Ibn Hâdîjî and al-Barâdî, respectively.

Soon after the first half of the 4th/10th century negative traits have started to appear in this literary form; this has to do with the appearance of commentaries (ghârîh). The earliest attestation of a ghârîh, and after that of a hâshîyâ (i.e. a supercommentary), is connected with the Sharî’ah: the Mukhtasar of al-Muzanî led to the composition of a commentary in eight volumes by Ibrahim. Ahmad al-Mawwarî (d. 340/951-2) and another, more extensive one, by Ahmad b. Bihrî al-Mawwarî (d. 362/973).

The authors of the commentaries gave very plausible reasons for their enterprise; paradoxically, the commentaries stand in complete contradiction to the mukhtasars. The latter, argue the commentators, are very brief; consequently they tend to be vague; thus a need is felt by scholars and to enlarge them. ’Abd al-Rahmân al-Suhaylî (d. 580/1185) resorted to this explanation in order to justify the compilation of his al-Rauw ul-unuf, a commentary on Ibn Hâshâm’s abridgment of the Sîra. In any event, the conscientious craftsmen mobilised himself for the task, starting from one common point of departure: there is no need whatsoever to revert to the masterpiece of the original work; it is sufficient to explicate the abridgments and to comment on them. This new practice went from bad to worse, since the dimensions of the commentaries surpassed by far the old sources, which had seemed too long. Within a short time the commentaries proliferated: Mukhtasar al-Shaykh al-Khalil and al-Kuduri’s abridgment attracted some 35 hâshîyâs each. In other fields, a similar process took place. Thus the Aljîmâa of Ibn Malik [q.v.] inspired a very large number of commentaries and supercommentaries, see GAL, I, 298-9, GAL S I, 522-5. Furthermore, through a rather strange phenomenon of mimicry these commentaries were transformed into sources, in order to be abridged again.

The evolution of the mukhtasar, with its corollary the hâshîyâ, is significant as a lesson. Starting out from considerations of utility, and even necessity, they became a source of inertia, which hindered considerably the renewal of the classical culture. Being content with epitomising did away with the lengthy repetitive discussions and other features, so indispen-

sible for the maturation of any intellectual discipline. There was no profundity, and superficiality became the order of the day. Furthermore, every abridgment reflects the preoccupations of the period in which it was produced. By working with unchanged patterns, the mukhtasar and the hâshîyâ tied a fair share of the cultural disciplines to fixed horizons during the 3rd/4th/9th-10th centuries. Finally, by definition the abridgment can lead only to negative results: the absence of discussion, the reduction of the various stages of reasoning, and the habit of being content with quoting conclusions have prevented the progress of science. Ibn Khâldûn, in a lucid analysis of the phenomenon, is highly critical of the mukhtasar (Mukaddima, iii, 250-1, section: The great number of abridgments on scholarly subjects is detrimental to the process of instruction). Parallel abridgments, he argues, offer the beginner advanced notions of a certain science before he has reached the ability to understand them. Furthermore, such works are replete with numerous obscurities which result from the concentration of so many ideas and difficulties. Their usefulness is certainly inferior to that of lengthy and more detailed books, whose length and repetitiveness may give the reader a perfect knowledge of a subject. And so, in his view, the student is confronted with a mass of difficulties, which prevent him from acquiring and keeping useful knowledge.

In philosophy and related sciences:

Arabic literature in these fields has been heavily influenced, indeed is dependent, on Greek sources. Already in antiquity there was a tradition of abridgments and epitomes. These took on two forms: epitomes of works of one specific writer and doxographies or compendia that brought together views of various authors on a given subject. The main purpose of the ancient abridgments and compendia was didactic (see Fuhrmann). Early translators of Greek texts into Arabic knew such Greek abridgments (e.g. the doxography of "Ps.-Plutarch", see H. Dailber, Alcius Arabus, Wiesbaden 1980; several of Plato’s dialogues seem to have represented in some ancient abridgment by Galen [see Aflatun, Jialusins]). Al-Farabi must have had these examples in mind when he epitomised Plato’s Laws. However this was not merely a selection; it was rather a shortened and interpretative paraphrase in which Plato’s ideas had been reformulated in Islamic terms (see L. Strauss, How Farabi read Plato’s Laws, in What is political philosophy, Glencoe 1959). It seems that al-Fârâbî did not plan to make systematic compendia of all works of Plato or Aristotle. Al-Fârâbî also wrote a handbook of political philosophy entitled Fusûl musta’s (a work of F. M. Nadjdjar, Beirut 1971, and cf., in the introd., 11, on additional fusûl works by al-Fârâbî).

An older contemporary of al-Fârâbî, the humanist Abû Zayd al-Balkhî (d. 322/934), is said to have written two recensions of a treatise on political philosophy, one short and one long, both entitled Kiât al-Šîûa (Ibn al-Nadîm, Al-Fihrist, ed. Fluegel, 138; cf. F. Rosenthal, in C.E. Bosworth (ed.), The Islamic world from Classical to Modern times: essays in honor of Bernard Lewis, Princeton 1989, 287 ff.; on a grammatical compendium by Abû Zayd see GAS, ix, 189). At the
same time new selections were made of the philosophical systems of the ancients, which were arranged according to topics; a typical example is the Ṣūrat al-kāma by the 4th/10th century philosopher Abū Sulaymān al-Sidjistānī (the original full text is lost, and surviving texts are different recensions of abridgments, some called Mukhtasar, some Muntakhab; see the editions of the latter by A.R. Badawi, Tehran 1974; D.M. Dunlop, The Hague 1979, and cf. J.L. Kraemer, Philosophy in the renaissance of Islam, Leiden 1986). Abridgments were also made of writings of more recent authors such as John Philoponus (see S. Pines, An Arabic summary of a lost work by John Philoponus, in IOS, ii [1972], 320-52). Relevant to the present description is the fact that Ibn Sīnā composed a number of expositions of his philosophy; a conspicuous difference between some of these expositions is in length; one modest volume of al-Naqḍāt (ed. Cairo 1331) is a condensation of the entire philosophical system and scientific knowledge contained in the multi-volume project of al-Shifāʾ (see Ibn Sīnā).

Ibn Rushd composed the most important interpretative abridgments of the Aristotelian œuvre. At the recommendation of the physician-philosopher Abū Bakr Ibn Ṭufayl, an Almohad prince invited Ibn Rushd to compose commentaries in an abbreviated Aristotelian œuvre. The prince's purpose was, according to Ibn Rushd's own evidence, to abridge (yaḥdab bi-akhbār) the works in their Arabic version and make them easier to understand. It was, however, left to Ibn Rushd to decide on the format (al-Marrākūši, al-Muṣā’ab bi-yuḥdūk all al-muhārīb, ed. Cairo, 136-7). He composed commentaries on most of Aristotle's works in three recensions, which are widely known as the "short, middle and long" (the latter is a proper running commentary on the Aristotelian text). The Arabic terms for the first two are qawāmāt and talkhīṣ. The first indicates, according to Ibn Rushd himself, selections from various works of the Stagirite on a specific topic, given mainly in the form of conclusions, and leaving out Aristotle's quotations from earlier authorities and his discussions; instead, Ibn Rushd adds opinions of late commentators and also his own comments (introduced by the phrase akāl). All this is done in a very concise and brief style. The talkhīṣ is mainly a paraphrase of the ideas contained in Aristotle's works, reformulated in the language of Ibn Rushd (introduced by a short verbal quotation from the original, entitled kāl); see Ibn Rushd, Rasā’il: Kitāb al-Samā‘ al-jilātī, Haydarābād 1947, 2, idem, Commentary on Aristotle’s De Generatione et Corrup- tione, Trans. by Moses b. Tibbon, ed. S. Kurland (Corpus Commentariorum Avroesi in Aristotelem, iv/1-2), Cambridge, Mass., 1958, 102, 187-8 (Eng. tr. S. Kurland, 114, 210 n. 3); H. Davidson (tr.), Avroesi’s Middle Commentary on Physicōs Isagoge ... and on Aristotle’s Categories (CACAI, Ua. 1-2), Cambridge, Mass.-Berkeley-Los Angeles 1969, introd., pp. xv-xix; ibn Rushd, On Plato’s Republic, tr. R. Lerner, Cornell 1974, 3, and translator’s introduction; Qāmāl al-Dīn al-Alawi (see Bibl.). Ibn Rushd’s purpose in composing his commentaries in the threefold format was not only didactic; in the "short" compendia he aimed, according to his own testimony, at sif-ting from the Master’s works only those parts which were indispensable for the attainment of human perfection, leaving out all discussions which could cast doubt on the received ideas of Aristotle (pro d. to the compendium on Physics, see A.F. al-Albānī, introd. to Talkhīṣ al-ṣaḥīḥ al-nafs, Cairo 1950, 16; C. Butterworth (tr.), Avroesi’s Middle Commentary on Aristotle’s Categories and De Interpretatione, Princeton 1983, introd., 4-5); it was also aimed at concealing from the non-philosophical public matters which might entangle their correct philosophical convictions (and possibly also their religious faith). The threefold format could thus serve as a gradual introduction into peripatetic philosophy.

Abridgments or compendia of works of the ancients were both translated and written in various fields of science; to quote very few examples: in medicine Hippocrates’ Aphorisms were translated by Hunayn b. Ishāk (d. 873) under the title Fusūl il-burāj (see GAS, iii, 28-9), printed by Tytler, Calcutta 1832; Galen’s commentary on the Fusūl was also translated by Hunayn; this commentary was abridged (talkhīṣ) in its turn and again commented on (see ibid., 30, 343). A medical compendium (mukhtasar) was ascribed to Hippocrates himself (ibid., 42), and to the early author ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb (d. 238/853, ibid., 230). In astronomy, as early an author as al-Farghānī (early 3rd/9th century?) wrote Qawāmāt (a compendium) of ancient astronomy, and Fusūl of Ptolemy’s Magiṣṭā (see GAL, 1, 221, GAL, s1, 393; GAS, vi, 150, and vii, 151 on the compendia by Thābit b. Qurra. On mathematical mukhtasar, see GAS, v, passim.

In Judaeo-Arabic literature.

The use of mukhtasar and related terms is well attested in various fields of cultural activity. However, the facts that while the term mukhtasar was used in an Arabic sense, Judaeo-Arabic literature had become confined mainly to less educated strata of Jewish society [see JUDAEO-ARABIC, iii] limited also the need for abridgments or handbooks.

In Biblical exegesis, the Karaite al-Kiršiṣīnī (fl. in the 930s) found it necessary to write an abridgment of his commentary on the Pentateuch, because the original long version had been too complex for the needs of philosophical discussions (ms. B. L. Or. 2492, fol. 1a). Over a century later the Karaite Abu ʿl-Farājī Ḥurḵān of Jerusalem was asked by a wealthy co-sectarian from Egypt to compose a comprehensive commentary on the Pentateuch on condition that it be more concise (ṣikūra) than the one he was already writing; according to the author’s own words the request originated from eager readers (see M. Kurland, Averroes’》Middle Commentary on Aristotle’s Categories, ii, Cincinnati 1935, 34-5). In linguistics (of Hebrew) there is an evident trend of abridgments. The first Arabic dictionary of Biblical Hebrew was written by the Karaite David b. Abraham al-Fāṣī (middle of the 10th century), entitled Qāmāt al-ṣaḥīḥ. It was abridged at least three times in the course of the 11th century (see the introd. to the ed. of S.L. Skoss, i, New Haven 1956, pp. xxiv-xxv; on abridgments of Arabic dictionaries, already in the 4th/10th century, see e.g. GAS, viii, 55). The 11th century grammatical tract Hīdāyāt al-kārīmī was epitomised twice, first by the anonymous author and later in the Yemen. The abridgement became much more popular than the original (see I. Elidar, Lešonena, [1986], 214-31). The grammatical treatise al-Maḥbūmī by Abu ʿl-Farājī Ḥārūn (early 11th century), was possibly the basis for one compendium or more (M. Steinschneider, Arabische Literatur der Juden, 87-8).

It seems that there was not much activity in com-posing handbooks on legal topics in Judaeo-Arabic. Early codification of Jewish law, even in Muslim countries, was in Aramaic. Nevertheless, the rich literary output of Saadya Gaon (d. 942) contains a number of legal monographs which seem to have been compendia (one of which, on the subject of deposits, is called mukhtasar); the same is true regarding another early codifier in Judaeo-Arabic, Samuel b. Hofni (see
It is noteworthy that the first comprehensive code of Jewish Law, by Isaac al-Fāṣi (d. 1103 in Lucena, Muslim Spain), is in fact an abridgment of the Babylonian Talmud, in which the original order and (Aramaic) text of the legal decisions is left intact, while the discussions are omitted.

This may be an indication that the original order and (Aramaic) text of the legal decisions is left intact, while the discussions are omitted.


MUKRĀ, name of a district and a village south of San'ā in the Yemen, known to the Arab geographers for its mine of carnelian. It is also the name of the mountain chain in al-Sarāt [see qazrāt al-'Arab, 5'ārī, al-Hijāz]. According to Sprenger, there is no reason to identify the Hijārītī tribe of this name with the Muṣṭāqūn of Polēmy, since the latter must be localised in the neighbourhood of Najgrān.


AL-MUKTADI BI-AMR ALLAH, Abu '1-Kasim Abd Allah b. Muhammad, 27th 'Abbāsid caliph (reigned 467-78/1075-94), grandson of the caliph al-Kā'im (d. 467/1075) whom he succeeded. Trying to arrive at a carefully balanced policy between the dogmatic and juridical trends of Sunni Islam—he himself belonged to the Shāfi‘ī madhhab of the traditional Baghdad stamp—he shortly after assuming power brought about in Baghdad a mediation between Hanbalis and Ash‘arīs and later, in 476/1083, he caused the vizieral family of the Banū Qāshīr [q.v.] to be expelled. However, he was unable to prevent the schism which was threatening Sunni Islam, and which seemed unavoidable because of the Saljuq influence pressing upon the religious and political situation in Baghdad [see nizām al-mulk and nizāmiyya] and in 'Irāq, upon the caliphate itself in particular. The real ruler was the Saljuq sultan Malikshāh [q.v.], whose daughter Malik Khātūn (also called Muḥmalak or Māh Malik) became al-Muktadi's wife. While still heir to the throne, al-Muktadi, at the wish of his grandfather al-Kā'im, had been given in marriage to one of Alp Arslān’s [q.v.] daughters. The second marriage, concluded for political reasons after difficult negotiations, took place in Baghdad in 480/1087 in the presence of the bride's parents and of the two viziers, but it did not last long. One of the conditions put forward by the bride's father had been that al-Muktadi should give up his entire harem in favour of the Saljuq princess. In 482/1090, which assured Malik Khātūn freedom, neglected and being disappointed, returned to her parents with her and al-Muktadi's little son Abu 'l-Fadl Dja'far. This favourite grandson of Malikshāh's was to be used as a pawn against al-Muktadi, but this sole 'Abbāsid-Saljuq scion died at the early age of five.

The sultan and his vizier Niẓām al-Mulk, who at first seemed to have preferred a policy of reconciliation and restrained control, in the end strove after eliminating the caliph as an independent factor of power and weakening the latter's dignitaries straightforwardly. Al-Muktadi, in his turn, tried everything to shake off Saljuq influence on the caliphate. But the caliph's freedom of action already had become so circumscribed that he had to resort to intrigues and (quarrels, which poisoned the relations between Baghdad and Isfahan and brought about sad consequences. Baghdad suffered under the occupation policy of the tempestuous and unbalanced Saljuq sultan, and disagreements in Malikshāh's entourage were registered at the caliphal court. They were signs of incipient instability. In 475/1083 al-Muktadi tried to improve the situation in Baghdad by sending an embassy to north-east Persia, led by the esteemed Shāfi‘ī fakih Abu Isḥāk al-Shārāzī, for whom the Nizāmiyya madrasa in Baghdad had been founded; but the result was negligible.

When the sultan, together with his vizier, arrived at Baghdad for the first time—he was to stay there from the beginning of Dhu 'l-Hijja 479 till the middle of Safar 480/March-end of May 1087—it was not easy to arrange an official meeting with the caliph, both parties behaving self-assuredly. The aim and climax of the Saljuq mission was Malikshāh's festive coronation and investiture as sultan by the caliph in Muharram 480/April 1087, the Saljuqids having already been in power for fifteen years. Niẓām al-Mulk, too, was received twice by al-Muktadi and honoured with robes of honour (Čiwaš [q.v.]).

In the winter of 484-5/1091-2 Malikshāh, having chosen Baghdad for his headquarters, paid a second visit to the city but ignored the caliph. His trump card was Abu 'l-Fadl Dja'far, whom he wanted to play against 'Abbāsid interests. He demanded from the
caliph that he should dismiss his eldest son, the future caliph al-Mustazhir [q. v.], as usual in favour of his second son, Djač car. The caliph requested time for reflection. Meanwhile, Malikšah left Baghdad for Isfahān in Rabī‘ 1 485/April 1092, taking the young Djač car with him. Sizeable building plans for the city were to mark out this latest stay.

At the end of the same year 485/1092, Malikšah came to Baghdād for the third time. He now tried to obtain the caliph from the city, instigated by his slave, the Greek slave. The caliph requested time for reflection. Meanwhile, Malikšah left Baghdad for Isfahan in Rabī‘ 1 485/April 1092, taking the young Djač car with him. Sizeable building plans for the city were to mark out this latest stay.
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At the end of the same year 485/1092, Malikšah came to Baghdād for the third time. He now tried to obtain the caliph from the city, instigated by his slave, the Greek slave. The caliph requested time for reflection. Meanwhile, Malikšah left Baghdad for Isfahan in Rabī‘ 1 485/April 1092, taking the young Djač car with him. Sizeable building plans for the city were to mark out this latest stay.
carried off the Black Stone. On the Byzantine frontier, both sides continued their raids with varying fortunes. In 307/920-2, the caliph al-Muktafi b. Muhammad took his army to Bagdād and made an offer of peace and exchange of captives (the fidi' Mu‘nis: see LAMAS-SO), and after two years, peace was definitely concluded; but hostilities very soon broke out again. In 314/925-6, the Byzantines ravaged the district of Malātia, and in the following year they crossed a considerable part of Armenia. After taking several Armenian cities which belonged to the Arabs (316/925-9) and occupying northern Mesopotamia (317/929-30) they took all their gains in 319-20/931-2. In Muharram 317/February 929 a military rebellion broke out in the capital caused by the exasperation of some commanders at al-Muktadīr’s extravagance and recklessness. Al-Muktadir was forced to abdicate, but was brought to a place of safety by Mu‘nis, while the soldiery plundered the palace. His brother Muhammad was summoned to be Commander of the Faithful in the stead with the style al-Kāhīr [g.v.]; but since the chief leader of the rebels, the head of police Nāzūk, could not satisfy the demands of the troops for higher pay, al-Kāhīr was deposed shortly afterwards and al-Muktadir placed on the throne once more. In Bagdād the confusion increased, and in 320/932 the catastrophe came. The enemies of Mu‘nis took up a separate vizierate of their own, and al-Nawbakhtī contrived that Mu’tasim made the caliph that Mu‘nis intended to dethrone him, and when Mu‘nis approached at the head of his army, al-Muktadir was persuaded with great reluctance by his brother Muhammad b. Yākūt [g.v.] to take the field against him; he fell at the beginning of the encounter (27 Ṣawwāl 320/31 October 932). Mu‘nis favoured a son of Abu ‘l-A‘bāb Āḥmad as successor in the caliphate, but the dead ruler’s brother Muhammad al-Kāhīr was now raised to the throne once more, under the influence of Iṣḥāk b. Ismā‘īl al-Nawbakhtī.

Al-Muktadir was the youngest of the ‘Abbāsid caliphs to have achieved the throne, and his 24 years’ reign was the longest which a caliph had thus far enjoyed. His caliphate inaugurated, however, a period of unparalleled impotence and disaster for the central power of the caliphate, contingent with the resurgent strength of the institution during the previous period of al-Muwaffak, al-Mu’tadid and al-Muktadīr. Al-Muktadīr was the choice of ‘Alī b. Muhammad Ibn al-Furāt, whose influence had been growing in the latter part of al-Mu’tadid’s reign and who now became al-Muktadīr’s first vizier, in preference to the older and more experienced prince-poet Ibn al-Mu’tazz, because—as Ibn al-Furāt rightly calculated—al-Muktadīr would prove a nonentity as ruler. In fact, the new caliph remained a voluptuary, dominated by his mother Shāghīb, known as Sayyida, with an expensive and numerous household of slave-girls and eunuchs. In the first years of his reign he contrived to run through the substantial fortune left by his predecessor [cf. AL-MUṬAFI]. Thālib b. Sinān al-Šābī’s verdict (quoted in Mushākhwī, in Eclipse of the ‘Abbadid Caliphate, i, 238-41, tr. v, 267-71) was uncompromisingly severe: that al-Muktadīr wasted over 70 million dinārs on futile and unnecessary expenditure, having inherited 14 million dinārs in the privy treasury (bayt al-mdl al-khdssd).

Whereas al-Mu’tadid and al-Muktadīr each had only two viziers, there were no fewer than fourteen separate vizierates during al-Muktadīr’s caliphate. The holders of this office continued in the main to be long-established vizieral and secretarian families, including the Furāṭīs, Ğār-rāḥīs, Khākāns, Wāhībs and Mahdīlāds, and included able if unscrupulous men like ‘Alī b. Muhammad Ibn al-Furāt and the upright and conscientious ‘Alī b. Ḥṣā Ibn al-Ghārārī [g.v.]. For all the viziers, the dominating problem was the bankruptcy of the treasury, caused by an apparent and not wholly explicable decline in the revenues from the Sawād ʿIrāk and by heavy expenditure on the caliphal household and on the army, above all for its campaigns against the Karmātīs. It was thus the aim of ‘Alī b. Ḥṣā, when he was in power, to curb caliphal expenditure and to endeavour to pacify the Karmātīs by negotiation with them and with subsidies, policies which earned him al-Muktadīr’s opposition and, prompted by the caliphal family, the reputation of being friendly to the Karmātīs henceforth. Throughout the reign in general, in order to pay the troops and to cover the expenses of state from a shrinking tax base, financial expedients such as the farming out of taxes (gāman, see BAYT AL-MAL. II) [e.g. those of Syria and Egypt to the Madhāgarāt family [g.v.]] from the later years of al-Muktadīr] and the granting out of idāt’s [g.v.] or assignments of land and their taxative yield (as were in effect the lands granted to the Sādfīs [g.v.] in ʿAdhārābāyiḏān and Armenia). Moreover, the incessant changes in the vizierate and other leading offices gave great opportunities for the mulcting of fallen and dismissed officials [see MUṢĀDAṬAR].


(K. V. ZETTERSTEN-[C. E. BOSWORTH])

AL-MUKTAFĪ BI-LLĀH, ABū MUḤAMMAD ÂLĪ b. ÂḤMAD, *‘Abbāsid caliph, reigned 289-95/902-8, son of al-Muṭaḍīd and a Turkish slave concubine named Čekē (Arabic Diǧārīk).

In 904-5, he was appointed by his father governor of al-Ra‘i and several towns in the neighbourhood, and five years later he was made governor of Mesopotamia and took up his quarters in the emperor's palace.
al-Rakka. After the death of al-Mu'tadid on 22 Rabi'a II 289/5 April 902, he ascended the throne and at once won the good-will of the people by his liberality, by destroying the plundering operations of the enemy in the capital built by his father, releasing prisoners and restoring confiscated lands. He proved a brave and fearless leader who fought with success against the many enemies of the caliphate. The Karmathis [q.v.] were ravaging Syria; one town after another fell into their hands and Damascus itself was plundered. On 6 Muharram 291/29 November 903, the caliph Muhammad b. Sulayman finally succeeded in inflicting a crushing defeat on them and they scattered in all directions. Muhammad then turned his attention to Egypt, where he put an end to the rule of the Tūlūnids. Many of their followers joined him and after the Tūlūnid Hārūn b. Khumārāwāyhi had been slain, the capital had to surrender (Ṣafār 292/January 905) and ʿĪṣa al-Nūgārī was appointed governor of Egypt. An attempt to restore the Tūlūnids was easily crushed (293/905-6). About this time, the Karmathis again began to be troublesome and at the beginning of the year 294/October-November 906 they attacked the great pilgrim caravan returning from Mecca, massacred the men and carried off the women and children. In Rabīʿ I of the same year/December-January 906-7, they were defeated near al-Kādisiyya by the caliph's troops under Walad Muhammad, son-in-law al-Khızārī. The war with the Byzantines was also vigorously pursued. In 291/903-4, a Greek named Leo who had adopted Islam undertook a number of raids on the Greek coasts with his fleet of 54 ships. The Byzantines, however, had the advantage by land. In 292/904-5, Marāḥsh, al-Maṣṣīja and Tarsūs were taken by the Greek general Andronicus, and in the following year the Byzantines advanced as far as Aleppo. Then the Muslims gained the upper hand, and Andronicus went over to them. Al-Muktafi fell ill, and a power-struggle amongst the chief secretaries and viziers followed (see below); after momentarily rallying, the caliph finally nominated his younger half-brother ʾAḍīr al-Muktadir [q.v.] as his heir, but he died at Baghdad on 12 Dhu'l-Kaʿāda 295/13 August 908.

Al-Muktafi himself merges as a man of sensibility, a gourmet and an appreciator of the verses of poets like Ibn al-Rūmī [q.v.]; although his six-and-a-half years' reign wasракked by warfare, above all by the Karmatī outbreaks, the state remained prosperous; the caliph continued his father's careful financial policies and when he died is said to have left 100 million dirhams in coinage, garments, property, etc.—a full treasury, which his successor was speedily to dissipate. Al-Muktafi was served by two able viziers, al-ʿAskāmī b. ʿUbayd Allāh b. Sulaymān b. Wāhh (289/919/902-4) and, after his death, by al-ʿAbbās b. al-Ḥasan al-Dājūrātī [see al-Dājūrātī?] (291-5/904-8). Al-ʿAskāmī secured a considerable ascendancy over the young caliph, and used it ruthlessly to remove his enemies, beginning with the military commander-in-chief, the mānūd Badr and then the son of al-Muwafqī [q.v.], ʿAbd al-Wahhāb; he gained the honorific of Wāʿl al-Dawla and had his daughter betrothed to one of the caliph's infant sons. He aimed to combat the pro-Shīʿī influence in the Banū ʿl-Furat [see IBN AL-FURĀT], but under al-ʿAbbās b. al-Ḥasan the power in the state of Allābī b. Mūhammad Ibn al-Furat grew. When Al-Muktafi was clearly dying, there arose great scope for intrigue among the chief secretaries, and in particular for ʿAbd al-Wahhāb's preference for an inexperienced and pliable caliph, al-Muṣṭafīr, prevailed over the claims of the older and much more competent prince-poet Ibn al-Muṭṭaz [q.v.], and see also al-ʿAbbās b. al-Ḥasan b. ʿAbd Allāh in EN'.


(R. V. ZETTERSTEN—C. E. Bosworth)
Al-Muktana, Bahá' al-Din, a Druze missionary and author, with his teacher Hamza (b. 'Ali [q.v.]) founder of the theological system of the Druzes [q.v.].

During the lifetime of Hamza he was the fifth of the five supreme dignitaries (šahād) of the Druze hierarchy, with the titles al-Diğnah al-asyr (the Left Wing) and al-Tāli (the Follower). His 'secular' name was Abu l-Hasan 'Ali b. Ahmad al-Sammuki. Of his life practically nothing is known. As Arab historians are silent about him (S. de Sacy, Exposé, ii, 320), his own writings are almost the only source (S.N. Makarem, The Druze faith, 26, identifies him with the well-known Fātimid general and governor 'Ali b. Ahmad al-Dayf, but this identification seems to be unfounded). According to Druze tradition, he was bābt in Alexandria in al-Hākim's [q.v.] time (M. von Oppenheim, Vom Mittelmeer zum Persischen Golf, i, Berlin 1899, 135). In consequence, one must assume that he came to the front after the disappearance of al-Hākim and Hamza. From that time onwards he has had to be the supreme leader of the Druze da'wa; his letters to the communities in Upper Egypt, Syria and Mesopotamia, Persia, the Hijāz, Yemen, Bahrayn and Sind have been preserved in the Druze canon. His activity, however, was not a continuous one and he had even to live for a time in concealment (about the year 17-18 of Hamza, i.e. 425-6 A.H.; see de Sacy, op. cit., ii, 364), whether in Egypt or Syria is not certain (Guys, La nation druze, Paris 1863, 66-8, 119-20; P.K. Hitti, The origins of the Druze people and religion, New York, 1928, reprinted in New York 1986), index; de Sacy, Christianisme arabe, ii, Paris 1826, 67-105 (text) and 191-273 (tr.), by al-Muktana are 9-11 and probably 7; Chr. Seybold, Die Drusenschrift Bābt Alnoqat Waldau'drūn, Das Buch der Punkte und Kreise, Kirchhain N.-L. 1902 (reprinted 1981), p. ix, and 76-9 (Kāb-b al-Bad'ī); J. Khalil and L. Ronzevelle, L'Épitre à Constantin, in MFOB, iii (1909), 493-534; Sami N. Makarem, The Druze faith, Delmar 1974, 25-39; D.R.W. Bryer, The origins of the Druze religion, in Id., iii (1975), 249-7, 259, 262, liii (1976), 18; Nejla M. Abu-Izzeddin, The Druzes. A new study of their history, faith and society, Leiden 1984, 103-12, 127-9. (I. Kratchkowsky-[H. Halm])

Al-Mukurra, al-Mukurra, a kingdom of the mediaeval Sudan. Situated south of Egypt and north of 'Alwa [q.v.], it was formed from the combination of the two Christian Nubian kingdoms of Nobatia and Makuria. The unification date is uncertain, but must have occurred between 690 A.D. and the reign of king Merkurius (696/7 until 710 at least), according to evidence from the Life of Isaak, patriarch of Alexandria 690-2, and from an inscription of Merkurius. The former mentions strife between the kings of Maurotania (Maris [q.v.], i.e. Nobatia) and Makuria, whilst the latter attributes to Merkurius, king of Dongola [q.v.], the capital of Mukurra), the construction of two churches in Nobatia, at Faras and Taifa. In a document almost certainly of king Kyriakos and dated 141/759, the royal title is "Lord of Mukurra and Nubia".

The main connection of Mukurra with the Muslim world was the bakt [q.v.], payment, and there also the ecclesiastical dependence on the patriarchate of Alexandria. Al-Makrizi regarded the bakt as binding on Nubia and慷g to the borders of 'Alwa, i.e. on both Nobatia and Mukurra.
After the attack of King Dawud of Nubia on ʿAydhab in 671/1272, the power and independence of Mukurra was curtailed, and Mamluk interference brought a Muslim king to the throne by 717/1316. Arabic sources generally refer to al-Mukurra as al-Mukurra was curtailed, and Mamluk interference or Dunkula (Dongola), but a Coptic letter [q.v.]

Refers to Nobadia, Makuria, and Alodia as being possible splinter kingdom around Djabal Adda called Djabal Adda as late as 1484. Sources is Nasir (800/1397); but a King Joel of Under his jurisdiction. In the 14th century A.D. the state kept on issuing many decrees throughout the centuries to regulate the system; see, for example, Mülazim, q.v. Mulazim, Mülazim (a. mülazama), an Ottoman administrative certificate of eligibility for office. In the Ottoman guild system, the investing of students, their enrolment, in turn, entitled him to appointment to a (usually young), i.e. a candidate for office, in the mulazim, of an important city such as Istanbul, or the sponsorship of the holder of one of a number of high-ranking posts in the learned hierarchy—for the holders of the high learned posts, each of which was assigned a quota, as an important perquisite and was an important privilege which was hereditary; in the event of a godkii dying without a son, their posts were filled by the seniors among the other 16 men, who were called mülazim.

mulazim, mülazim, Mülazım (a.; Turkish form: mülazım), an Ottoman administrative and military term (e.g. denoting in later times a lieutenant in the army), the most notable use of which was to designate a candidate for office in the Ottoman learned hierarchy (the 'ilmiyeye [q. v.]) whether at the beginning of his career (in which she he was, strictly, a mülazım-neo) or at any later stage when he was awaiting a post; in this last respect, the former usage is by far the more commonly met with in the literature (usually without the addition of neo), since attaining the status of a mülazım, or of mülazama (mülazmet [q. v.]), was an essential step in the qualification of a (usually young) scholar for entry into the learned career. Once a student had completed, or nearly completed, his studies, it was necessary for him to secure the sponsorship of the holder of one of a number of high-ranking posts in the learned hierarchy—for example, the Şeyhülislam [q. v.], the kadi of an important city such as Istanbul, or the müdderris of an important medrese such as one of the Süleymaniye medreses—whose backing would enable him to be enrolled as a mülazım, i.e. a candidate for office, in the register of one of the two kadi 'askers [q. v.], which enrolment, in turn, entitled him to appointment to a vacancy in the learned establishment when one occurred. The right to become a mülazım was often, though not necessarily, earned by the student through performing a service for an established scholar, such as acting as mu'âid or a müdderris or as teşkereci for a kadi 'asker. The investing of students, their own or others', with the right to become mülazims was regarded by the holders of the high learned posts, each of which was assigned a quota, as an important perquisite and was important for office. In the Ottoman guild system, mülazim alluded to the reserves among the 31 men who were under the command of the Inspector over the Guild Affairs, the muhtesib. Of the 31 men, 15 were referred to as the Privileged, godkii, since they held posts by virtue of a dignity for which, see MÜKÜS [see MARS]. MULADI [see MUMALLAD]. MÜLÂZEMET (a. mülazama), an Ottoman administrative certificate of eligibility for office. In the Ottoman guild system, the investing of students, their own or others', with the right to become mülazims was regarded by the holders of the high learned posts, each of which was assigned a quota, as an important perquisite and was...
exercised both at regular intervals (fixed at seven years by Abu 'l-Sucud Efendi [q. v.], who was largely responsible for regularising the practices with respect to mulazim), these occasions being known as naubah (nabl, naubah), and also to mark special occasions such as the accession of a sultan or a famous victory, in which instances they are referred to as resifyr.

When applied conscientiously by all concerned, the procedures for becoming a mulazim provided the Ottoman state with a useful means of control of both the quality and the quantity of the intake into the learned profession, but the system had largely lost its effectiveness in both these respects by the early 12th/18th century.


**MULAZIM** [see NAUBAH] 546

**MULHID (A.), deviator, apostate, heretic, atheist.** The religious meaning of the term is derived from the basic sense of the root l-l-h-d "to incline, to lean, to wantonly, We shall make him taste a painful punishment".

In the Umayyad age, the terms mulhid and ỉlbad were used to denote desertion of the community of the faithful and rebellion against the legitimate caliphs. Mulhid thus appeared as synonymous with haid, rebel, and ỉlhid al-ỉsād, splitter of the ranks of the faithful. ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr [q. v.], who described himself as "the seeker of asylum in the Sacred House (al-ʾāṣid bi ỉl-bayt),", was branded by his Umayyad opponents, with reference to Kurʾān, XXII, 25, as "the deviator (mulhid) in the Sacred Mosque". Umayyad propaganda forged ḥadīṣs of the Prophet concerning the "A man of Kuraysh shall deviate (ylhidhi) in Mecca upon whom half of (God's) punishment of the world will rest (in the hereafter)" and "A man of Kuraysh shall deviate in the Sanctuary of God whose crimes, if weighed against the crimes of mankind and the Dhimm (al-īhākāl), shall preponderate". The ḥadīṣ ascribed to Muhammad "Monopolisation of grain (štikdru al-ʿam) in the Sanctuary constitutes ỉlbad in it", is probably likewise a product of Umayyad anti-Zubayrid propaganda. The supporters of Ibn al-Zubayr were collectively called mulhidun. Conversely, the poet Ǧādiri characterised loyal supporters of the Umayyads as "never being tempted by ỉlbad (wārā hamāmi bi-ỉlḥād)". In the late Umayyad age the poet Rūba described the Kharījī leader al-Dāḥib b. Kays al-Shaybānī as being followed by every mulhid. The Kharījīs, from the other hand, considered the Umayyad authorities as deviators from the right path of Islam, and their poet ʿĪsā al-Ḵuṭṭār said in the time of ʿUbayd Allāh b. Ziyād, "I am wary of meeting my God without having frightened the tyrants and deviators (dhuwā ʿl-ḥadīq wa ʿl-ỉlḥād) in a mighty army".

In the early ʿAbbāsid age, the kalām theologians began to use the term mulhid in the meaning of "heretic, deviator in religious beliefs". Ỉlbad came to signify not so much mere adherence to false religious doctrine as rejection of religion as such, materialist scepticism and atheism. Refutations of the mulhidun were written in the 2nd/8th and 3rd/9th centuries by Muʿtazilī theologians like Dirrā b. ʿAmr, Abu ʿl-Fahd al-Nabhānī, and Abū ʿl-Muṭṭam, by the Murdābī al-Husayn al-Nojādī, and by the Ỉlḥādī al-Ḥaythām al-Ḥaythām. None of these works is extant, but the extant K. al-ʿRadd ʿalla ʿl-mulhidūn by the Zaydī imām al-Ḵāsim b. Ibrāhīm al-Rassī (d. 246/860) clearly portrays the anonymous mulhid as a religious sceptic inclining to atheism (W. Madeleine, Der Imam al-Qāsim Ibn Ibrāhīm, Berlin 1965, 100, 110). Criticism of, and deviant teaching about, the Ỉlḥān in particular was, evidently with reference to Kurʾān, XII, 40, qualified as ỉlḥād. Thus the Muʿtazilī grammarian Kutrub (d. 206/821) wrote a K. al-ʿRadd ʿalla ʿl-mulhidūn fi muṭaḥābīh al- قوله al-Ḥaythām, and al-Dāḥib (d. 255/868-9) composed a K. al-ʿRadd ʿalla man alḥadda fi Kūṭ al-annels. In the 6th/12th century, the Yamanī grammarian and Ḥanafī preacher Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Zabīdī (d. 555/1160) wrote a Radd ʿalla man alḥadda fi ʿl-Kūṭ al-?=.* (Brockelmann, S1, 764), Al-ʿAquārī (d. 324/935-6) discussed in his Makātīb al-mulhidūn cosmological theories of the ancients. He defined the term mulhid as comprising "the muʿātīla (deniers of God's attributes), zanāddi, dualists (gulawwyya), Barāḥīma, and others who repudiate the Creator and deny prophecies of the Lord".

Later the Ismāʿīlī, traditionally described as anti-Ismāʿīlī polemists as crypto-athiests, were charged with Ỉlḥād, at first in eastern Persian territory. The Transoxanian Māturīdī theologian Abu ʿl-Munī al- Nẵngasi (d. 508/1114) wrote a refutation of the Bātiniyya (Ismāʿīlīyya) entitled K. al-ัสida li khuda ỉlāḫaʾ al-ỉlḥād (Shahrastānī, Liere des Religions et des Sectes I, tr. D. Gimaret and G. Monnot, Louvain 1986, 554 n. 34). Al-Shahrastānī (d. 548/1153) noted that the (Nizārī) Ismāʿīlīs in Khurāsān were called the Taʿfīmiyya or Mulhidā (al-Shahrastānī, 147). From the second half of the 6th/12th century, the plural mulḥadā (in early Persian usage mulḥadā) was commonly applied to the Nizārī Ismāʿīlīs everywhere, including Syria. In the Mongol age, European and Chinese travellers brought it as a name of the Nizaris including Syria. In the 19th century, the historian Ahmad Qudwet characterised the ideas of the partisans of the French revolution as ỉlḥād.


In Ottoman usage, mulḥad and ỉlḥād were terms commonly employed to describe subversive doctrines among the Shīʿīs and Sufis. In the 19th century, the historian Ahmad Qudwet characterised the ideas of the partisans of the French revolution as ỉlḥād.


**MULHID** [see MAWLID]

**MULK (A.), royal power,** is used in the Kurʾān with reference to God and to certain pre-Islamic personages, who all appear in the Old Testament, and in the former case is synonymous with muḥākāt; the latter word, however, occurs only four times in the Kurʾān and always with a dependent genitive ( kull ʿalā or al-ʿalā wa ʿl-ʾard) while mulk is used usually absolutely. To God alone belongs mulk over heaven and earth as well as over the judgment. He gives mulk to whom
Mulkiyya (A.), designates, in Arabic, a title to property [see mlrk], but the Turkish form mlkyye, or more precisely iider-i mlkyye, became by roughly the 1830s the customary Ottoman term for civil administration [see ma'mur on "civil officials", me'marin-i mlkyye]. It is not clear exactly when mlkyye acquired this sense. Muhammad Ali's reforms in Egypt may have contributed to this development; he had separate d'vans for civil and military affairs by the 1820s (d'vans-i mlkyye, d'vans-i dhiykyye; Deny, 108, 111-15). Since the term mlkyye has associations with both land ownership and sovereignty, the Istanbul government's generalised use of the term may have reflected civil officials' growing role in provincial administration, a huge new domain on employment for men who had historically served mostly as scribes (knt, kalem efendileri) in Istanbul but were now becoming "civil officials" with a much broader range of roles. When Mahmud II [q.v.] reorganised the central offices as ministries, the new Interior Ministry was at first called the Umur-i Mlkkyye Nezhreti (1251/1836; Lusti, v, 29-31), becoming the Diikyye Nezhreti a year later. As a systematic personnel policy developed for the emerging civil service, however, the nomenclature used to discuss and regulate it made clear that mlkyye referred not to a single ministry, but to the entire civil service (Findley, Bureaucratic Reform, 65-6, 140-7, 194-7, 280-9, 326-33, 364, n. 66).

The term mlkyye acquired another specific association with the founding of the Ottoman School of Civil Administration (Mektebi-i Mlkkyye) in 1859 (Ergin, ii, 495-517, iilka, i-ii, passim). Intended as an institution of higher education, the Mlkkyye became one of the empire's most prestigious schools during the reign of 'Abd al-Hamid II (1876-1909 [q.v.]), was moved to Ankara under the Republic, and has survived as the Faculty of Political Science (Siyal Bilgiler Fakultesi) of Ankara University. For classes graduating under the empire, Mlkkyye graduates' biographies show that some 70% of them served under the Interior Ministry, especially in local administration; most other graduates served in other civil agencies (Findley, Ottoman civil officialdom, 157; iilka, viii, chart opposite p. 164). A major factor in professionalising the Ottoman civil administration, the Mlkkyye greatly improved the "officeless' training; and it became the first Ottoman school to have a student association, as well as an alumni association, which published a significant professional journal, also called Mlkkyye, during the Young Turk period (Findley, op. cit., 158, 243-52). Graduates of the School began to reach the grand vizierate with Ibrahim Hakk Pasja [q.v.] (in office 1909-11; Findley, op. cit., 195-299), and have remained prominent in high office ever since. 'Abd al-Hamid used the school as a way to patronise his non-Turkish Muslim subjects. Non-Turkish Mlkkyye alumni consequently remained politically and intellectually prominent in Ottoman successor states, both Balkan and Middle Eastern, until the mid-20th century (Findley, op. cit., 114-19; iilka, passim; Blake, passim).


MULKA SADRA SHIRAZI, SADR AL-DIN MUHAMMAD b. Ibrahim Kawami Shirazi (ca. 979/80-1571/2 to 1050/1640), known as Mulka Sadra, the leading Iranian Shi'i philosopher of the Safavid period.

After elementary studies in Shiraze, he completed his education in Isfahan, where his teachers included three of the chief thinkers of his day: Mir Muhammad Bakir Astarabadi, the Dkum-i mulkiyye (see AL-DAMAD), Shykh Bahai, and—probably—Mir Abu 'l-Kasim Findiriski [q.v. in Suppl.]. Sadra's subsequent exposition of unorthodox doctrines, notably that of wahdat ul-wujud, which he dealt with in an early work, Tarh al-kasvani (Rahman, Philosophy, 17-18), led to his condemnation and excommunication by some Shi'i 'ulam'. He therefore retired for a lengthy period (variously given as 7, 11 or even 15 years) to a village named Kahak near Kum, where he engaged in contemplative exercises. While in Kahak, he also composed a number of minor works, including the Risla fi l-baqhr and the Risla fi hadith al-aslum.

As a major factor in professionalising the Ottoman civil administration, the Mulkiyye greatly improved the "officelss' training; and it became the first Ottoman school to have a student association, as well as an alumni association, which published a significant professional journal, also called Mulkiyye, during the Young Turk period (Findley, op. cit., 158, 243-52). Graduates of the School began to reach the grand vizierate with Ibrahim HakkPasja [q.v.] (in office 1909-11; Findley, op. cit., 195-299), and have remained prominent in high office ever since. 'Abd al-Hamid used the school as a way to patronise his non-Turkish Muslim subjects. Non-Turkish Mulkiyye alumni consequently remained politically and intellectually prominent in Ottoman successor states, both Balkan and Middle Eastern, until the mid-20th century (Findley, op. cit., 114-19; Canekaya, passim; Blake, passim).


After elementary studies in Shiraze, he completed his education in Isfahan, where his teachers included three of the chief thinkers of his day: Mir Muhammad Bakir Astarabadi, the Dkum-i mulkiyye (see AL-DAMAD), Shykh Bahai, and—probably—Mir Abu 'l-Kasim Findiriski [q.v. in Suppl.]. Sadra's subsequent exposition of unorthodox doctrines, notably that of wahdat ul-wujud, which he dealt with in an early work, Tarh al-kasvani (Rahman, Philosophy, 17-18), led to his condemnation and excommunication by some Shi'i 'ulam'. He therefore retired for a lengthy period (variously given as 7, 11 or even 15 years) to a village named Kahak near Kum, where he engaged in contemplative exercises. While in Kahak, he also composed a number of minor works, including the Risala fi l-baqhr and the Risala fi hadith al-aslum.

As a major factor in professionalising the Ottoman civil administration, the Mulkiyye greatly improved the "officelss' training; and it became the first Ottoman school to have a student association, as well as an alumni association, which published a significant professional journal, also called Mulkiyye, during the Young Turk period (Findley, op. cit., 158, 243-52). Graduates of the School began to reach the grand vizierate with Ibrahim HakkPasja [q.v.] (in office 1909-11; Findley, op. cit., 195-299), and have remained prominent in high office ever since. 'Abd al-Hamid used the school as a way to patronise his non-Turkish Muslim subjects. Non-Turkish Mulkiyye alumni consequently remained politically and intellectually prominent in Ottoman successor states, both Balkan and Middle Eastern, until the mid-20th century (Findley, op. cit., 114-19; Canekaya, passim; Blake, passim).

school, which may be seen as a continuation of the School of Isfahan of Mir Damad and Shaykh-i Bahā', were promulgated after Sadra's death by his pupils, several of whom became noted thinkers in their own right, including Mulla Muhsin Fayd Kāshānī [q.v.] and 'Abd al-Razzāq Lāhīdī. Although Sadra's influence remained limited in the generations after his death, it increased markedly during the 19th century, when his ideas helped inspire a renewed Alhārī tendency within Twelver Shi'a (Morris, Wisdom, Introd., 49). In the modern period, his works have been widely studied in Iran, Europe and America. Although no firm chronology has yet been established for Sadra's writings, it seems clear that the majority were produced during the later part of his life, while teaching in Shīrāz. The most important is al-Hikma al-mu'ta'āliyya fi 'l-'asrār al-akliyya al-arba (generally known as the Asrār), first completed in 1037/1628. This lengthy work is widely regarded in Iran as the most advanced text in the field of mystical philosophy (hikmat). Much shorter but of almost equal popularity are al-Hikma al-`arshiyya, on the knowledge of God and eschatology; the Kitab al-Ma`ṣūr, on ontology; the Majāfīth al-ghayb, on metaphysics, cosmology, and eschatology; al-Shawūhīd al-rubūhiyya, one of his last works, in which he summarises his main teachings; his Shakb Usūl al-Kāfī, a lengthy commentary on part of Kūshy's canonical hadīth collection; and the Sīh, his most important Persian work, in which he attacks the legalistic Usūlī version of Shi'a. All of these works have been extensively studied and commented on in Iran. Most of Sadra's opus has been published in editions of varying quality since the end of the last century.

Mullā Sadra's philosophical system, although highly original, owes a considerable debt to earlier schools of thought, particularly kalām theology. Ismā'īlism, Avicennan metaphysics, Ibn al-Arabi, Ṣūfism in general, the Iḵrājī philosophy of Shīhāb al-Dīn Yahyā Suhrwārdī and the School of Isfahan. To these he adds several original doctrines, notably: (1) the basic reality of existence (wujūd) as against quiddity (māhiyya); (2) the unity of intellect and intelligibles; and (3) the movement of all beings in their being as well as in their qualities (karakat ḡafrātayya), described by Rahman as his "original contribution to Islamic philosophy" (Philosophy, 11).


(M. MacEoin)

Mullān, the name given by the Arabs to the ancient Pangdājī city of Multanah (B.C. L., Historical geography of ancient India, Paris 1954, 112), thought to be Mall of Alexander's historians (Quintus Curtius Rufus, History of Alexander, Cambridge, Mass. 1946, ii, 433).

1. History. Multan was one of the cities conquered by the Arabs during Muhammad b. al-Kāsim's expedition to India in 92-5/711-14. Like the city of Mānsūra [q.v.], Multan became one of the centres of Muslim rule in Western India. Due to the wealth found in it by the early conquerors, Multan was dubbed "opening of the house of gold" (farād bāyt al-ghahab) (al-Baladhuri, Futūh, 175). It seems that the amirs of the city professed until Multan came under Fātimid influence, see below allegiance to the 'Abbāsid caliph, but were practically independent (waw-layla huwa fi tālī‘atī ahad waw-khathabatī li-banī ‘l-Abbāsi) (Ibn Hawkal, 322; cf. al-Iṣṭakhrī, 175). Mullān was at the time of the Muslim conquest the site of an important temple and a centre of Hindu pilgrimage (Ibn Rusta, 136-7 and other geographers). Contrary to Muḥammad b. al-Kāsim's practice in other captured cities (such as Daybulq [q.v.]), the temple was left intact and pilgrims were allowed to perform their rites in it. In return for this policy of toleration, the amīr of Mullān used to receive a considerable portion of the temple's income. Multān is the earliest and the best documented case in which the Hindus were implicitly awarded the status of ṣahabī (Y. Friedmann, The temple of Multan. A note on early Muslim attitudes to idolatry, in IOS, ii [1972], 176-82).
By the end of the 9th century A.D., Fatimid activity began in Sind, and for some time the province was under the influence of Isma Ḭii (al-Mukaddasi, 485). It was one of these, Halam b. Ṣayyābān, who destroyed the temple of Multān in the second half of the 4th/10th century and established a mosque in its stead (for different dates suggested for this event, see S.M. Stern, Ismāʿīlī propaganda and Fatimid rule in Sind, in IC, xxiii [1949], 300-1, and A.H. al-Hamdānī, The beginnings of the Ismāʿīlī daʿwā in Northern India, Cairo 1956, 31; cf. Ismāʿīlī notes, in BSOAS, xii [1947-8], 599-600). Ismāʿīlī influence in Multān received a serious blow when Maḥmūd of Ghāznā invaded the city in the context of his Indian campaigns (in 396/1006 and 401/1010), imprisoned the Ismāʿīlī amīr Abu ʿl-Futūḥ Dāwūd b. Nasr and put some of his followers to the sword (Gardīzī, Zayn al-akḥābār, ed. Hāḥibī, Kābul 1947, 178, 180; al-ʿUṯībī al-Mānīnī, al-Fath al-waḥīli ... yahdi al-Yamīnī, ii, 73-6; M. Ṣāʿīmī, The life and times of Sultan Maḥmūd of Ghāznā, Cambridge 1931, 96-9). However, the Ismāʿīlīs seem to have recovered from this defeat, and when the Ghiyūrī Muʿīz al-Dīn b. Sām conquered the city in 570/1174-5, he is said to have “extracted it from the hands of the Karmaṭīs” (as-dāʾi Karmaṭī Mutlūnū muṣṭafāgār kard) again (Diwān, ed. Tābātābāei, i, 218, tr. Dāhījī). During the first years of the Dihlī Sultanate, Multān was under the sway of Nāṣir al-Dīn Kābāča. However, his position there was weakened by his unsuccessful encounter in 621/1224 with Djalāl al-Dīn Khārāz-šāh (Dīwānayī, ii, 146, tr. Dīwānayī-Boyle, ii, 415) who reached the area while fleeing azar-Shah (Djuwaynī, ii, 146, tr. Djuwaynī). Multān became an integral part of the Dihlī Sultanate [q.v.] (Divān, Tābātābāei-nāsīrī, 173; Muḥammad Maʿṣūm Bakhkārī, Tarjāmāt-ī Maʿṣūmī, Bombay 1938, 36). The history of the city continued to be stormy during the subsequent period. While the heartland of India was spared the fury of the 7th/13th century wave of Mongol invasions, its western fringes suffered from them several times. The area of Multān was attacked by Iltūtmish in 625/1228 and Multān (Djuwastān-i Kardmīt Multānrū mustakhlas hard) was defeated in 643/1245 (Bhakkarī, i, 119). It also suffered from several rebellions and frequent changes of governors.

Following the invasion of India by Timūr in 1398-9, Multān came under the sway of Khāṇ Khān [q.v.], the founder of the short-lived Sayyid dynasty of Dihlī. After the Sayyids’ grip over the area weakened, Multān became the centre of the Langāḥ dynasty, which ruled between 1437 and 1526 (see Hamed ud-Dīn, Multān in the 9th/15th and 10th/16th centuries, in Final of Indian History, xl [1962], 24; and see Hūsāyn Ghāḥ Langāhī and Hūsāyn Ghāḥ Langāhī ii) and successfully defied Lōdī attempts to incorporate Multān into their state. The Langāḥs were defeated in 1526 by the Arghūnīs, who collaborated with the Mughāls and made Multān a dependency of their empire.

After the end of the Sūr interlude in Indo-Muḥāl history, Multān became the capital of an important sābā of the Muḥāl empire (ʿAllāmī, ʿAṯīn-ī Aḵkārī, tr. H.S. Jarrett, Calcutta 1949, ii, 129, 329-48) and enjoyed a long period of stability. It was only in 1752 that Ahmad Shāh Durrānī [q.v.] forced the feeble Muḥāl emperor to cede to him the sābā of Lahore and Multān (J. Sarkan, Fall of the Muḥāl empire, Calcutta 1964, i, 23). The main feature of the follow ing period was the history of Multān as a focal point of warfare between the Sikhs which culminated in the conquest of the city by Ranjīt Sing in 1818 (L. Grīfin, Ranjīt Sing, Oxford 1892, 182 ff.; Khushwant Sing, A history of the Sikhs, Princeton 1963, i, 249-52).

The Sikh rule over Multān was stable until the death of Ranjīt Sing in 1839. Dīwān Sāwān Māl, who ruled Multān between 1821 and 1844, extended his influence over a number of adjacent areas. In 1845, however, the British began their campaign against the disintegrating Sikh state in the Pandjāb. After an assault in Multān on two British officers in 1846, the city was occupied by the British and annexed, with the rest of the province, to their dominions.

Under the British rule, Multān served, at different times, as a divisional or district centre. In Pakistan it has been the capital of a division which includes the districts of Multān, Jhang, Lyallpur and Montgomery. Its population was, in 1951, just under 200,000 (Census of Pakistan 1951. v. Punjab and Bahawalpur states, 58-9). The proverbially inhospitable surroundings of Multān were exemplified in the couplet: “Four are the choice things of Multān: dust, beggars, heat and graveyards” (dār-e zā hāb hād-dāyīnīū Multāngād gārd gārma wa gūrīnīū) (Burnes, Travels, iii, 119).

Bibliography: In addition to sources mentioned in the text, see H.T. Lambriick, Sind. A general introduction, Hyderabad (Sind) 1964, index; U.M. Daudpota, Sind and Multān, in M. Hāḥibī and K.A. Nizāmī (eds.), A comprehensive dictionary of the history of India, Delhi 1970, v, 1166-34; Elliot and Dowson, The history of India, index; Yāḥūt, Muḥāmād al-kuldūn, s.v. Multān; M.A. Pathan, Multān under the Arabs, in IC, xliii (1969), 13-20; V. Minorsky, ed., Marvāzān on China, the Turks and India, London 1942, 36-7 (of the Arabic text), 48-9, 148-9; F. Singh, History of the Punjab (AD 1000-1526), Patiala 1972; index; Ibn Bāṭtūṭa, iii, 118-21; E. Thornton, A history of the countries adjacent to India, London 1844, ii, 59-60; A. Burnes, Travels into Bokhara ..., London 1834, iii, 399-409 (on commerce and industry), iii, 109-21; E.D. Maclagan, Gazetteer of the Multān district. 1901-1902, Lahore 1902 (with valuable ethnographic information); The imperial gazetteer of India, Oxford 1908, xviii, 21-38; Ch. Masson, Narrative of various journeys in Balochistān, Afghanistan and the Punjab, London 1842, i, 395-8; H.B. Edwards, A year on the Punjab frontier, London 1851, ii (a detailed account of the circumstances leading to the British takeover of Multān in 1848-1849); G. Singh, Āḥkārī-ū Laḥavār e Multān, in Proceedings of the Indian Historical Records Commission, xxii (1944), 43-6 (on newsletters concerning the British takeover in 1848-1849); J. Mahājān, Circumstances leading to the annexation of the Punjab, 1846-1849, Allahabad and Karachi 1949; Kazi S. Ahmad, A geography of Pakistan, Karachi 1964, 159; A. Tayyeb, Pakistan. A political geography, London 1966, 176; Population Census of Pakistan 1972: District Census Report Multān, 15. (Y. FRIEDMANN)
mukādā ḍāli, mukādā ḍānī, mukādā ḍānī al-Dīn Zakariyyā (Bahā al-Hakk) (d. 661/1262 or 666/1267 [q. v.]), the base is a massive square chamber left completely plain, and relieved only by the strong projection of a pishtak of full height around the doorway which, like the preceding example, is framed by paired rectangular fillets, and houses successively recessed arches; the octagon of half the height, whose windows with four-centred arches set in shallow panels echo the base. In that of Bahā al-Dīn Zakariyyā, hemispherical dome pierced in a panelled frieze around the base. In that of Bahā Dānā Shāhīd, martyred in 668/1270, the recessed base of the dome is set with repeated small niches. Damage repaired after the siege of 1849. The doorway, affirms its stable proportions, and the blind recessed base of the dome is set with repeated small guldasta at the angles. The structure is completed by an arched drum with an opening on each face, and the third a plain, and relieved only by the strong projection of a rectangular fillet.
perity. Otherwise, the aim of multezims was to get as much out of the peasantry as possible in order to render their businesses profitable. As tax-farming extended to almost every variety of land-holding, it exploited both the land and the peasantry, thereby undermining the preservation of Ottoman sources of revenue. As matters further deteriorated toward the end of the 17th century, a system of life-leases called mulâkâne was introduced; by giving the contractor a life interest in the yield of whatever revenue source he was empowered to tap, this system improved the taxpayer's position relatively until it got beriddled with its own problems.

The lütâzam system was abolished in 1839 as the Tanzimât altered the Ottoman taxation system. Yet it was later reinstated and reformed by laws and regulations promulgated in 1855, 1858, 1861 and 1871. From 1897 onwards the system was gradually phased out and abolished in 1905; the duties of a multezim were then left to cadastral officers.


(M. Ö. GÖÇEK)

MULÜK AL-TAWÂ'IF (A.). 1. In pre-Islamic Persia.

'The kings of the territorial divisions' is the Arabic phrase used by Muslim historians originally for the 'regional rule' of the Parthian or Arsacid period, and afterwards also for the rulers of the principalities which arose on the ruins of the Umayyad empire of al-Andalus. In the 3rd-4th/10th-11th centuries, their information is said to have come from the lost works of Ibn Khurra'dâhîhî, Músâ b. 'Išâ al-Karawî, the melâka of Shîrâz, (Bîrjâhpûr, and Fârs, the âghar al-Pûrs of 'Umar Ksîrâ, the Shâhnama of Fârs, the melâka of Shîrâz, and the Shâhnama of the Sasanian Avesta. Some of this information may go back to a lost Arsacid king list or chronicle. This period lasted from the defeat of Dârâ b. Dârâ by al-Iskandar until the rise of the Sâsânîd dynasty under Ardashîr b. Bâbak. After Dârâ's death, local rulers took over each district and were confirmed or appointed as kings by al-Iskandar, in some accounts at the advice of Aristotle, to keep them divided.

After al-Iskandar the region from the Tigris to the Oxus, in some accounts, extending to al-Yaman, Syria and Egypt was divided among 70 to 100 independent Persian, Aramaean, Arab and Greek rulers (al-Tâ'âli, who gives 513 years for the mulâk al-tawâ'if as 'a religious and political secret' of the Persians that Zoroaster had prophesied in the Avesta that the Persian religion and kingdom would be destroyed after 1,000 years, and that when Ardashîr came to power less than 200 years were left, so he set the death of al-Iskandar at 260 years after al-Iskandar, cutting the duration of the mulâk al-tawâ'if in half, in order to lengthen the duration of his own dynasty. Lewy suggests that the year of Ardashîr's accession (538 S.E.) was changed to 538 years from the appearance of Zoroaster. Since al-Iskandar died 272 years later, that left 266 years for the Avestâ'ânîd dynasty, which number occurs fairly consistently in Islamic sources that depend on the Persian Avesta.

According to al-Ya'kûbî, the mulâk al-tawâ'if were not Madjus [q. v.] but Sâbû'ans who worshipped the sun, moon, fire, and the seven planets, and spoke and wrote Aramaic. Al-Tâ'âli claims that Akgûrûsh recovered the dînâfshî-kûrâîn [see KAWAM] and books on medicine, astronomy, and philosophy that al-Iskandar had taken from Iran. Nearly 70 books, including Kalûla u-wû-bîn [q. v.] and Snûbû'd, are said to have been composed in this period. The prophetic careers of Yahyâ b. Zakariyya and 'Išâ b. Maryam are integrated with Aghsânî history by Muslim historians. The claim that a king called Kharûds attacked Jerusalem to punish the Israelites for killing Yahyâ may reflect the capture of Jerusalem in 4 B.C. by Pacorus, the son of Orodus II, 266 years before the accession of Ardashîr. The version in which Dîdâhrz and Bâgkhân attacked the Israelites for killing Yahyâ may reflect the massacre of the Jews of Seleucia in ca. 40 A.D. during the civil war between Gotarzes and Vardanes. Otherwise, they report that Titus destroyed the Bayt al-Makdis. The image of the mulâk al-tawâ'if as a time of anarchy and cultural decay seems to be late Sasanian propaganda and may have contributed to Şâbid al-Andalusî's commentary on the memoirs of 'Isâ b. al-Mas'ûd, al-Andalus was divided among a number of rulers "all of whom considered the condition was like that of the mulâk al-tawâ'if of the Persians" (see 2. below).

Bibliography: Baladhurî, Futûh, 197; Dinâwarî,
The earliest taifas appear to have emerged by 399/1009 and the invasions of the Almoravids at the end of the century. The late 11th century system of the 5th/11th century they entered upon an era of flourishing development, culturally as well as in other ways, and in a number of states, most notably Seville, was the most successful state in this respect, and eventually came to be that state which more than any other entertained a possibility, although some states, notably Seville, continued to maintain a caliphal fiction and to aim at power beyond their own immediate circumstances. Around forty taifa states are known (see Wasserstein, Rise and fall, 83-99 for lists of states and rulers), of which Toledo, Saragossa and Seville were the most important, ruled respectively by the Dhu ‘l-Nunids, Huidzal and ‘Abbāsids (q.v.). Each of these had a solid economic base in agriculture, and other states, mainly on the eastern coast, had economies based on extensive maritime trade. Many states were simply the products of an energetic local leader and a city not yet dominated by one of its larger neighbours. As the century wore on, in consequence, many of the smaller and weaker states were absorbed by others; Seville was the most successful state in this respect, and eventually came to be that state which more than any other entertained some realistic ambition to reunite the territories in the peninsula formerly subject to the Umayyads.

Ethnically, the taifas were fairly mixed, but some, such as Granada and Málaga, or the small eastern coastal states, as well as Seville, were characterised by the dominance of one particular ethnic group, and the ethnic factor remained significant in taifa politics until mid-century. Thereafter it tended to become attenuated, reflecting the real political and military strengths and concerns of the members of the taifa system. Most of the taifas had minorities of Jews and Christians; though the sizes of these communities, like those of the populations as a whole, can only be guessed at, it seems to have formed relatively small elements in the overall population (about whose size there is no reliable information); the Christians appear to have been declining, both in numbers and in importance. For the Jews, by contrast, the taifa period marked a significant advance. Under the Umayyads the Jews had enjoyed tolerance and some economic well-being; but in the fiscally and politically strong political system of the 5th/11th century they entered upon an era of flourishing development, culturally as well as in other ways, and in a number of states, most notably Granada, Jews also played a variety of roles in government and politics, sometimes as a group, more often through individuals who rose to high office.

Culturally, the taifa period saw al-Andalus come of age. The large number of individual states, each of which sought to emulate the courts of the Umayyads and the Mansūrids of alien race by era of flourishing development, culturally as well as in other ways, and in a number of states, most notably Granada, Jews also played a variety of roles in government and politics, sometimes as a group, more often through individuals who rose to high office.

Furthermore, the taifa period saw al-Andalus come of age. The large number of individual states, each of which sought to emulate the courts of the Umayyads and the Mansūrids of alien race by an era of flourishing development, culturally as well as in other ways, and in a number of states, most notably Granada, Jews also played a variety of roles in government and politics, sometimes as a group, more often through individuals who rose to high office. 

Culturally, the taifa period saw al-Andalus come of age. The large number of individual states, each of which sought to emulate the courts of the Umayyads and the Mansūrids of alien race by an era of flourishing development, culturally as well as in other ways, and in a number of states, most notably Granada, Jews also played a variety of roles in government and politics, sometimes as a group, more often through individuals who rose to high office.
supported the building of a famous water-clock, said to have been taken apart under the later Christian rulers of the city in an attempt to discover its workings. Some rulers devoted considerable energy and resources to the building of mosques, as in Seville, where we have a good deal of information on the religious architectural activity of the dynasty.

On the literary side, the taifas were extremely productive. We possess great amounts of poetry from this period, thanks in part to the great anthologies, both contemporary and later, produced in al-Andalus. The basic study of this material remains that of Cagigas (see Bibli.), the poetry of the last 4Abdādīdīg king of Seville, al-Mu5tamādī [q. v.], has been made the subject of a detailed literary study recently, by Scheindlin, in an attempt to found a sounder understanding of such poetry on literary terms. Much of this poetry is, understandably, a product of the political and social circumstances of the time; thus we have long paragonecs of the most obscure taifa rulers and their courtiers (the Jewish poets, writing in Hebrew, produced much similar, parallel work), and all the other genres of Arabic poetry are represented as well. In the 4azdrādālī and the muwashshāht [q. vv.], the Andalusians broke new ground, introducing strophic structures and also non-classical Arabic linguistic forms, as well as Romance expressions, into the standard repertory of Arabic literary cansons and tastes.

The biographical dictionaries, which provide virtually complete chronological cover for Andalusian history from the conquest right up to the 9th/15th century, show us the integration of the muwalladun into Andalusian society (and probably, in fact, their take-over of it) as well as the range of subjects and individual texts studied and/or available in al-Andalus at this time. On this basis, we can see that al-Andalus enjoyed access to the entire cultural production of the central areas of the Islamic world, and also contributed to it. Scholars, pilgrims and merchants travelled to the East, and returned to maintain and deepen Andalusian contact and integration with the Islamic heartlands.

Despite the internal political divisions, al-Andalus remained culturally and religiously a unity. Malikism remained the norm, with other schools of law represented only in scholarship. Probably the best-known religious scholar (and polemicist) of this time was Ibn Hazm [q. v.] but as a 4āzdhir (and a failed political careerist) he had little real or lasting influence during his own lifetime; his posthumous fame rests mainly on his 4fsdāl, regarded widely though inaccurately as an early study in comparative religion. Scholars and litterateurs moved easily and frequently between rival states and rulers, and culture in general (and scholarship along with it) benefited from the competition between these different patrons. Besides Ibn Hazm, writers of note in this period include the historians Ibn Hayyān [q. v.] and Saādīd [q. v.] of Toledo, as well as the last Zirid ruler of Granada, 4Abd Allah b. Butuggin [q. v.], whose memoirs were discovered fifty years ago by Lévi-Provençal, the religious scholars Ibn 4Abd al-Barr and Abō 4Amr al-Dānī [q. v.], the latter of whom belonged to a veritable school of izardat scholars supported by the “Slav” ruler Mudjaidūn of Denia; the medical scholars of the Ibn Zuhr [q. v.] family, and many others.

By the second half of the 9th/11th century, the taifa system was coming under increased strain. It was being squeezed between the rising power of the Christian states and rulers, and the demands of the Christians grew steadily more burdensome as they became more aware of Muslim weaknesses; their easy takeover of Toledo in 1085 marked a great psychological, as well as military, advance for the Christians because of the city’s significance as the old Visigothic capital, but the city’s fall sent a tremor through al-Andalus, and the taifa rulers turned to the only possible source of salvation, the Almoravids. The latter saw in the taifa rulers dissolute and immoral tyrants, and were not slow to take advantage of their opportunity; in a swift series of campaigns, interrupted by the victory against the Christians at the battle of Sagrajas or Zallāka [q. v.] in 1086, the North Africans made away with the taifa states one by one, destroying Spanish Islamic autonomy but saving the day for Islam in the peninsula.


(D.J. WASSERSTEIN)

MUMAYYIZ [see BALIGH].

MUMIN (A.), denotes (i) one of the names of God (Kur'ān, LIX, 23); (ii) believer.

"Mumin" is the active participle of form IV of the root َمُنَمَ. What a Muslim believer ought to believe, and what "to believe" means, is discussed in the article َمُنَمَ (g.v.).

Hebrew and other Semitic languages closely related to Arabic, possess derivations of the same root َمُنَمَ to express the concepts of faith and trust. It is a matter of speculation whether Arabic took over the meaning of "belief" from one of its cognate languages (and from which one), or whether in Arabic the meaning of religious belief developed independently.

In Kur'ān, LIX, 23, God Himself is called َمُنَمَ; logic compels one to conclude that the original Arabic meaning of "someone who protects, gives safety" is here to be preferred. Similarly, َمُنَمَ in Kur'ān, LIX, 9, ought to be understood as "giving mutual protection and security".

In other Kur'ānic contexts, it is not easy to decide whether َمُنَمَ refers exclusively to those contemporaries of Muhammad who recognised Muhammad as the Messenger of God or whether other monotheists, e.g., the Jews and Yathrib Muslims, were being included. Also, the context of the "Constitution
of Medina”, the famous treaty between Muhammad and the inhabitants of that town, is obscure on this point.

In hadîq texts, mu'min occasionally refers to other varieties of belief than belief in God. These texts use expressions like mu'min bi 'l-kawkab (someone who believes in astrology) and mu'min bi -sr (someone who believes in magic). In fıkhi texts, the term may again include or exclude non-Muslim monotheists. The context, the subject matter and the usage of school of law concerned will have to indicate which of the two is the case.

In contemporary standard Arabic, mu'min may, in Muslim usage and especially in political contexts, almost be the opposite of muslîm. Certainly, the religious opposition in Egypt at the end of the Sâdât era understood the term in this way. This was especially the case where mu'min was used in the honorific formula al -nâbi al-mu'min (“the believing President”). The Sâdât régime gave this title to its leader at the very time when the religious opposition dreamed of a “Muslim ruler”, a hâkim muslîm.

In Arabic texts written by non-Muslims for other non-Muslims, and especially in Christian Arabic, the term occurs as well, in the meaning of “believer”, with the same complexities that are involved in the use of this term in Jewish and Christian writings in other languages than Arabic.

Historians of religion and non-Muslim observers of Islam sometimes discuss the relative importance (to Muslim believers) of “having faith” and “carrying out the precepts of Islam”.

In Islam, orthopraxy is no doubt of greater practical importance than orthodoxy. The question what Islam orders a Muslim believer to believe is of little daily significance when compared to the question what Islam orders a Muslim believer to do. This is reflected by the contents of Muslim religious instruction to children, and by the contents of Muslim religious magazines and journals. It is easily verifiable that the contemporary Muslim religious press devotes more space to the practical consequences of Islam and adherence to its precepts than to the abstractions of faith and doubt. This difference between Islam and Christianity in no way reflects, as an outsider might assume, a weakness on the side of Islam; on the contrary, it may be regarded as its strength.


MU'MIN (Mûmin), Hâkim Muhammad Khân (1215-68/1800-51), Urdu poet, was born into a noble Khâlîmî family noted for its distinguished physicians. As such, his father Hâkim Ghulâm Nabi was personam grata at the Mughal court. The family had been granted a dîjîr [q.v.] which was subsequently appropriated by the East India Company in exchange for a substantial pension. In due course, the poet had a share of it, and he never needed to work for a living. This background of financial independence and social status should be born in mind in judging Mu'min as both a man and a poet.

After sowing his wild oats as a young man, he became a disciple of Sayyid Ahmad of Râz Brêîlî [q.v.], whom he praised in a Dîjîhâd mu'tâṣâbi (Kulliyatî, Brêîlî, 436-8) as a worthy successor of 'Ali, Husayn and Hasan, saying that “the death of unbelievers is his life.” But the poet did not become puritanical, and his religious views did not appear to give any particular colour to his poetry. Unlike Khâdîja Mir Dard [q.v.] (1719-85), whose great granddaughter he married, he is not generally regarded as a mystical poet.

His father saw that he had the broad education befitting a man of his social station—the Islamic sciences, languages (including Persian and Arabic), literature, as well as the family profession, medicine. Mu'min was, by inclination, something of a dilletante, and studied one subject after another, whether scientific or artistic, with no thought of taking up any profession. But when he concentrated on writing, he took pleasure in using the copious specialised vocabulary which he had acquired in such subjects as medicine, mathematics, music, chess and astronomy/astrology, in order to give his poetry a particular flavour of erudition which, when combined with condensation, made some of his verse hard to follow. This has led Muhammad Sadiq (op. cit. in Bibl., 174) to compare him with the 17th-century English poet John Donne.

His mentor in poetry was the second-rate poet Shâh Naṣîr, but he was too independent to tolerate tutelage for long. Indeed, he started to declare himself superior to all other poets, past and present—a somewhat questionable formula—the same thing Ghalîb, who were his contemporaries. His published works include, in Persian, a diwân and a collection of prose: but his fame rests on his Urdu diwân. He was probably too much of a perfectionist to be prolific; nevertheless, his Urdu Kulliyât include examples of most forms—kâddû, mu'tâṣâbi and miscellaneous other genres such as chronograms, enigmas, rubâ'î, mu'tâṣâbi and mu'tâjîm. But he is best known for his ghâzal; and even when he writes in other forms—as, for example, mu'tâṣâbi—there is often a strong ghâzal flavour.

He did not follow the normal road to fame as a poet, sc. the patronage of princes; nor did his pride endear him to other poets. Nevertheless, he attracted numerous pupils. Kahl 'Ali Khân Fâ'îk (op. cit. in Bibl., 125-91) discusses 37 of them. He also mentions a book on prosody (Dîjîhâd -sr) by his grandfather, now lost, if it ever existed. He must have been a good teacher, and he has been called the founder of a “school of poets” (Saksena, op. cit. in Bibl., 150). But to Sadiq, 172, he represents “the most sophisticated and artificial stage in the decline of Urdu poetry.”

Mu’min’s fame did not outlive him, despite some lip-service paid to him for his importance. But in recent years, after a century of neglect, determined efforts have been made by a handful of scholars to revive his fame (see Bibl., works of Dânish and Išlāhî, Fâ’îk, Brêîlî—with what success, it remains to be seen.

Mu’min’s poetry is full of erudition, but restricted in scope, concentrating on love and beauty. His ghâzâls are generally thought to be about earthly love, though not exclusively physical. There is much despair and irony in them. He paints himself as a uniquely gifted man who is badly treated by his beloved, in particular, and by fate in general. Yet his champions see a universality in his poetry. Brêîlî concludes (Shâhîrât, 342) that he is purely a poet of feelings, without depth of thought or philosophy. The poet, he says, expresses human emotions to perfection in his ghâzâls, and despite his limitations, he is unique. Yet even critics favourable to him admit his love of complexity as a weakness on the side of Islam.
than reveal thought". Each example consists of a single verse of two hemistichs, which is almost untranslated and must be paraphrased and extended to give some idea of the meaning. Dānīgh and Išlāhī treat this condensation rather leniently, saying (op. cit., 103) "Mādīḥfīūtī go with his style. Some like them, others do not."

Mu'īn, then, is a controversial figure. The reasons for his neglect can be deduced from the above remarks. However, the reasons given by his champions include considerations unconnected with the quality of his poetry; for example, Muhammad Husayn Azā'īd’s belated inclusion and lukewarm account of him in his Abī-bayātī (Lahore 1297/1880), the poet’s distaste for patronage, scorn for other poets, and excessive boasting. An example of the latter is his placing of his own poetry on a par with the Seven Mu'allātī [q.v.] of pre-Islamic Arabic literature. It must be admitted that he was not the first Urdu poet to indulge in such boasting, but he is usually considered to have overdone it. Perhaps it might have been more easily tolerated had his own poetry had a more immediate appeal.

Mu'īn spent his whole life in Dihīl and seldom left the city. His death was caused by a fall from the upper storey of his house when the roof was being repaired. He died of his injuries some time later, but not before he had demonstrated his skill in astrology by foretelling the date of his demise in a chronogram.

**Bibliography:** Mu'īn’s Urdu poetical Kulliyātīāt were first published, ed. Mawlāwī Karīm al-Dīn, Dīhīl 1262/1846. There were various editions from 1873 onwards, published in Lucknow by the Nawāl Kīḏīrī rīsa, but by the second quarter of the 20th century, copies were hard to come by, before he had demonstrated his skill in astrology by foretelling the date of his demise in a chronogram.

Mu’īn’s Persian works are given on p. 123. For further bibliographical information, see Fā'īk, op. cit. Publication details of Mu’īn’s Persian works are given on p. 123. (J.A. Haywood)

**MU’IMINDS** [see al-MUWAHHIDUN]:

**MU’IMĪYĀ** (thus in Arabic, in Persian mūmīyā‘, from mūm, “wax”, but perhaps of Greek origin). Mumīnātul persica, bitumen, mineral tar, is a solid, black, shining mineral liquid, which trickles from rock-caves. In ancient medicine, it was mainly used against lesions and fractures. It is to be distinguished from the Mumīnātul fitīta var. humana, the bituminous substance of the Egyptian mummies. The Mumīnātul persica, called in Greek μούμια (mumia, “wax”), has entered the Arabic translations of Dioscorides. In the West, mucin (and variants). Mūmīyā‘ was found in Persia in the first place, to a lesser extent in Syria and the Yemen, and also in the Islamic West, i.e. near Cordova, on the Atlantic coast and in the regions of the Moroccan Berber tribes. On the method of extraction, there exists a series of different, but remarkably realistic reports, above all in the works of al-‘Rāzī, al-Bīrūnī, al-Īdīrīsī, al-Suwaydī and al-Anṭākī (see Bibli.). A further variant of these reports, going back in the end to Dioscorides, is found in an anonymous Arabic commentary on Dioscorides, dating from the turn of the 6th/12th century and published recently (see Bibli.). According to this text, there were, in the mountains of the Berber Banū Makīd, rock-caves in which many birds of prey were lodging, consuming their prey there. As a result, bits of meat slip out of their grasp, remain lying around, shrink and in the end decay. In due time, the decayed meat sucks up rainwater, which forces its way through the rock-crevices and trickles out as a kind of squeezed juice (qā‘ara), which gradually solidifies and becomes mūmīyā‘.

Dioscorides reports very little about the healing virtues of the mūmīyā‘, unlike however the Arabs, who attribute to it an extraordinary, many-sided effect. According to the sources (for references, see Bibli.), mūmīyā‘ above all allays pains originating from fractures, sprains, dislocations, lesions and pulled tendons. It is therefore occasionally called dqābārī, “bone-setter” (M. Steinschneider, in WZKM, xii [1898], 6).

It also helped against headaches, migraine, facial dropiness, paralyses, angular strabismus, heart, hiccup (fawākī), suffocation, choking and illnesses of the spleen. Mūmīyā‘ was considered to be the most efficient remedy against coughing up blood, incontinence, trembling and tetanus, disturbances of the stomach and liver, ulcers of the bladder and the urethra (išbīl), against epilepsy and dizziness, dropsy, jaundice, phthisis, skin eruptions (ḥurūd), flatulence, pains due to wind and against poison from scorpion stings. Mūmīyā‘ is mentioned in combination with numerous vegetable drugs which are applied in various preparations (pastes, solutions, tinctures, salves, etc.).

When the Arabs, after the conquest of Egypt, opened up the old tombs and came upon the embalmed bodies, they soon became aware that these had been treated with asphalt (kufr) and in that way had escaped decay. Before this, when a part of the body became ill, a juice was extracted from the corresponding part of a healthy body and used for curing purposes. This procedure now suggested the idea of cutting up embalmed, and therefore undecayed, mummies, mixing the pieces with grain, wine, balm and other ingredients, putting them in vessels, and preparing a juice from this mixture. Since the juice had been extracted from every part of the body of the mummies, it was considered to be effective as a universal medicine against all diseases (see A. Wiedemann, Mūmīn al-’Ilmātī, in Zeitschrift des Vereins für rheinische und westfälische Volkskunde, iii [1906], 1-38, esp. 2-6).

MUMTAZ — MUNADIJRIM

MUMTAZ, BARKHWURDAR B. MAHMUD TURKMAN
FARAHI, a Persian writer, a contemporary of the Safawid Shah Djahdan, often wrote as an astrologer and astronomer, so close were the functions of the two. Often the court astrologer used to observe the stars scientifically and to interpret their movements for the benefit of his master. This is borne out in Isfahan. At a banquet there at his master's house he heard a story which attracted him exceedingly. He wrote it down and it became the foundation of a great collection, the Mahfil-arâd, which contained about 400 stories and consisted of a mukaddima, eight hâsâh and a khâlimâ. Soon afterwards he returned to Farah, spent some time in Harat and Mashhad and then entered the service of the amir Minûthân Khân b. Kârîbah, whose duty it was to defend Darûn and Khâbûdân against raids by the wild nomad tribes. His stay there was disastrous for Mumtaz, since he lost all his goods and chattels and the valuable manuscript of his Mahfil-arâd during a nomad raid; he did not have another copy of it. He resolved, however, to restore the book and wrote down all the stories that he could remember a second time. Thus arose the second version of the Mahfil-arâd, which consists of a mukaddima, five hâsâh and a khâlimâ and has come down to us under the title Mâhûtâb al-kullûb. The book is written in an extremely refined style. The best part; it contains the celebrated story of Zîbâ and Ra'nâ, which is very common in Persia in a simplified form in many editions from the popular presses.


MUMTAM MAHALL, wife of Shâh Djahân, and the lady for whom the Tadj Mahall [q.v. and hind. vii. Architecture] was built. She was the daughter of Abû 'l-Hasan Ashâl Khân, who was Nûr Djahân's brother. Her name was Arджumand Bânu, the title Mumtaz Mahall being conferred on her after Shâh Djahân's accession. She was his favourite wife and bore him fourteen children, seven of whom grew up. She was born in 1001/1593, married in 1021/1612, and died, at Burbânpur in the Deccan, very shortly after the birth of a daughter in 1041/1631. She was reportedly beautiful and amiable, and Shâh Djahân loved her tenderly.

Bibliography: Khâthîr Khân, Munîshâb al-lubâb, i, 459; 'Abd al-Hamid Lâhâwî, Rûdhâb-nâmâ, i, 384; Manucci, Storia del Persia, ed. W. Irvine; Elliot and Dowson, History of India, vii, 27; Indian Magazine (December 1913), 316.

(M. BEVERIDGE)

MUNADIJRIM (a.), active participle of the form III verb nadda “to call”, hence crier, herald.

In the Kur'ân, munadijrîm is used (L, 40/41) for the one who will proclaim the Last Day and give the summons to Judgement, in popular Islam usually identified with the angel Isrâfîl [q.v.]; in another context where one might expect it, the story of Joseph, we find instead mu'addahîm used for Joseph's herald (XII, 70).

In the towns of the pre-modern Islamic world, the munâdir or town crier performed a vital function of communication in an age when there were no newspapers or, if those did tentatively appear, they could only be read by the small, literate section of the populace. Thus in Fâs, the Munâdirs of the town (but not the Jews of the Mâlâkî [q.v.]) had a corps of some 20 town criers under an amîn who acted as disseminators of information; they were not however specifically paid by the Mâhûtân [q.v.] but exercised other callings, e.g. that of undertakers' mates, in order to go along with their daily sustenance (in Fâs avec le Protecteur, Casablanca 1949, 258-9). In mediaeval Cairo, up to E. W. Lane's time, there was a munadîj 'l-Nîl for each quarter, and he went round each day from the rising of the Nile about the time of the summer solstice until it had risen to the level of 16 ghârds or cubits on the Mâyâ [q.v.] or Nilometer (see The manners and customs of the modern Egyptians, ch. xxiv “Periodical public festivals, etc.”). But the ordinary munâdirs of Cairo were agents of the muhâfiz [see nihâs] and had the duty of proclaiming through the streets and markets information about price levels, the state of the coinage, etc. (A. Raymond, Artisans et com-

mercants au Caire au XVIIe siècle, Damascus 1973-4, i, 590); whilst in late 19th century Damascus, a member of the corporation of munâdirs might be hired by the government to give public announcements, or else they could be hired by private individuals to make announcements about lost children, animals, goods, etc., payment being according to results (Muhammad Sa'id al-Kâsimî, Kamius al-sinâ'ti al-shâmîyâl/Dictionnaire des métiers damascains, Paris-The Hague 1960, ii, 471-2, no. 399). Finally, it should be noted that, from al-Djabarti, it appears that the head of a Cairo trade corporation (birf[a see sîwir]) had his own munadîji to act as his official herald and announce the opening and closing of the aÌshdî in Damascus (Raymond, op. cit., ii, 559).

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(C.E. BOWSORTH)

MUNADJAT (a.), the verbal noun of the form III verb nadjâ to whisper, to talk confidentially with someone”, which is used in Kur'ân, L.VIII, 13, in this sense, and in the reciprocal form VI in LVIII, 9, 10, of the murmurs of discontent amongst the Prophet's followers, probably after the Uhud reverse (see Nöêde-Schwally, Q des Gs, i, 212-13).

Munâdîjat becomes, however, a technical term of Muslim piety and mystical experience in the sense of “extempore prayer”, as opposed to the corporate addressing of the deity in the jâliyat (see Hughes, A dictionary of Islam, 420), and of the Sufis' commu-

nication with God; the meanings here were perhaps influ-

enced by Kur'ân, XIX, 53/52, where Moses engages in confidential talk (nâdiyîn) with God on Mount Sinai. In Arabic, the Sufi master al-Djunaîd [q.v.] is said to have composed a K. al-Munâdîjat, which has not survived, as did also Shâhâb al-Dîn al-Suhrawardi [q.v.], whose work is in fact extant (Brockelmann, i, 117) and has come down to us under the title Munk. The manners and customs of the modern Egyptians, ch. xxiv “Periodical public festivals, etc.”). But the ordinary munâdirs of Cairo were agents of the muhâfiz [see nihâs] and had the duty of proclaiming through the streets and markets information about price levels, the state of the coinage, etc. (A. Raymond, Artisans et com-

mercants au Caire au XVIIe siècle, Damascus 1973-4, i, 590); whilst in late 19th century Damascus, a member of the corporation of munâdirs might be hired by the government to give public announcements, or else they could be hired by private individuals to make announcements about lost children, animals, goods, etc., payment being according to results (Muhammad Sa'id al-Kâsimî, Kamius al-sinâ'ti al-shâmîyâl/Dictionnaire des métiers damascains, Paris-The Hague 1960, ii, 471-2, no. 399). Finally, it should be noted that, from al-Djabarti, it appears that the head of a Cairo trade corporation (birf[a see sîwir]) had his own munadîji to act as his official herald and announce the opening and closing of the aÌshdî in Damascus (Raymond, op. cit., ii, 559).

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(C.E. BOWSORTH)

MUNADJIJRIM (a.), active participle from nadjâmîm “to observe the stars and deduce from them the state of the world”. The munâdijim claims to know the lot of humans and their destiny from the positions of the stars. He is the astrologer.

For a long time this noun designated both astrologer and announces, so close were the meanings of the two. Often the court astrologer used to observe the stars scientifically and to interpret their movements for the benefit of his master. This is borne out...
by the fact that, according to Djabir b. Hayyān, "the astrologer must be a mathematician (riyādī); he must have mastery of astronomy (al-hay'yā); this is a part of ʿilm al-nudjūm (the science of the stars or astrology). For ʿilm al-hay'yā (astronomy [q.v.]) is the description of the situation of the state of the sky and what it contains (zīnāt waḍāʾ al-jalāl wa-ma fīh), whereas astrology is the "gift of the planets" (ʿāqūt al-kawākīb) (K. al-Bahgātī, ms. Taqījī, fol. 98a; ms. Cārūllāh, fol. 168b; cited in Sezgin, GĀS, vii, 109).

According to the early Arabic astrologists, astronomy is currently designated by the expression ʾabhām al-nudjūm (Ṭaṣḥīḥprāzīz, Mīṣfāḥ al-saʿāda, Haydarābād, 1328-57/1909-37, i, 307-8) or ʾilm al-ʾabhām Ḥādīdī Khālīd, Kaṣīf, ed. Flügel, Leipzig 1833-58, i, 177 ff.), ʾabhām being, according to this author, a name given, in the category of methods of reasoning, to the process of deducting unknown states (al-ḥaḍīr al-ghaybīyya) from known data which, in this case, are the stars in their movements, position and time. Hence the adjective ʾabhām given to the astrologer who interprets the astrological signs (on the difference between astrology and astronomy, cf. S. Pines, The semantic distinction between the terms astronomy and astrology to al-Birūnī, in Līti, lv (1964), 345-7; M. Ullmann, Die Natur- und Geheimwissenschaften im Islam, 271-8; C. A. Nallino, I re dei secoli, i, 1914, 1-2).

For astronomy, the reader is referred to the art. NUDJUM (ʿILM AL-). We will limit ourselves here to the mention of the functions of the munadjdjm or ʾabhām. The first is to answer the questions (mashīḥ) which are asked by his clients concerning their everyday activities and their outcome. The methods in current use are described in the arts. ʿILĀR, HURūF, KHAṬṬ, MAḤĀMMA (cf. T. Fahd, La divination arabe, 498-97).

The second function is to distinguish the auspicious and inauspicious astrological signs (ʾabhām), the opportune and inopportune hours to take action, the favourable and unfavourable moment for such conduct, all in terms of the sun’s position in the signs of the Zodiac and the moon in the mansions (mawāṣil [q.v.] and the relations which result from them, such as opposition (mukābaḥa [q.v.]), lunar quarter (ṭarībī) and benefic (mukābīlī). As a result of all these observations, the choice is made of the propitious moment for every action to be undertaken [see IKHTIYARAT (ʿILM AL-); and cf. Fahd, Divination, 483-8].

The third function is, at the moment of birth, to study the omens to predict the future of the newborn. This part of astrological lore, called "genethiology" (cf. Fahd, Divination, 480), is the subject of an extensive literature entitled Tahwīl sīnʾ ʿl-mawāṣil, a title rendered in Latin as Revolutiones annorum nativitatum. In short, it is concerned with the art of preparing horoscopes, which, coming from the East, was very successful in the West (cf. F. Carmody, La fortune de l’astrologie arabe en Europe au XVIIe siècle, in Actes del V congreso internacional de filosofía medieval, i, 1979, 607-12).

These three functions of the munadjdjm correspond to the three parts which go to make up astrology, i.e. mashīḥ (interrogations), ikhtiyār (elections) and masāʾil (nativities), which will be the subject of the art. NUDJUM.

The role of the munadjdjm in Arab-Islamic society is very similar to that of the astrologer in mediaeval society in Europe. It is known that the Popes themselves used to consult the astrologer of the pontifical court to choose the day of their coronation, the means of securing the consecration and every important action. There was even a chair of astrology in the Sapientia (cf. C. Bezold, in Boll, Sternglaube und Stern-
Yahya apparently occupied a leading position in the Bayt al-hikma [q.v.] created by al-Ma'mun, where he took the promotion of the interests of the Banu Musa b. Shaker (559) to heart. He is described as a cultivated Persian and as an adherent of the Byzantine ter-

ritory during al-Ma'mun's last campaign in Asia Minor, 215-7/830-2. According to other sources, he died in Aleppo, where he was buried on the cemetery of the Kuraysh.

(3) ABU 'L-HASAN 'ALI (b. 200/815-6) is the first real courtier, a personality with a widening education and many interests, of perfect manners, a great spirit, witty, as good at repartee as capable of adap-
ting himself to the changing moods of the ruler of the time (cf. the description in Qabil's Amali, in Yakuti, Udabai, v. 486-7). He lived partly in Bagdad, partly in Samarra, where he died and was buried in 275/888-
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his father, 'Ali was greatly interested in science and

medicin, as is clear from two works written at his instigation: Kustab b. Lukaa's Kitab fI '1-mudNyal ila 'ilm al-handasa, in the questions-and-answers form [see MA^SA]" wA-^IQAMBA], and Hanun b. Ishak's inven-
tory of Galen's writings. However 'Ali's special inte-
gest was in the hands of 'Abd Allah al-Balkhi [q.v.] is said to have resolved

questions were discussed. He is said to have composed

many learned men of his time. Among his pupils

generously put it at the disposition of users from far

His friend Thabit b. Kurra (Ibn al-Kiftf, Taikh sim 'l-

material, which follows the trend taken by

the Umayyads and the

In a Risdla fi nubuwwat Muhammad, by his son Ahmad, he collected information about poets who had lived in the transition period between the Umayyads and the 3Abbasids (see MUKADDAM). Of this work there exists a short table of contents, and Abu 'l-Faraq al-Isfahani has moreover long extracts from it in his Kitab al-Aghani, which suggests that Yahya in his turn used his father's book on poets men-

though he died at the age of thirty-seven or thirty-
eight, Yahya's younger brother (5) ABU 'ABD ALLAH HAKN (251/865 to 288/901 or to 289/902) was also an esteemed companion at the caliphal court. Of his literary production, which later enjoyed great favour and is said to have served as an example for authors of similar works, such as al-2T^a'I^I^I, al-Bakharzi, al-Hazfri and 'Imad al-Din al-Katib al-Isfahani (Ibn Khallikan, Wafayii, Cairo 1310, ii, 194 ff.; cf. Haddji Khalifa (Kirkbelei), ed. G. Fliegel, ii, 5). The Kitab al-kabib, which is mentioned only once in the sources (Fihrist, i, 144, 7 f.) and which did not reach further than the

poets Bashshar b. Burd, Abu '1-'Atayiya and Abu 'I-Nuwas [q.v.], which are mentioned in the introd-
deal with one of

and directed personally a madjii in which theological

in the articles on Bashshar b. Burd and Abu '1-

other works which the title, Abu 'l-Faraq and Abu '1-


Nothing is known of the dates of life of another brother of Yahya's, (6) ABU 'ISAA AHMAD. He was the author of a Risdla fi nubuwat Muhammad, against which Kustab b. Lukaa engaged in a polemic (Fihrist, i, 295, 10 f.; cf. J. Fick, Neue Materialien zum Fihrist, in ZDMG, xc [1936], 307), and of a Tarikh sin'i 'il^am, fragments of which are preserved by Abu 'I-Fid^a [q.v.] and in Ps. Abu Sulayman al-Man^tik's Siwan al-hikma (see M. Stern, op. cit. in Bibli.).

To the family's fifth generation belonged (7) ABU 'L-HASAN AHMAD (262-327/875-939). Like his father, he was one of the leading representatives of the Mu'tazila in Bagdad, and frequented the court of the caliphs al-Muktafi and al-Radi (d. 322/934). Of the many theological writings which he is said to have composed, only two are known by title. The Kitab al-
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tioned above, against the attacks of Kusta b. Lūkā. In ḥik, Ahmad was a follower of the school of al-Ṭabarī [q. v.] as is shown in two of his writings, the Kitāb al-Mudkhal išā madḥhab al-Ṭabarī wa-nusrat madḥhabih and the Kitāb al-Iṣnaḏ fi 'l-fikh šalā madḥhab al-Ṭabarī. Whether the above-mentioned mention to his father’s Kitāb al-Bāhir (Fihrist, i, 143, 29 ff.) was used by Abu l-Faraj al-Isfahānī at the seven places where he mentions Ahmad as an informant (Kitāb al-Aghānī, iii, 307, 3; v, 174, 5; xii, 380, 5; 380, 5; xiv, 107, 15; cf. Fleischhammer, Hinweise, loc. cit., no. 18), cannot be decided. The glorious past of his family induced him to compose a chronicle, which probably had the title Aḥkār Bani ‘l-Munadjdjim wa-nasabuhum fi ‘l-fikh wa-nāṣabuhum fi nasabuhum fi ‘l-Furs. From the standpoint of literary history, this is worth mentioning because it is one of high}

**Genealogical tree of the Banu ‘l-Munadjdjim**

1. (5) al-Hasan
2. (2) Yahya
3. (3) Ali
4. (4) Yahya
5. (5) Harun
6. (6) Ahmad
7. (7) Ahmad
8. (8) Yusef
9. (9) Ali
10. (10) Harun
11. (11) Hishāb Allah

**Notes to the genealogical tree**

1. Names without a note are found in Fihrist, i, 143-4, and in most of the sources mentioned in the Bibliography.
2. Masʿūd, Murāḏ, viii, 238, 8 = § 3387; perhaps identical with his brother Muḥammad.
3. Only found in a family iṣnad: Aḥānī, x, 133, 17 f.
5. Only found in the nasab of his son Hishāb Allāh.
7. Tahrīḵ Bahgdād, iv, 318, no. 2122; Saṃṣānī, fol. 543b, 11 f.; Yākūṭ, Uḏahā, i, 232 f.; verses in Thaʿalibī, Yatima, iii, 209.
8. Tahrīḵ Bahgdād, xiii, 156, no. 7135; Saṃṣānī, fol. 543v, 13.
9. Tahrīḵ Bahgdād, vii, 390, no. 3925; Saṃṣānī, fol. 543b, 13; verses in Thaʿalibī, Yatima, iii, 209.
10. Tahrīḵ Bahgdād, xiii, 380, no. 6837; Saṃṣānī, fol. 543b, 13.
In the sources, information about the Banu '1-Munadjdjim dry up with two representatives ... (e.g. al-Zamakhsharl, ii, 202, iv, 130) gloss IX, 73, and LXVI, 9, "fight the kuffdr [with the sword] and the

2. In Muslim thought. There is a tendency to mollify some of the Kur²án's severity by stressing the "hypocrite" connotation. None of the Muslim lex-

Bibliography: A survey of the most important members of the family and of their works is found in Fehrist, i, 143-4, see also 275; biographies and notices on individual persons mainly in Tha¹alibi, Yatima; Tha¹ikh Baghdål; Sam¹anim; Yákát, Idbål, Ibn al-Kfí, Tha¹ikh al-Hukama², ed. J. Lipper; Ibn Khákían; Sa²afí, Wáfí; Broekelman, S.I, 225, for no. (4); F. Sezgin, GÁS, i, ii, iii, v, vi, vii, viii, see indices; G. Gabriélí, Nota bibliográfica su Qust¡ ibn Liq¹, in RCAL, Serie Quinta, xxii (1931), 341-82, esp. 365-73; M. Fleischhammer. Die Banu l-Muntasím, eine H,historische Gattung des Islam, in der Gedankenlehre und der Geschichtsschreibung des Islam, Colloque international de Lyon, 1-4 décembre 1969, 229-236; M. Fleischhammer, "Abà d. Ya¥b al-Munadjdjim ( ³ = no. 3), in Magdallat al-Madgýma al'ími al-frák, xxxv/2 (1405/1985), 201-216; idem, Hárín b. Ali al-Munadjdjim ( ³ = no. 5), in op. cit., xxxv/2 (1406/1986), 238-97. (M. Fleischhammer)

MUNADJDJIM BÁSHI [see múnægdjim báshi].

AL-MUNAFIKUN (A.), a term used in the Kur²án. It is the masc. pl. agent of form II of the root n-f-k, and is also the name of sura LXIII.

1. The word munafíkun in the Kur²án. Here it is usually translated into English and French as "hypocrites" and into German as "Verräter" but also "Zweifler" "doubter" or "Wankelmütiger" "waverer". While these connotations are present, the term in the Kur²án is usually stronger and covers a wide semantic range. In LXIII, 3 the munafíkun are apostates (cf. murtadd, zindik [q.e.v.]). The same is the case in IX, 73-87 (especially 74), where along with the kuffdr they will never be forgiven and will be punished by eternal Hell-fire (cf. also IX, 140-5; XLVII, 6; LVII, 13-15; and LIX, 11-17). Qibhad [q.e.v.] is to be waged against them (IX, 73; LXVI, 9) and they are to be killed (IV, 89; XXX, 60). In the rest of the sûra named after them, LIXIII, they are berated in the strongest terms. They are liars (1), obstructors (2), ignoramuses (3), propped-up timbers, the enemy (4), arrogant (5), unforgivable deviants (6), they dissent over levies (7, i.e. infák, cf. also IX, 67, 90-110, especially 99) and as such are held up as an example of how not to contribute to the cause (8, cf. pace Noldeke, Geschichte, i, 209 ult.). They also dissent from fighting (most of the other occurrences, e.g. i, 167; XXX, 12 ff.; LIX, 11 ff.). They even dissented from the cult and established a rival mosque (IX, 107). The munafíkun were clearly dissenters within the umma, whether openly or in secret. They were not joining up to fight and they were not contributing to the cause. The threats against them seem to be deliberately unspecific, perhaps to have as general an effect as possible. The severity of them is slightly muted by occasional statements that repentance is possible (IV, 146; IX, 74; XXX, 29).

2. In Muslim thought. There is a tendency to mollify some of the Kur²án's severity by stressing the "hypocrite" connotation. None of the Muslim lexiconographers relate the etymology of the word to the sense "payment of money", found in the predominant fourth stem of the root, infák, and in the noun nafaka. They link it to the word nafaká "the escape hole of the gerbil" (e.g. Ibn Manzür, s.v. n-f-k; Ibn Durayd, 198 f.) The gerbil enters the burrow through one hole and then goes out secretly from another. The munafík enters Islam from one side but slips out from another. The similar word nafát is used in Kur²án VI, 35, to signify "escape tunnel" (Lane 3036b.c, 1342a), but Ibn Manzür says this is not the source of munafík. Al-Rághib ibn al-Ísriháfi (524) provides a synonym nafádh, and explains that nafát is entering by one door and nafák by another. The term is possibly right way. Al-Tabári's (431) explanation of IX, 98-101, where nafák and infák occur in close proximity, comes close to making an etymological link — hálá²a il-munafíkun ... yunfiçkun níyá².

If the Kur²án refers to the munafíkun in general terms, then subsequent Muslim literature does the opposite. Space permits only a few examples. The leader of the munafík was said to be Abd Allah b. Ubayy [q.e.v.], an ambitious Medinan chief (Síra, 411-13 = 277-9; Watt, 181-7). For instance, he is said to have defended the Jewish Banu Kaynakú against the Prophet (Síra, 546 f. = 363 f. ad Kur²án, V, 51 f.) and defected from Ubud (Síra, 539 = 372; al-Zamakhsharl, ad III, 167). IX, 73 ff. is said to refer to dissidents at the raid on Tabúb (al-Zamakhsharl, ii, 190; Watt, 190), either to ones who held back but were guilty of cowardice against their fellow Medinans (Imám Sháí'í thought on the question is best shown with respect to God's injunction to wage djihad against the munafíkun alongside a general agreement that the Prophet did not fight them (al-Tabári, i, 50-25). One interpretation is that the Prophet fought the kuffar and Allah fought the munafík (Kohlerberg, 70) especially at Síffín (Ibn Muzámål, 489, 7 ff.) Another, attributed to al-Hanási, is that djihad is the implementation of God's punishments, ûkhmat al-bulúd, in M. F. al-Zamakhsharl, al-Dhikr al-Hdri, ii, 153 ff. (cf. also al-Zamakhsharl, ii, 202). Others, like some Sunnis (e.g. al-Zamakhsharl, ii, 202, iv, 130) gloss IX, 73, and LXVI, 9, "fight the kuffar [with the sword] and the
munafikun [with argument]. Yet others adduce the Imam’s (Allah’s?) *tafsir* of “munafikun” (al-Tabarsi, iii, 388, 14; Kohlberg, 78). Al-Kummî understood the *munafikun* to be the first three caliphs (Nöldeke, Geschichte, ii, 180). Shi’î doctrine is also famous regarding cases of danger or duress, when they sanction a form of hypocrisy or precautionary dissimulation, *taqiyâ* [q. v.] (Kur’ân, XVI, 106; al-Tabarsi, iii, 388, 14; Kohlberg, 78).

The Khawârij discuss *nîfâk* in the context of relations with non-Khawârij. For example, the Nadjiad (q. v.) are said to have classified quietist Khawârij, i.e. those who stayed among the non-Khawârij instead of making a *hijra* to a Khawârij camp, as *munafikun* (al-Aghârî, 91), and Sâli’î b. Dhakwân appears to classify non-Khawârij as *munafikun*; one may intermarry with them and inherit from them because the Muslims in the time of the Prophet did so with the *munafikun* (Hinds, *Xenex*, 159-160, 189; cf. Cook, 89, 96, 199, n. 71).

*Åkhâm al-Kurâni* authors dwell mostly on the “hypocrite” idea and tend to centre their discussions on sūra II, 8-20, where the word *munafikun* does not actually appear, but where hypocrisy is severely attacked. There are two senses (II, 8-9) of the word closely linked to *nîfâk* by al-Tirmidhi (18 f., 20). For the Shi’îs’ school, al-Kiyâ al-Harâsî (i, 7) points out that Muslims have not been commanded to kill *munafikun*, despite the fact that they are worse than *kuffîr* because they occupy the lowest Hell (Kur’ân, IV, 145; cf. also al-Râghîb al-Isfahânî, 524; al-Bayhâkî, iii, 293 ff.).

The Hânâfi al-Dâjâs concurs (29). Similarly, the Mâlikî Ibn al-‘Abî (i, 11 f.) maintains that the Prophet did not kill them although he knew who most of them were. Rather like al-mu’ulafa kulubuhum [q. v.], who were given money, they were not killed so that they might be won over.

In the hadîth literature, there are many traditions to be found about *nîfâk*. Aside from those directly related to the Kurâni, perhaps the most widespread one is “The signs of hypocrisy are three” (Wensinck et alii, 523-7). Sîfî writes naturally dwell more on the devotional approach to *nîfâk*. *Nîfâk* is the opposite of *wifâk* “harmony”, whose essence is *nîfâ* “contentment” (al-Hudjwîrî, 89) not *riyâ* “ostentation”. Ibn ʿAbî’s tafsîr of LXIII certainly mentions “Abd Allâh b. Ubayy (ad verse 8), but dwells more on ideas like “the *munafikun* are those who vacillate. They are attracted by an instinctive openness to the light of Imâm but then by an openness to *ka’f*, acquired by them because of the [deceptive] permanence of natural forms ...” (160 f.).

3. Western discussion of the term. This mainly concerns the etymology of the word and the dating of its various contexts (notably Nöldeke). Whether sârat al-munafikun itself is Medinan or Meccan, for instance, is not decided (Blachère, 1000; Bell, 581; Rahman, 158-61; Nöldeke, Geschichte, i, 209 n. 2). The etymology adopted by Nöldeke (Geschichte, i, 88, n. 5; Neue Beiträge, 48) and most scholars after him (see Jeffery, 272) up to the present day (Rodinson, 184; Paret, 85) is that the word is a borrowing from Ethiopic. The usage of the Ethiopic word “heteric, sceptic, doubter, waverer” (Dillmann, 710 ff., esp. 712) is certainly close to the totality of Kurânic references, but Nöldeke’s conclusion (in the *Majdzârâc*, 7, 9) are untranslated from the Arabic. There is always the possibility therefore that the borrowing could have been the other way (cf. Leslau, e.g., 167). Serjeant proposes an inner-Arabic etymology from nafak “a levy”. Originally the third stem derivative was a label for those who were pressing their levies. (“Bad grace”) (Q. 14) or reluctance (BSOAS, 11). It then took on the more religious connotation. This view is connected with Serjeant’s analysis of “the constitution of Medina.” Watt also proposes an inner-Arabic etymology, partly following the lexicographers, and suggests that “Creepers” or “Moles” might best capture the original meaning (Watt, 184).

4. Conclusion. It may be said that the English word “hypocrite” most closely fits post-Kurâni Muslim usage of munâfik, but the English word that comes nearest to munâfik in its totality of use in the Kurâni is “dissenter.” Dissent can be secret or public, and in English also carries the historical connotation of religious schism (OED, s. v.). “Dissent” would also concur with the usage of the common Semitic root n-f-k, principally attested in Aramaic, which has the basic connotation of “issuing going out” (Jastrow, s. v.). Dissenting, paying money and escaping from holes are all specialised Arabic aspects of this basic meaning.

**Bibliography:** 1. Sources. Ibn Hîjiâm, *Sîra*, ed. F. Wüstenfeld, Göttingen 1859, tr. A. Guillaume, *The Life of Muhammad*, Oxford 1955; Hinds, *Xenex*, Cambridge University Library, Or. 1402 (2 vols., 1892); Nöldeke, *Neue Beiträge*, Leipzig 1909; idem, Der Koran: Kommentar und Interpretation (AL MUNAKHKHAL AL YASHKURI, the name given to a pre-Islamic poet whose personality is hard to define, in so far as his historical existence is

**AMUNAHADA** [see MUKHARADJA]

**AL-MUNAKHKHAL AL-YASHKURI**, the name given to a pre-Islamic poet whose personality is hard to define, in so far as his historical existence is
not actually in doubt. His father is called al-Harith, Masud, Ubayd and even ʿAmr, and he does not appear in the genealogical table (no. 141) of Ibn al-Kalbī’s Dājamār concerning the Yashkur; two men with the name of al-Munkhakhal are cited in this work (see Register, ii, 428), but neither of them seems to correspond to the poet treated in this present article. Furthermore, one wonders whether the carefulness to explain at any price the allusions to an al-Munakhkhal taken Munakhkhal poetry has not led the philologists to forge a whole romance from the starting-point of a verse of al-Namir b. Tawlāb [q. v.] and from the expression ʿattu yaʿawuba ʿl-Munkhakhal “until al-M. returns”, i.e. “never”, which is found there and which has become a proverbial saying.

According to classical biographers, the poet (whose death Father L. Cheikho placed ca. 597 A.D.) is said to have been a boon companion at Hira of the Lakhmīd ʿAmr b. Hind (d. ca. 568 A.D. [q. v.]), who is said to have put him to death because he had tried, unsuccessfully, to seduce his sister (or daughter) Hind. It is to this woman that one might think that al-Munkhakhal al-Yashkuri’s sole known kasida of any length (32 vv., metre kāmil maṣṣaʿ, rhyme ḥaṭ [q. v.]) is addressed, since in it he calls on a certain Hind for help, in a verse which nevertheless looks as if it might have been invented in order to justify the tradition about his execution said to have been pronounced by ʿAmr b. Hind. What remains of this fairly composite poem, of Bedouin type, illustrates the classic themes: personal glorification, horses, wine, love, women, etc. The poet alludes there to a fatūt with whom he took shelter one rainy day and who was the beautiful Mutaqarrirda, wife of al-Nuʿānī III b. al-Mundhir (d. 602 A.D. [q. v.]), and it is from her that he was said, during the king’s absences. The latter, having surpassed the lovers, punished the guilty man—who had in any case maligneed in his presence his rival al-Nabīgha al-Dhubyāni [q. v.].—the traditions about his fate are divergent: the king is said to have had him killed by a certain ʿIkābī, drowned, buried alive or yet again imprisoned mysteriously in some unknown location (this last detail was perhaps invented in the first place in order to explain the proverbial saying mentioned above). In order to pad out these romantic episodes, the biographers add that al-Munkhakhal, in so far as he ever existed, owes his escape from oblivion to his kasida which gained a lasting fame. It was set to music by Ibrāhīm al-Mawṣilī [q. v.] and was further taken up by several other famous musicians. The other verses attributed to this poet are very scanty in number, and the most commonly cited are those which he is said to have composed just before his death in order to incite his tribe to vengeance.

Bibliography: Aṣmaʾiyā, ed. Hārūn and Shākir, 52-5; Djāḥīz, Bayān, ii, 346-7; Abū Tammān, Ḥamāsā, i, 208-11; Ibn Kutayba, Shīrī, 238-9; Aṭḥāni, ed. Beirut, xi, 13-14, xx, 392, xxi, 3-11; Amīdī, Muʿāṣirī, 178; Manṣūbān; Muʿjam, 387; L. Cheikho, ʿQuraʿa al-Naṣṭānuya, 421-4; Abīkūrūs, Rawdat al-adal, 174-6; Rothstein, Lāḥīmān, Berlin 1899, index; O. Rescher, Abriss, i, 58-9; Blachère, H.LA., 298; Sēzgīn, G.S., ii, 183; A. al-Rabīʿī, Maklīka wa-gardāʿīnī al-Muʿtadharīdā vwa ʿl-Munkhakhal vwa ʿl-Nībīgha, Baghādād 1398/1976 (not seen).

(C. Pellat)
export of locally-produced sugar (see al-Kalkashandi, Subb, v, 218), especially to Genoa.

Bibliography: The chronicles relating to Muslim Spain and Muslim al-Munakkab in the context of the historical events in which the town and the port were involved; for further details, these should be consulted. Besides the works cited, the reader is referred to J. Bosch-Vilà, Los Almorávides, Tetuan 1956, 291; R. Arié, L’Espagne musulmane au temps des Nażids, Paris 1973, index, s.v. Almucefar.

MUNÁSHAFA (a.), lit. reciprocal property-sharing by two co-owners, each of them holding the half of a one and undivided object, signifies a special form of co-ownership in Islamic law which, as equivalent to European condominium in Arabic administrative terminology, historically became particularly important in the juridical, fiscal and administrative organisation of border regions between Islamic and Frankish Crusader states in 12th and 13th century Syria.

Munáshafa as the possibility of co-proprietorship of any kind of possessable object is frequently mentioned in Islamic law compendia and seems to have played an important role especially in agriculture, since the term occurs particularly often in munáshafa treaties, where its implications as to the manner of harvest-sharing and the right of succession are discussed (e.g. al-Sarakhsi, K. al-Mahsūs, xxiii, 43 ff.). Being probably of pre-Islamic origin, the sharing of revenues early became a possible way to come to terms with non-Muslim communities and lordships. It already plays a role in the Prophet Muhammad’s treaty with the Jews of Khaybar [q.v.]. A second example might be seen in the sharing of the tributes of the island of Cyprus on which Byzantium and the Umayyads agreed in 20/640-9 and 69/688-9.

In the context of Muslim-non-Muslim relations, the expression munásha fa itself, however, does not appear before the 12th century. The first Muslim historian to mention the creation of munásha fī is the Damascene Ibn al-Kalānī (465-555/1073-1160 [q.v.]), the author of the Ḍhayl Ta’amī Ḍimāzū, who gives an account of the sharing by halves of the taxes of several border regions between Muslims and Franks, e.g. in the Djawlān and Hawrān, on several districts in central Syria from 502/1108 onwards, and only a little later also in northern Syria on the frontier between the Norman principality of Antioch and the Salğūk lordship of Aleppo. The specific difference between earlier cases of tax or profit sharing and the Frankish-Muslim munásha fī is that the latter were not merely restricted to the division of tax receipts and other revenues but also implied that administration and jurisdiction were exercised by both sides together. Although historiography reports some 30 cases, it is only from a few bilateral treaties from the second half of the 13th century (included in Mamlūk historiography and kutāb literature) that details of the administration of a munásha fī are known: revenues of taxes, customs, mills, etc., are divided up equally, both sides are obliged to take care of the common property, the compulsory services of the population could be shared, and jurisdiction and police authority could be exercised by mixed commissions.

The raison d'être of a munásha fī was obviously to arrange a compromise on disputed border territories which neither the Frankish nor the Muslim neighbouring states were able to control completely. Although virtually limited by the date of expiration of a peace agreement or sīlah, munásha fī were frequently prolonged. In 587/1191-2 several munásha fī projects helped to bring about terms between the Third Crusade and Salāḥ al-Dīn. In the later 13th century, the establishment of munásha fī became very frequent in the relations between the Mamlūks and the last Frankish petty principalities, and was especially the last step before total annexation by the Muslims.

Although Western sources have no common name for munásha fī, it is not improbable that the form which it took in Syria is due to Frankish influence, for in Europe condominium-like models of Germanic origin (co-seigneurie, pariage) were very frequent at the time. After the fall of the Frankish states in Syria in 1291, this type of munásha fī disappeared; it continued to exist only in the law of private property.

Bibliography: Information can be found in nearly every Arabic chronicle, etc., relevant to Syrian history of the 12th and 13th centuries; Latin and Old French historiography give only a very few indications. See e.g. Kalkashandi, Subb al-dhâkhr, xiv, 31-9, 42-51. For detailed analyses, see J. Richard, Un partage de seigneurie entre Francs et Mamelouks: les «Casaux de Sar», in Syria, xxx (1953), 71-82; P. M. Holt, The treaties of the early Mamlûk Sultans with the Frankish states, in BSOAS, xlili (1990), 67-76; M. A. Köhler, Munâsha fī: Gebietsstiftungen..., in ZDMG, Suppl. vii (1985), 155-65; idem, Alliance und Verträge zwischen fränkischen und islamischen Herrscher in den Vorderen Orient, Berlin-ffb, 1993.

(M.A. Köhler)

MUNÁSHADA (a.), derived from nashāda ‘to search (especially for a stray camel), designates a set form of oath, at the beginning of a prayer of petition, sometimes involving a threat or coercion, directed at God. A certain Abū Sammāl b. Bānū Assad set out once in search of his camel; after a long, vain search, he turned to God, entreating him in these words: amanuka la'ūn lam tawaddkhī tayyab lā ăaštud, ‘I swear if you do not return it to me, I will not worship you’; and he found it. The man was not a saint, so that his success could be attributed to his merits. However, 'Abd Allāh b. Ṭaṭār, a contemporary of the Prophet, known by his kunya of Abū Rayhānā, was renowned for his piety; he once lost a needle and begged God to return it to him: ‘Oh, God, I entreat you (‘Uṣūn ‘ālā-yī), return it to me’. And it appeared to him.

Before Islam, the role of nāḏid was assumed by the kāhin [q.v.]; his voice was compared to the twittering of birds in a hemistich of al-Kutaml (ed. Barth, 2,21). Mysterious whispering is a recognised characteristic of soothsayers (Iṣa’i, viii, 19).

Munâshada survived under Islam; it is expressed in the formula yā rabbi rudda... (Ibn al-Athīr, Uṣūl ad-dhārī, ii, 305, 1,3); a ritual was elaborated with time (Ibn Kutayba, 'Uṣūn al-akhdar, ed. Brockelmann, i, 170). It seems that such appeals were sometimes made in mosques. We read in the Musnad of Ibn Hanbal (ii, 420): ‘...Anyone who hears a man seeking the restoration of a camel (yanshūd) in the mosque, let him say: “May God return it to me”. But mosques were not made for that’.

A saying is attributed to the Prophet: “When some one calls upon God (da'ā), let him not say ‘If you will’; let him ask rather by entreating him (wa 'l-y'azum) and stressing his need” (al-Tirmīdī, ii, 263; Muslim, v, 290; Muwattā, i, 384). “God loves those who are insistent” (al-Ḍāhibī, Bayān, ii, 13, 222).

The pious man obtains a reply to his request: law aksama 'ala 'l-Lāh il-.tabarruth “if only he would entreat God, his prayer would be answered” (cf. ref. and example in Goldthwaite, Zurberversamente, 369 ff.). Even after death, the saints keep the power to force
God's hand. He is entreated in their name. Abu '1-
Hasan al-Shadhili recommended his disciples ... were equivalent (takafu^al-adilld). The principle
of takafu^al-adilld was also adopted in cases in which

Often, however, the loser, in order to save himself
expected and, when the discussion was held before a
contest by way of utterances of approval or discon-
terction of arbitrator. It was executed in the form of ques-
tions were equivalent (takafu^al-adilld). Frequently, in such cases, was also adopted in cases in which

Bibliography: This article is based largely on I.
Goldziher, Zauberelemente im islamischen Geth, in
Orientalische Studien Theodor Noldeke gewidmet, Giessen
1906, i, 304-8, which contains numerous references; (T. Fahd, La divination arabe, Paris 1987,
called Zayn al-Din al-Haddadi al-Munawi al-Kahri al-
Shafi^i, Egyptian religious scholar and mystic.

Al-Munawi is the nisba from the village of Munayt
or Munaw, a locality of Egypt where his ancestors
settled towards the 7th/12th century, coming from
Haddada, a village in Tunisia, hence his first
nisba of al-Haddadi. Al-Munawi was born in Cairo
in 952/1545 and died there in 1031/1621. He came from
a family renowned for its knowledge and piety, his
paternal grandfather being the Shaykh al-Insldm
Shaykh al-Inshad, his father and his two sons were
Muslims and adherents of the Ahl al-Kitdb [q.v.]
as well as between representatives of the different
Muslim denominations. A few records of such
munazara have been preserved. Although these
records, as far as the outcome of the disputes is con-
cerned, were adapted to literary standards, or are
even simply fictitious, they nevertheless provide an
insight in the way the munazara actually took place.
The discussions were held before an audience which
was not however supposed to interfere with the
dispute by way of utterances of approval or discon-
tent. Often the discussion was held in the presence of
a caliph or vizier, who eventually could have the func-
tion of arbitrator. It was executed in the form of qon-
tions and answers [see mas^h, waij^ib, where are
also given the records of the contests which have been
transmitted]. In principle, the more advantageous
role of questioner fell to the challenger, but courtesy
prescribed that the right of questioning was yielded to
the weaker contestant. From the loser, conversion was
expected and, when the discussion was held before a
highly-placed personality, he could be punished.

Then, however, the dispute was held in order to save himself from the affair, used the argument that in such
cases the proofs were equivalent (takafu^al-adilld). The principle
of takafu^al-adilld was also adopted in cases in which

sudab al-su^n^iya, in which he gives the lives of the great
Sufis from Muhammad to his own time; this work is
also known as the TahabkP al-Munaw^i al-^ubha (ed.
Cairo 1318/1900-lf, or 1345/1926). He also wrote
several works, including al-Dama^i al-as^ar min hadi^h al-Nabi al-
awm, which contains more than 30,000 hadi^hs (ed. Cairo 1286/1869-70), Kunal
al-^ubha fi hadi^h khayr al-khail (ed. Cairo 1350/1931-
2) and al-Ibada al-saniyya li 'la^h^i^f al-kudisiyya (ed.
Cairo 1354/1936). There are detailed items of infor-
mations on al-Munawi's works in al-Mubbi's
Khatfa al-^athar, ii, 193-5, 412-16. Al-Munawi's other
son, Zayn al-^Abidin, died in 1022/1613 during his
father's own lifetime; he also had followed the
spiritual way and, as a true Sufi, had devoted his life
to prayer and the adoration of God.

Abd al-Ra^uf, his father and his two sons were
buried in Cairo at the side of the za^wiyah known
till today as the Zawiyat al-Munawi, a building suste-
guished by Zayn al-Khalifa, the third of three in Egyp-
t. —A. MUNAZARA (A.) means the scientific, in par-
ticular the theological-juridical, dispute on the one hand, the literary genre of the struggle for
preeminence on the other.

Theological disputes took place between Muslims and adherents of the Ahl al-Kitdb [q.v.] as well as between representatives of the different Muslim denominations. A few records of such
munazara have been preserved. Although these
records, as far as the outcome of the disputes is con-
cerned, were adapted to literary standards, or are
even simply fictitious, they nevertheless provide an
insight in the way the munazara actually took place.
The discussions were held before an audience which
was not however supposed to interfere with the
dispute by way of utterances of approval or discon-
tent. Often the discussion was held in the presence of
a caliph or vizier, who eventually could have the func-
tion of arbitrator. It was executed in the form of qon-
tions and answers [see mas^h, waij^ib, where are
also given the records of the contests which have been
transmitted]. In principle, the more advantageous
role of questioner fell to the challenger, but courtesy
prescribed that the right of questioning was yielded to
the weaker contestant. From the loser, conversion was
expected and, when the discussion was held before a
highly-placed personality, he could be punished.

Then, however, the dispute was held in order to save himself from the affair, used the argument that in such
cases the proofs were equivalent (takafu^al-adilld). The principle
of takafu^al-adilld was also adopted in cases in which

sudab al-su^n^iya, in which he gives the lives of the great
Sufis from Muhammad to his own time; this work is
also known as the TahabkP al-Munaw^i al-^ubha (ed.
Cairo 1318/1900-lf, or 1345/1926). He also wrote
several works, including al-Dama^i al-as^ar min hadi^h al-Nabi al-
awm, which contains more than 30,000 hadi^hs (ed. Cairo 1286/1869-70), Kunal
al-^ubha fi hadi^h khayr al-khail (ed. Cairo 1350/1931-
2) and al-Ibada al-saniyya li 'la^h^i^f al-kudisiyya (ed.
Cairo 1354/1936). There are detailed items of infor-
mations on al-Munawi's works in al-Mubbi's
Khatfa al-^athar, ii, 193-5, 412-16. Al-Munawi's other
son, Zayn al-^Abidin, died in 1022/1613 during his
father's own lifetime; he also had followed the
spiritual way and, as a true Sufi, had devoted his life
to prayer and the adoration of God.

Abd al-Ra^uf, his father and his two sons were
buried in Cairo at the side of the za^wiyah known
till today as the Zawiyat al-Munawi, a building suste-
guished by Zayn al-Khalifa, the third of three in Egyp-
t. —A. MUNAZARA (A.) means the scientific, in par-
ticular the theological-juridical, dispute on the one hand, the literary genre of the struggle for
preeminence on the other.
conversion or the finding of the truth were no longer at stake, but where it was a case of a rhetorical contest as a means for entertainment.

Besides the scientific dispute, mundzara (synonyms are muṭḥara and muḥdara) indicates, in Arabic and other Islamic languages, also a literary genre in which two or more living or inanimate beings appear talking and competing for the honour which of them possesses the best qualities. The result of the competition depends on the discretion of the poet: a participating poet may declare himself defeated of his own free will, or the rivals may reach an understanding and recognise each other's equivalence. They may, however, also call in an arbiter, who then awards victory to one participant or declares that both, or essentially all, are of equal standing. Finally, there may also surprisingly appear in the end a new competitor who claims victory. The term mundzara may be composed in prose, rhymed prose (ṣ̱ajf) or verse. Often the poet uses the three forms at the same time.

In Arabic literature, a series of earlier forms preceded the fully developed mundzara. They already show the ability of the Arabs for antithesis and their sense of dialectics, which appeared also in the theological mundzarāt. Already in old Arabic poetry, derision of the opponent (ḥūdūq [q.v.]) was often set against self-praise (muṭḥara [q.v.] in the same poem. Such parodies were the fully developed mundzara, which then could again be answered. Thus a whole series of contest-poems (nakādīd [q.v.]) came into being, which were performed before the general public, especially in the Umayyad period. Thus we have already to do with a kind of competition for honour, but there are here still two poets who represent their own interests, and not one poet who simulates the competition of more that one representative of different interests. One might conjecture that the fully developed mundzara were no more than parodies of the nakādīd, in which the composers were joking about the competing poets by representing insignificant objects as talking instead of the latter persons. Such a conjecture would, however, lead to the conclusion that the mundzara took their origin already in the Umayyad period, when the nakādīd were flourishing. This was not the case.

In poetry, a dispute between inanimate beings is found for the first time with the ‘Abbāsīd poet al-‘Abbās b. al-Ahnaf (d. after 193/808 [q.v.]), who makes heart and eye blame one another for the poet’s love (ed. A. al-Khazzadī, Cairo 1945, 45 = no. 79). It is true that we have to do here with a dispute, but it is a matter of blame, not of precedence and dependence. Precedence is at stake in Ibn al-Rūmī’s (d. 283/896 [q.v.]) Tafṣīl al-nardjis al-l-ward (ed. H. Nassār, Cairo 1973-81, 643-4 = no. 470). But here too the mundzara is not yet fully developed, because the objects do not speak themselves, and because the poet immediately takes up position on one side. On the other hand, with the shame of the rose, anthropomorphism is introduced. Several poets composed refutations (muṭḥara) of Ibn al-Rūmī’s Tafṣīl (enumerated in Nassār, 643), but this was done in the form of a real mundzara for the first time by al-Sanawbarī (d. 334/945 [q.v.]) (ed. I. ‘Abbās, Beirut 1970, 498 = App. no. 123). Here the rose talks first in indirect speech, then both the rose and the narcissus in direct speech (cf. G. Schoeler, Arabische Naturlied, Beirut 1974, 204-15, 313-6). Thus the fully developed mundzara is proved to exist in poetry since the 4th/10th century.

In prose, there had originated already in an earlier period, i.e. in the hadīth literature, the so-called ḡaddāl
Next to the *mundzara* between animals, plants and seasons, there were also disputes between cities (the literary continuation of the *fadd* of cities), pen and sword (expressing the conflict between civilians and the military), minerals, scripts, physicians and astrologers, drugs, and, in more recent times, railways and telegraph, donkey and bicycle, as well as tram and bus.

In New Persian literature, the *mundzara* turns up for the first time in the 5th/11th century with Abū Mansur ʿAlī b. Ahmad Asadī (born ca. 1010 [q.v.]; in the article *asāsi* there still is a distinction between two authors, but see J. Rypka, *History of Iranian Literature*, Dordrecht 1968, 164). In five of his panegyrical *kašīdas*, he replaces the *nasīb* [q.v.] with a *mundzara*. The themes treated are day and night, heaven and earth, bow and lance. The connecting motive to the panegyrical part of the *kašīda* consists in calling in the praised one as arbiter, in singing that in his presence there should be peace, etc. (cf. Ye. E. Bertels, *Prose wie manuzare Asadi Tuskougo, in Üenige Zetapisi Institutu Vostokovdenjia Akad. Nauk SSSR*, xix [1958], 55-88). Already present in the Arabic *makāmāt* [q.v.] in a preliminary stage, the *mundzara* penetrates into the Persian *makāmāt* during the 6th/12th century. While the debates in al-Ḥarīrī’s *makāmāt* had not yet been fully-developed *mundzara*, they became so with the Persian poet Ḥamīd al-Dīn Ahmad Hallāqī (d. in the first half of the 9th/15th century). In the Persian context too, the independent *mundzara* was now open to all the literary genres.

In the eastern Turkish world, we have, from the second half of the 5th/11th century, hence more or less contemporary with Asadi, a fragment of a poetical fight between summer and winter (cf. C. Brockelmann, *Altrussische Volkspoesien*, ii, in *Asien Major*, i [1924], 24-44, at 32-4) in Mahmūd al-Kaṭbūšī’s *Kašīda Bandī* (cf. H. Hofman, *Turkish literature*. A bibliographical survey, sect. ii, pt. ii, vol. ii, Utrecht 1969, 92-7) made the narcotic *bandī* [q.v.] fight with wine. The Persian influence is evident from the introduction, in which he says that he wants to treat the theme in the Persian way but in the Turkish language. His *mundzara*, in its turn, was a model for Fudūlī’s [q.v.] *mathnawi* Bang wa-bāda. Yakini (cf. Hofman, *op. laud*. sect. ii, pt. i, vol. vi, 100-3) deals with the fight between arrow and bow, and Ḥamādi (cf. Hofman, *op. laud*. sect. iii, pt. ii, vol. ii, 61-3) with that between stringsed instruments. In the same tradition stands Miḥr ‘Alī b. Nawāʾī’s [q.v.] *Maḥkamat al-lughatayn*, even if it is not a *mundzara* in the proper sense but a proof that *Čaghaṭāy* is equal to Persian. In Central Asia, the *mundzara* has remained a favourite literary genre until the present day.

The Ottoman *mundzara* was apparently influenced by the Central Asian one. This is not only true for Fudūlī but also for Lāmī (d. 938/1531-2 [q.v.]), who was in close relation with Central Asia (cf. E. Bornbaum, *The Ottomans and Central Asian literature*, in *CaJ*, xxv [1976], 157-190, at 166). He treats the theme of spring and winter in epic detail by staging both seasons as kings in armed conflict, which fight not only with words but also with weapons. In the Ottoman
empire, too, the munazara lived on until very recent times.

Poetry dealing with the struggle for precedence did not only exist in the Islamic world but also in many other literatures. In the Ancient East, it was known to the Sumerians and Egyptians, later to the Greeks (σύγγραφοι), to the Romans (confictus) and in the Middle Ages in the West (altercatio). The question arises to what extent the Arabic munazara was influenced by foreign elements on the one hand, and on the other, to what extent it affected literatures outside the Islamic world. Foreign influence upon the munazara is not necessarily to be assumed, because a continuous series of preliminary stages can be shown inside the Arabic world (see above). Yet foreign participation in the development of the genre is not to be excluded either. Because of the distance in time, there is, supposedly, no direct influence from the Ancient Orient, but Persian and Greek may have affected the munazara. From Middle Persian we know the fight for precedence between the dare palm and the goat (drakht i asārī). The text goes back to an oral Persian original, which was probably transmitted orally, still in a Middle Persian version, until after the Arab conquest (cf. E. Benveniste, Le texte du Draxt asārik et la ver- sification pehlevie, in JA cxxiv [1930], 193-225; M. Boyce, Middle Persian literature, in Handbuch der Orientalistik, Abt. 1. Bd. 4. Abschn. 2. Lfg. 1, Leiden 1968, 31-66, at 55). Because of the impressive date, the influ- ence of this version on the Arabic munazara cannot be established with any certainty. As a literary genre, the munazara has certainly not been influenced directly by the Greek synkrēsis, but it may well have been that the practice of the Hellenistic rhetorical schools, in which synkrēsis was a favoured part of the training (cf. F. Focke, Synkrēsis, in Hermes, Iviii [1929], 327-68, at 331), may have had its influence on the theological dispute in Islam (see above). Al-Dāḥiq wanted the fight between the supporters of the dog and the rooster (see above) to be classified as such a dispute. Still in a Persian munazara, the third party, settling the fight, blames the dispute as an "illusion of philosophers".

The fight for precedence in the literature of the Western Middle Ages can easily be traced back to the Greek pattern through the Latin one. However, the Arabic influence on the origin of the Italian contrasti is not to be excluded completely. The first Jew to com- pose in the Middle Ages a fight for precedence was the Spaniard Abraham ben Ezra, who was also active as a translator from Arabic. He died in Rome in 1168. Some fifty years later, the first contrasti appeared, among which was the theme of summer and winter, also treated by Abraham ben Ezra.


AL-MUNDHIR IV, one of the Lakhmids kings of Hira, who reigned ca. 575-580, being the third and last son of al-Mundhir III (ca. 505-54) to rule Hira after his elder brothers, ʿAmr b. Hind (559-64) and Kabūs (569-ca. 574). His accession to the throne of Hira [q.v.] was not smooth. After the death of his elder brother, he was proclaimed king during which a Persian, Suhrāb, ruled Hira for a year. There was opposition to his accession on the part of the population of Hira because of his violence and possibly because of his heathenism. Finally, it was Zayd b. Hammād, the father of the poet ʿAbdī b. ʿZayd [q.v.] who saved the throne for the Lakhmids and con- vinced the people of the Hira to accept al-Mundhir as their king in ca. 575. Not much is known about his reign, but prosopographical data on him are not lack- ing. Two of his wives are known by name; the first was Salmā bint al-Ṣāighīgh, a Jewish woman from Fadak whom the Kalbāl al-Hārith b. Ḥiṣān had cap- tured after a raid on Fadak, and the other was a Chris- tian, Māriya bint al-Ḥārith b. Qulūmān from the tribe of Taym al-Ribāb. He fathered some twelve or more children, none of whom the most important was al- Naʿūmān, the son of Salmā, and al-Aswad the son of Māriya. It was during his reign that the Ghassānīd al- Mundhir captured Hira, set it afire, and freed some Byzantine prisoners. He was succeeded by his son al- Naʿūmān, who reigned as al-Nāʿūmān III [q.v.] for some twenty years, after ʿAbdī b. Zayd secured the throne for him, even as the father Zayd had secured it for al-Mundhir.


AL-MUNDHIR B. MUHAMMAD, Abu ʿl-Ḥa- rām (229-76/844-88), sixth Umayyad amir of Cor- dova and the son of a slave belonging to Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān II. ʿAbd al-Rahmān b.
Marwan al-Djilijli. Five years later (268/882), he besieged Saragossa [see SAARAKUSTA] and seized several places of the Upper March before returning against Ibn Marwân and expelling him from Badajoz. At this time, the famed agitator 'Umar b. Hafsûn (d. 306/918 [q.v.]) had ostensibly submitted to Muhammâd I, but had taken up arms again, and it fell to al-Mundhir to combat him (273/886). The amîr's son invested al-Hâma (Alhama) and repelled a sortie by the rebels, but had to forgo proceeding any further when he received the news of his father's death. He thus returned to Cordova, where he was proclaimed ruler on 3 Rabî'I 273/7 August 886, in circumstances recounted in a dramatic fashion by Ibn al-Abbâr, in the chapter which he devotes to the vizier and commander of Muhammâd I, Hâghâm b. 'Abd al-Âzîz, who was only able with difficulty to read the text of the proclamation. Al-Mundhir retained his father's viziers: Tammâm b. 'Amir al-'Ishâkî and Abû Marwân 'Abd al-Malîk b. Djâwhar, and appointed Hâghâm as hâdî 'l-djamâ' [q.v.]. But his relations with the latter were no longer good and, at Ibn Djâwhar's instigation, he soon had him arrested and executed, confiscating his family's possessions and levying a hefty fine on them.

Al-Mundhir's brief reign was mainly devoted to the war against Ibn Hafsûn, who took advantage of the monarch's death to precipitate a new uprising. The new amîr caused him to be harried, and in the spring of 274/888 himself led an expedition aimed at reducing the rebel's headquarters, Bobastro [see SUBASHTRU in Suppl.]. First of all he besieged Archidona [see URJUDHUNA], whence he succeeded in getting hold of Ibn Hafsûn's representative, nailing him alive on a cross, and then captured the rebels and sent them to Cordova to be crucified there. Then he turned towards Bobastro and became involved in deceptive and misleading negotiations with the rebel leader, who made a show of submission and rejoined the amîr. The hâdî drew up an act of amnesty, and al-Mundhir even sent to Bobastro a hundred and fifty mules in order to load up and bring back all Ibn Hafsûn's possessions, but the latter took flight and seized the command of operations. The new rebel who had led him to turn towards Bobastro directly, fell ill and summoned his brother 'Abd Allâh [q.v.], in order to entrust to him the command of operations and the siege of the place, before dying on 15 Safar 275/29 June 888. 'Abd Allâh, who has been accused of poisoning his brother, waited three days to announce the news and then had the corpse carried back to Cordova, at the same time asking Ibn Hafsûn to allow the funeral cortège passage.

Al-Mundhir had a reputation for intelligence and generosity which contradiacts in large measure the cruelty which he demonstrated on several occasions, he is also said to have been the friend of religious leaders and of literary men.


(CH. PELLAT)

(Al-)MUNDHIR b. SA'ID 569

Abû al-'Amîr al-Hakam al-Nasir (d. 348/960), the renowned vizier of Abd al-Rahman III. On his return to Spain from Egypt, where he publicly corrected the reading of a verse of Madjûnân Laylâ [q.v.] by Abû Djâfar al-Nahhâs, who subsequently refused to lend him, for the purpose of copying, the Kitâb al-'Ayn of al-Khâlid b. Ahmad [q.v.]. He succeeded, however, in acquiring a text, and also made a copy of the Kitâb al-lbrâhîf fi 'llî'idîl al-sultânî of Muhammad b. al-Mundhir al-Naysabûrî. His generosity, as a man of letters, poet and fakhr, speaks for itself, and it was at this stage that he appears to have begun to exercise the duties of a hâdî, probably in the eastern frontier region. In Džumâddî II/March 942, while his brother Fadl Allâh (d. 335/947), who had accompanied him in the East, was appointed to the kadî of Fâbû-al-Bâlijî, he himself became chief kadî of all the frontier regions, with the right of supervising the activity of all the kadîs and tax officials within the scope of his jurisdiction; he was also charged with the control of travellers arriving from abroad. Ibn Khâlûdîn (Muku'ddîma i, 400, tr. Slane, i, 452) is the only author to mention him as an example of a kadî placed in command of the troops who set out every year to do battle with the Christians. The exact date of his transfer to the kadî of Madinat al-Zahârâ' [q.v.] is not known, but he was probably occupying this post when there occurred, in 338/949, an incident to which his biographers attach the utmost significance. He was present at the court of Abd al-Rahmân III al-Nâsîr during the reception for an ambassador from Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, in the course of which Abû 'Ali al-Kâlî [q.v.], whom the crown-prince al-Hakam had brought from Baghad and who enjoyed his protection, was supposed to make a speech praising the caliph and stressing the prosperity of the country under his rule; when the designated orator was struck speechless by fear, Mundhir b. Sa'id improvised an eloquent address, the text of which has been preserved and reproduced by numerous biographers, including Ibn Khâlûdîn (Mukaddîma i, 241-4) and Yâkût (Uubah', xix, 176-80). This unexpected intervention prevented his master from being killed. Mundhir b. Sa'id, who now became aware of his existence for the first time and who the following year appointed him kadî 'l-djâma'î, in other words "most senior delegate of the supreme chief of the Andalusian Muslim community for the administration of justice" (E. Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. mus., iii, 120). In spite of his repeated offers to resign, he was retained in office by al-Hakam II (who reigned from 350/966 to 366/961-76) until his death, which took place on 18 Dhî '1-Ka'da 355/15 November 966 (and not on 4 Rabî'I 349, at 47 years old, as is stated by al-Suyûtî, Bughyâ, Cairo 3126, 398, who also makes him the kadî 'l-djâma'î of Granada).

The frank speech of Mundhir b. Sa'id might well have cost him his position and even more. His biographers draw attention to a stern speech, full of allusions to the culpable behaviour of the monarch who was intent on the construction of the Madinat al-Zahârâ', and in particular to the criticisms addressed to him directly after he had built a pavilion covered with tiles gilded in gold and silver, accusing of allowing himself to be seduced by Satan to the point of acting like an infidel. The kadî was not harassed in any way, because Abd al-Rahmân III was well aware of the value of his support. According to his contemporaries, he showed himself to be seduced by his own success but he did not appear before him for judgement, treating them all equally with no regard for their social class. His...
biographers note however, not without some astonishment, that his stern manner and dignified conduct did not prevent him jesting with his friends, and quote some of his witticisms which gave much pleasure to the people of Cordova.

Lévi-Provençal (Hist. Esp. Mus., iii, 479) considers him the first representative, in al-Andalus, in the 4th/10th century, of Záhirism [see AL-ZÁHIRIYYA], which he had introduced into Spain after being the pupil, in the East, not only of Dáwwád b. Khaláf (d. 270/884 [q. v.]) but also of one of his disciples (cf. Pellat, Ibn Hazm bibliographie... in al-Andalus, 372, 1954, § 35). He was able to permit himself the practice of 'ijtihád, the personal effort of reflection, while scrupulously respecting the Málikí doctrine.

The Hanbáli Ibn al-Ímád himself (Sháhdárat, iii, 17), acknowledges his rectitude, his intelligence and his eloquence, and does not criticise him more than other authors of biographical articles.

However, none of the works which he left behind has survived: al-Násíkh wa-l-mansúkh, al-Inbákh 'alá sitt-bih al-akhám min Kísá Alláh and al-Íbána 'an hákkih 'úsil al-dáyána. A few verses are still attributed to him, in particular with regard to zdhl [q. v.], and there is also mention of an exchange of letters in verse with al-káfih with the object of borrowing a book from him. It may be noted that this literary output did not at first appear sufficient to merit (Udábdár, [q.v.]),

be noted that this literary output did not at first appear sufficient to merit (Udábdár, [q.v.]), (Sháhdárat, iii, 17; idjtihád, xix/1 [1954], Pellat, al-And. [q.v.]).

The fourth, 'Abd Allah b. Masarra b. Zayd was appointed al-sahib al-radd, or appointed to regulate affairs considered too sensitive by other magistrates, was accused of involvement in the plot aimed at deposing Hishám II [q. v.], and he was hanged in 368/379 by order of al-Mánsúr Ibn 'Abd 'Amír [q. v.]; see in particular Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. Mus., iii, 217, 487).
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AL-MUNDHIR b. SÁWÁ (AL-)MUNDHIR b. SÁWÁ

The tribal division Dárám of Támím were in close relations with the Persians. Al-Mándhir b. Sáwá is mentioned in the Arabic sources as the “Master of Hájard” (sáhib Hájard) or as the “King of Hájard” (malik Hájard). These “kings”, said Muḥammad b. Hábíb in al-Múdhkár, were appointed by the kings of Persia and controlled the market of Hájard. One of the traditions says explicitly that al-Mándhir b. Sáwá was appointed by the Persians to control the Arab tribes (kásá Salá 'alá 'arab min kísá Alláh; al-Baladhirí, Ansáb al-aláhr, ms. 'Ashir Ef. 597-8, fol. 969a; and see idem, Fihíkh al-budáan, 106). After his conversion to Islam, the Prophet is said to have appointed him as governor (fámil) of al-Bahráin.

Reports of the štá compilations mention unanimously that the Prophet sent al-'Ali b. al-Hádraimí with a letter to al-Mándhir b. Sáwá summoning him to embrace Islam. They differ, however, as to the date of the event: whether it took place in the year 6 H. or in 8 H. The exact date cannot be established. But it is plausible to assume that the Prophet sent his emissary to al-Mándhir after his conquest of Mecca; the conquest strengthened his position in the Arab peninsula considerably and he could, due to his newly acquired authority, in the districts which were remote from Mecca and which, though they formed part of the Persian empire, were entrusted by the Persian kings to Arab leaders. The plan to dispatch the messenger was probably stimulated by the fact that the merchants setting out to Hájard (literally: to the Múštákahr) had to cross the territory of Múdárí tribes and had to get the protection of Küráysh (sc. of the Mekkan). Without this protection, the merchants could not reach Hájard with their merchandise (see Ibn Hábíb, op. cit.). Al-Mándhir responded by stating that he had embraced Islam, that he had read the letter of the Prophet to the people of Hájard and that some of them had converted to Islam while others had refused to do it. Some traditions say that the Arabs of al-Bahráin embraced Islam, and Al-ándálus (asked for instructions as to the positions of the Jews and the Magians in Bahráin. The Prophet decreed that the qiyya should be imposed on them if they stuck to their faiths. In another letter of the Prophet, written to the Magians of Hájard, the Prophet added two stipulations: the believers should not marry Magian women and should not eat meat of animals slaughtered by the Magians. The Prophet is said to have sent to al-'Ali a list of the mandatory taxes levied as sadaka from camels, cattle, sheep and fruits. The poll tax was imposed according to the social position of the taxpayer: people who had no landed property had to pay four dirhams a year and deliver a striped cloak ('abá'a) made of hair or wool; others had to pay a dinár. It is noteworthy that the poll-tax imposed on the people of the garrisons of Hájard (al-wusál'í) who had been settled there by Kúrá, with whom a separate treaty was concluded by the Muslim authorities, also amounted to one dinár. The Prophet is said to have dispatched special emissaries (mentioned are Abú Húraryá, Abú 'Ubaydá b. al-Dárirá and al-'Áli b. Dáriya al-Thákafi) who would carry out the functions of tax-collectors and instructors in performance of religious duties.

The full authority of the Prophet in the area can be gauged from a particular phrase in the letter of the Prophet to al-Mándhir: “... as long as you act rightly we shall not depose you”. Certain cases of deviation...
and disloyalty seem to have taken place; this is implied in an utterance of the Prophet saying, "Yadurrukum man dalla idhd 'htadaytum" (to be obeyed). The Prophet enjoined the converts to Islam to obey his messengers and to aid them in carrying out their mission. The Prophet kept direct contacts with the believers of Hadjar; he is said to have received a deputation of the believers of al-Bahrayn and to have welcomed them. Another tradition mentions that the Prophet met some believers from Hadjar and interceded in favour of al-Mundhir. The messengers of the Prophet in Hadjar passed favourable reports about al-Mundhir to the Prophet. The tradition says that al-Mundhir b. Sawa came with a group of believers to visit the Prophet was refuted by a majority of the scholars of the sunna. The position of al-Mundhir b. Sawa and his peculiar relation with the Prophet is examined by Ibn Hazm in his Fisal. Al-Mundhir is included in the list of Jews, Christians and Magians in al-Bahrayn to be quelled by al-Ahkâm of Medina and is reflected in one of the earliest documents reporting on this decision of the Prophet. The Prophet's ruling is said to have stirred a wave of discontent and anger among the Hypocrites about al-Mundhir. The letters of the Prophet to al-Mundhir b. Sawa in which the Magians of al-Bahrayn were granted the right to stick to their religion and were obliged to pay the poll tax, the djizya, are in fact the earliest documents of Medina and is reflected in one of the earliest commentaries of the Kur'an to the claim of the Hypocrites; the letters were authenticated and argued that the Prophet had violated his own decision to accept the djizya only from People of the Book; they complained bitterly that on the basis of that ruling the forces of the Prophet had fought and killed their fathers and brethren. The believers were perturbed by these arguments and informed the Prophet about it. Then the well known verse of sūra II, 236, lā tusha fi l-tin, explicitly forbidding to compel anyone to change his faith, was revealed. Another verse of the Kur'an, sūra V, 105, ā yāyuha îlādhīna āmāna îlāṣaykum lā yaudurrukum man dāla ilāh 'hadiytum was also revealed in connection with the claim of the Hypocrites; the very early taṣfīr of Mukātīl glosses the passage lā yaudurrukum man dāla by min ākīn hādhā. Later scholars tried to present the stipulations of the agreements concerning the position of the non-Muslim population on a broader ideological basis. Ibn Hazm states in his al-Muhallā that the djizya of Jews, Christians and Zoroastrians may be accepted on the condition that they acknowledge (aṣkārā) that Muhammad is a messenger of God to us (i.e. to the Muslim community) and do not offend him nor the faith of Islam. Malik formulated this stipulation as follows: "... he who says that Muhammad was sent as a prophet to us (i.e. to the Muslim community), not to them, is free of poll tax, the djizya, because they acknowledged that Muhammad was not a prophet should be killed".

The treaties concluded between al-ʿĀlāʾ b. al-Hadrami and the population of Hadjar according to the instructions of the Prophet were, of course, considered valid and the territories of al-Bahrayn and Hadjar were assessed as such territories. Some scholars attempted to justify the imposition of the djizya on the Magians by the fact that the Magians had had a sacred Book, which was concealed by their sinful king; this assumption was however rejected by a great majority of Muslim scholars of tradition and law. Some scholars claimed that the Magians were granted the right to pay the tax of the djizya because they had "something like a Book" (shubhat al-kitāb) and rules applying to the People of the Book are valid for them as well (Abū Yaḥyā Muḥammad b. al-Husayn al-Farrāʾ, al-ʿĀkām al-sulāṁiya, 154 above). The Prophet's ruling imposing the djizya on the people of Hadjar and al-Bahrayn was not well-known in the Muslim community of Medina. Even 'Umar was unaware of it, and was informed about it by some Companions of the Prophet. The injunction of the Prophet was supported by his utterance sunnā bismunnata ahī l-kitāb (see Humayd b. Zandjawayh, Kiāb al-Amaḍūl, 136, no. 122), "treat the Magians according to the sunna of the Prophet applied to the People of the Book".

The stipulations of the treaties concluded with the People of the Book (Jews and Christians) and the Magians in Bahrayn were applied in other territories of the Muslim empire. The Magian population in the Muslim empire became an integral part of the community, and the Muslim lawyers took care to provide details of their legal status; this can be seen e.g. in some chapters of the early Muṣannaf of 'Abd al-Razzāk.

The revolt against Islam, the ridda [p. r.], which flared up in al-Bahrayn after the death of the Prophet and after the death of al-Mundhir b. Sawa, was quelled by al-ʿĀlāʾ b. al-Hadrami, who headed some of the Muslim forces and succeeded in conquering some adjacent territories. Thus the Tarnīmi al-Mundhir b. Sawa played an important role in the islamisation of the territories of al-Bahrayn and in enabling the religious communities of Jews, Christians and Magians in al-Bahrayn to survive.
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The document discusses Ibn Jawzi, a notable Muslim scholar, and his work "al-Wafā bi-ahwāl al-mustafā," which was used in a masterful fashion by Minorsky for his Studies in Caucasian history. It also mentions the value of his work for understanding the Muslim dynasties and its importance in the field of history, especially for the knowledge of the Ottoman sultans. The text highlights the comprehensive nature of Ibn Jawzi's work, which covers various periods and dynasties, and its usefulness for researchers and historians. The document also notes the contributions of other scholars and sources that have influenced or been influenced by Ibn Jawzi's work. Overall, it underscores the lasting impact of Ibn Jawzi's scholarly contributions on the field of Islamic history.
MUNEDJDJIM BASHI — MUNEDJDJIM KHAN

(London 1953) and A history of Sharvan and Darband (Cambridge 1958); see also BAB AL-ABWAB and AL-SABH.
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MUNEDJDJIM, conventional form Monghyr, a town of Bihar in the Indian Union, situated on the south bank of the Ganges in lat. 25° 25’ N. and 86° 27’ E, and at an important communications point between Bengal and the middle Ganges valley. It is also the administrative centre of a District in the province of Bihar of the same name.

It was founded in Gupta times, Muhammad Bakhiyir Khâldî (q.v.) was its first Muslim conqueror when he raided into Bihar in 589/1193. It subsequently became a place of military and administrative importance, with a fortress built in apparently Mughal style [see MUNEDJDJIM]. Mir Kâsim ‘Ali (d. 1777 [q.v.]), Nawâwâd of Bengal, moved his capital thither from lower Bengal, away from the British East India Company’s presence in Bengal, and founded there an arsenal for the army of his which was being trained by the Armenian Gurgin (Gregory) Khân, the beginning of the gunmaking industry for which Mongîr became famous.

Mungîr became a municipality in 1864 and is now an important, modern, manufacturing and commercial centre, with a population (1971 census) of 102,462, whilst the District had 3,896,423 inhabitants.


MUNIF PASHA, MEHMET ÂMIR, prominent Ottoman statesman and educational reformer of the Tanzîmät [q.v.] era.

He was born into an ‘ulama’ family in ‘Aynî (Gaziantep, south-eastern Turkey) in 1828-9 (1830, according to Ibrahim Aîlettin Gîsma), and received a traditional madrasa education in his home town, in Cairo and Damascus. Entering the Ottoman civil service, he was a clerk in the Damascus Provincial Council. Munîf went on to Istanbul in 1852 and was employed as Persian and Arabic translator in the Translation Bureau (Terâtîm-i Odaat) of the Sublime Porte, the nursery of Ottoman reform statesmen. He learned French (and later some English) in Istanbul and then German in Berlin, where he was posted as Second Secretary at the Ottoman Embassy and attended courses at the University. Returning to Istanbul, he became known through his articles in the newspaper Dîride-yi Hâwâtâ, and was promoted head of the Translation Bureau in 1862. He made his first contribution to the cause of enlightenment in publishing in 1859 an anthology of translated excerpts from the writings of Voltaire, Fênélton and Fontenelle, under the title Muhammed-i Hikmîyye (‘Philosophical Discourses’). The following year he founded the Dîmîyye-i ‘Ulemâ-yi ‘Oltamîyeh (Ottoman Scientific Society), and its organ the Medînâ-yi Fîrinî (‘Journal of [Secular] Sciences’). This published in 1862 his plea for the reform of the Arabic script, which Munîf saw as inferior to the Latin alphabet and a factor in the prevalence of illiteracy. Appointed chairman of the Medîzî-s-i Mîsarî (Council of Education) in 1869, Munîf lamented that he did not succeed in changing the heading on the Council’s paper, let alone the system of writing of the country. However, he had greater opportunities to make an impact when, after five years as Ottoman Ambassador in Tehran, he embarked in 1877 on the first of his three terms as Minister of Education. His second term (1878-80) coincided with the accession of ‘Abd al-Hamîd II, whom he tutored in political economy. While at Tehran, it was energy and a desire to extend modern education through his empire, which he repeated interrupted the career of his reforming Minister, whose zeal he distrusted. Thus after being promoted to the rank of vezîr (which gave him the title of Paşa) Munîf found himself transferred to the Medîzî-s-i Sibhîyye (Health Council) before becoming Minister of Education for the third and last time in 1885. He lost his job in 1891, and was kept on the payroll but without an appointment until 1895, when he was sent to Tehran as special emissary to the jubilee of Nâsir al-Dîn Shâh [q.v.], and where he stayed on briefly as Ambassador after the Shâh’s assassination. Munîf retired at his own request in 1896, and spent the remaining years of his life, until his death in 1910, in his country house at Erenköy, outside Istanbul, which became a notable meeting place for Ottoman and foreign scholars.

Steepled in Islamic culture, yet an ardent admirer of Western civilisation, Munîf Paşa was deemed a poet, although his only major poetic work, the Dîsitân-i Al- ‘Oltamîyeh (‘Epos of the House of Osman’), amounted to little more than a 13-page kaşîda, written in 1881, at a time of enforced idleness to attract the Sultan’s favour. Apart from his translations, his only other books were edited versions of his lectures on law and political economy at the Istanbul Dâr al-Fünûn (University). However, it is not as an author, but as a reforming, westernising statesman and a founding father of Turkey’s modern educational system that he is remembered today.


MUNIM KHAN or MUNIM BEG, KHAN-I KHAîN (902/1497-1575), a leading Turânî noble of the Indian Mughal empress consort, Bakhtiyar Gîsma, Akbar, was the son of Miram Beg Andûjânî. As a foster-brother of Bakhtîar’s son ‘Askarî, he was counted among the important nobles of Humâyûn as early as 940/1534. Humâyûn appointed him governor of Khôst [q.v.] in 952/1545, and he accompanied his master on the Bakht campaign of 956/1549. In 960/1553 he was appointed atâ’îlî (principal adviser) of Akbar, and a year later of Akbar’s brother Muham- mad Hâkim [q.v. in Suppl.] at Kâbul. In 967/1560 Akbar recalled him from there and appointed him Wâkil (principal minister) with the title of Khâîn-i Khân. In 969/1562 Atka Khân replaced Munîm Khân as Wâkil but upon the former’s murder, Munîm Khân was shortly afterwards appointed Wâkil for a second time, holding the office till 971/1564.

After the suppression of the Uzbek rebellion, Munîm Khân was appointed governor of Dâjînpur [q.v.], and all the eastern districts were placed under his command. In 981/1573-4 he built the celebrated bridge over the River Gomati at Dâjînpur, which is still being used. When in 982/1574-5, Akbar established the mansab [q.v.] system, Munîm Khân was awarded the then highest rank of 5,000, but soon afterwards was being, having for about forty years one of the leading nobles of the empire under Humâyûn and Akbar.
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MUNIR LAHAWRI (1019-54/1610-44), the pen
name of Abu '1-'lbarakat, a prominent Indo-Muslim
poet of Shdh Djashes's period (1628-58). He was born on
12 Ramadan 1019/28 November 1610 at Lahawr.
His father, 'Abd al-Djall b. Hafiz Abu Ishak, was an
expert calligrapher attached to Emperor Akbar's
court. Munir received his education in Lahawr, and
began composing poetry at an early age. In 1045/1635-6 he took up service with Mirz?3 Sayf Khan, who was a son-in-law of Asaf Khan (d.
[q.v.].) His poetical contribution comprises a number of
mathnawis, ("A
dedicated to Sayf Khan. It describes the natural
beauty of Bengal, and spent the last period of his life in Agra, and died there
on 17 Radjab 1054/9 September 1644. His body was
taken to Lahawr, where he is buried.
Munir left a considerable output in verse and prose.
His poetical contribution comprises a number of
mathnawis, the best known of which is Mazhar-i gul ("A
flower theatre"), a poem composed in 1049/1639-40, the poet
entered the employment of Shapur Mlrza I
(Deccan) 1223/1808-9; Mir Husayn Dust Sanbhal?,
Haydarabad (Deccan), Awrangabadl, Kanpur 1879; Muhammad Salih
20th century (as most of his contem-
poraries, he also wrote some poems in Persian). For
modern scholarship, the prime importance lies in his
own observations and on eyewitness
accounts. It is the largest known prose work written in
Khorasan. Both the Firdaus al-ikbdl and the transla-
tion of the Firdaus al-ikbdl were later continued by a
nephew and pupil of Munir, Muhammad Rahim
Agahi [q.v. in Suppl.]
Munir was one of the first writers who belonged to
the period of the flourishing of Caghatai literature in
Khiva in the 19th century (as most of his contem-
poraries, he also wrote some poems in Persian). For
modern scholarship, the prime importance lies in his
original historical work, the Firdaus al-ikbdl. It is
divided into a foreword, a makaddima, and five bdbs:
(1) from Adam to the children of Noah; (2) the
Mongol rulers from Yafeth till the branch of Krongat;
(3) the Cingizids, mainly the Cingizids of Kharazm;
(4) the Krongats, sc. the ancestors of Eltizer Kh4in;
(5) the reigns of Eltizer Kh4in and Muhammad
Rahim Kh4in (Munir's intended to write also a khdtma,
which, however, was never written). Munir, who
himself considered his work as a continuation of the
Shdgara-yi Turk by Abu '1-Ghazzi [q.v.], brought his
account down to the events of Safar 1227/March 1812
(in ch. 5); the remaining part, written by Agahi,
forms about one-fifth of the entire work. The main
part of the work is a chronicle of contemporary events based on Munir's own observations and on eyewitness
accounts. It is the largest known prose work written in
Caghatai and one of the most important sources for the
history of Central Asia in the 17th-19th centuries.
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MUNKAR (A.), a technical term in the science of Edirne in the early 12th/18th century. His birth date is unknown, but he was a Mewlewl of the Abbasids, prominent during the caliphates of al-Mu'tadid, al-Muktafi and al-Muktafi, the statement may be true. (If so, in al-Mas'udi’s description, Muruq al-dhahab, vii = § 3355, of al-Mu’tadid’s death, for khadin read khizin, as in ‘Arab, 29.)

Munis owned his later eminence mainly to his leading the defence, in 296/908, of the Hasani palace at Bagdad for al-Muktafi against the partisans of the latter’s cousin, the pretender Ibn al-Mu'tazz [q.v.]. During the caliph’s youth, his gratitude and that of his powerful mother for this service assured Munis’s position; and though later al-Muktafi’s favour turned to enmity, by that time Munis’s authority was hardly in need of support, owing chiefly to his almost invariably successful generalship. For though he undertook no very important campaigns, except perhaps the repulse of the Fatimid al-Mahdi [q.v.] in 307/921-20 (for which he received the labab of al-Mu’azzaf), and the defence of Bagdad from the Carmathians [see karmat], in 315/927-8, he was only once defeated, sc. in 306/918.

Munis early fell out with the vizier Ibn al-Furat [q.v.], repeatedly opposing him, till in 312/924, on Ibn al-Furat’s third term of office, he was deprived of his authority. His example of mounting various punitive expeditions against unruh Bedouin and other rebels in central Iraq (286/899, 287/900, 289/902), and by al-Muktadir, the statement may be true. If so, in al-Mas’udi’s description, Muruq al-dhahab, vii = § 3355, of al-Mu’tadid’s death, for khadin read khizin, as in ‘Arab, 29.)

Munis now restored al-Kahir. But by resuming his dictatorial ways, he soon so alienated him also that he was obliged in self-defence to keep the new caliph in a prisoner in the palace. He even contemplated deposing him. Al-Kahir, however, succeeded in having him restored to the caliphate, together with his chief supporters, into the palace, where he shortly had them executed in Sha’ban 321/August 933.

Munis’s influence was on the whole exerted for good; but he was neither strong nor intelligent enough to prevent the decline of the caliphate. His example of depriving the caliph of real power was pernicious. It was to be followed all too soon by the series of adventurers who, with the designation of amir al-umara [q.v.], were to dominate al-Kahir’s successors.

Munis was restored to al-Kahir. But by resuming his dictatorial ways, he soon so alienated him also that he was obliged in self-defence to keep the new caliph a prisoner in the palace. He even contemplated deposing him. Al-Kahir, however, succeeded in having him restored to the caliphate, together with his chief supporters, into the palace, where he shortly had them executed in Sha’ban 321/August 933.

Munis’s influence was on the whole exerted for good; but he was neither strong nor intelligent enough to prevent the decline of the caliphate. His example of depriving the caliph of real power was pernicious. It was to be followed all too soon by the series of adventurers who, with the designation of amir al-umara [q.v.], were to dominate al-Kahir’s successors.
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of *hadith* [q. v.] used to describe a certain type of tradition or a transmitter of such traditions. The plural of *munkar* is either *munkarāt* or *munkār*. The definition of the term hinges on two connotations of the verb *anka*, which conveys among others the notions “to be ignorant of” as well as “to reject” or “disapprove”. Thus the term can be translated by “unknown” as well as “objectionable”, and in whatever context it occurs, it potentially constitutes a double entendre. Some Muslim scholars equate the term with *shahidh*, which stands for a tradition supported by a single *insād* strand not attested elsewhere but in essence acceptable, since the transmitters in its *insād* are defined as *thikas*. The majority of *hadith* experts, however, see in *munkar* a negative term, while they hold that a *shahidh* tradition, though often bizarre, conveys something positive which may not be discarded.

Transmitters of *mankār* are generally (although as will be seen below not always entirely justly) suspected of having had a hand in the invention of (part of) the *matn* of a tradition, while suspicion as to someone’s tampering with a tradition’s *insād* has given rise to the qualification of that transmitter as being *da‘îf*, a term also used to denote an *insād* in which something is amiss. In early days, *sc. the last few decades of the first/seventh century*, whereby traditions are hardly in existence yet, misgivings of *hadith* experts concerning certain traditions in circulation were promoted, more than by any other feature, by the *insād*. *Insād*-technical considerations, which became the major tools of the trade of *hadith* critics in their assessment of traditions, were on the whole formulated later, to wit in the course of the 2nd/8th century. In other words, the identification of traditions as *munkardt* is early as in mediaeval tradition critics, for a number of these have given rise to the *insād* definition and its date of origin posited here tally with the identification of traditions as *munkār*, which originated somewhat later and emerges only in the course of the second half of the 2nd/8th century; *viz. “on the authority of* *Abd Allāh* to the latter’s son *Amr b. Shu‘ayb* (d. 118/736). From this *sahīh* some 170 traditions, many of which were found to be *munkar*, made it eventually to the canonical collections (with the exceptions of *Buḫkārī’s*). These can be studied separately, as they are conveniently grouped together by al-Mizzī [q. v.] in his *Tahdhib al-ṣārah bi-ma‘rifat al-ʿarīf*, vi, nos. 8654-8823. But, as is evident from some recorded remarks of mediaeval tradition critics, for a number of these traditions it is not *Shu‘ayb* b. *Amr* but rather one of his alleged pupils (or conceivably one of that pupil’s pupils) who is held responsible. Ibn Ḥalaj enumerates several of these (cf. *Tahdhib*, viii, 54).


The punishment in the tomb [see CADHAB AL-KABR] whatever context it occurs, it potentially constitutes a criterion in *hadith* (The concept of lying, in Arabic *kadhib*, is only known through that *matn*. Material would be dented but not totally destroyed. *Munkar*, which originated somewhat later and emerges only in the course of the second half of the 2nd/8th century; *viz. “on the authority of* *Abd Allāh* to the latter’s son *Amr b. Shu‘ayb* (d. 118/736). From this *sahīh* some 170 traditions, many of which were found to be *munkar*, made it eventually to the canonical collections (with the exceptions of *Buḫkārī’s*). These can be studied separately, as they are conveniently grouped together by al-Mizzī [q. v.] in his *Tahdhib al-ṣārah bi-ma‘rifat al-ʿarīf*, vi, nos. 8654-8823. But, as is evident from some recorded remarks of mediaeval tradition critics, for a number of these traditions it is not *Shu‘ayb* b. *Amr* but rather one of his alleged pupils (or conceivably one of that pupil’s pupils) who is held responsible. Ibn Ḥalaj enumerates several of these (cf. *Tahdhib*, viii, 54).


The punishment in the tomb [see CADHAB AL-KABR]
is not plainly mentioned in the Kur'an. Allusions to the idea may be found in several passages, e.g. sura XL, 73: "... when they are about to die, shall smite them on their faces and backs"; sura VI, 93: "... But couldst thou see, when the ungodly are in the floods of death, and the angels reach forth their hands, saying, Yield up your souls; this day shall ye be recompensed with a humiliating punishment"; sura VIII, 52: "... And if thou wert to see when the angels take the life of the unbelievers; they smite their faces and their backs, and taste ye the torture of burning" (cf. further, sura IX, 102; XXIII, 21; LI, 47).

The punishment of the tomb is very frequently mentioned in the Tradition (see Bibl.), often, however, without the mention of angels. In the latter group of traditions it is simply said that the dead are punished in their tombs, or why this is so, e.g. on account of special sins they have committed, or on account of the wailing of the living.

The names of Munkar and Nakir do not appear in the Kur'an, and, it seems, only in canonical Tradition (al-Tirmidhi, Dina'a'z, bâb 70). Apparently these names do not belong to the old stock of traditions. Moreover, in some traditions one anonymous angel only is mentioned as the angel who interrogates and punishes the dead (Muslim, Imân, trad. 163; Abû Dâwûd, Sunna, bâb 39b; Ahmad b. Hanbal, iii, 233, 396; bâb 150; al-Tavâyil, no. 73). So there seem to be four stages in the traditions regarding this subject: the first without any angel being mentioned, the second mentioning "the" angel, the third two angels, the fourth being acquainted with the names Munkar and Nakir.

This state of things as reflected in hadith finds a similar reflex in the early forms of the creed. In the Fikh Akbar II, in which may date from the middle of the 2nd/8th century, the punishment of the tomb appears as the only eschatological representation (art. 10). In the Wasiyat Abu Hanifa, which may represent the orthodox views of the middle of the 2nd/8th century, we find, apart from an elaborate eschatology, the two following articles (arts. 18, 19): "We confess, that the punishment in the tomb shall without fail take place. We confess also, that the dead are in the floods of death, and the angels reach forth their hands, saying, Yield up your souls; this day shall ye be recompensed with a humiliating punishment". The term "reality" is apparently intended to oppose the allegorical interpretation of eschatological representations as taught by the Mu'izzilis.

The Fikh Akbar II, which may represent the new orthodoxy of the middle of the 3rd/9th century, is still more elaborate on this point (art. 23): "The interrogation of the dead in the tomb by Munkar and Nakir is a reality and the reunion of the body with the spirit in the tomb is a reality. The pressure and the punishment in the tomb are a reality that will take place in the case of all the infidels, and a reality that may take place in the case of some sinners belonging to the faithful. In the later creeds and works on dogmatism, the punishment and the interrogation in the tomb by Munkar and Nakir are expressed in similar ways.

The Karrâmîyya (q.v.) taught the identity of Munkar and Nakir with the two guardian angels who accompany man (Abd al-Kâhir al-Baghdadî, Usul al-dîn, Istanbul 1928, 246). Al-Qâzâlî admits the idea that eschatological representations are a reality that takes place in the malakûta.

The origin of the names is uncertain; the meaning "disliked" seems doubtful. The idea of the examination and the punishment of the dead in their tombs is found among other peoples also. The details to be found in Jewish sources (kibbûl had-keber) are strikingly parallel to the Muslim ones.

Munkar and Nakir are mentioned in the early Sunna, e.g. in the passages from hadith in Wen-sink, Handbook of early Moh. tradition, s.v. GRAVE(s); further E. Sell, The faith of Islam, London 1880, 145; Mouradde'a d'Ohsson, Tableau de l'Empire othoman, Paris 1787, i, 46; Wen-sink, The Muslim creed, Cambridge 1932, general index, s.v. Punishment, and Munkar and Nakir; J.G.O. Bodenschutz, Kirchliche Verfassung der heutigen Juden, Erleangen 1748, iii, 95-6; Tâbâwî, Bûna al-ismânna wa 'l-dümâ'a, Aleppo 1344; Abû Hâfîs Usâr al-Nasâ'î, 'Askâd, i, 1313, with the commentary of Tâafsârî, 132 ff.; Gha'zâlî, Ilâyî, Cairo 1302, iv, 451 ff.; idem, Al-Durr al-fâjihâ, ed. Gautier, 23 ff.; Kitâb Ahâd al-kiyâmä, ed. M. Wolff, 40-1. See also the Bibl. to Mâlûka'ir.

MûNKIDH. Banû, a clan prominent in Syrian (and to a lesser extent Egyptian) affairs from the middle of the 5th/11th century to the end of the 6th/12th century. Between 474/1081 and 552/1157 their principal possession was Shâyzar, a fortified town perched on a crag overlooking the Orontes (al-Asî [q.v.] River, some 15 km. northwest of Hamât [q.v.]). Shâyzar was destroyed and most of the clan killed in the disastrous earthquake of 552/1157, its remaining members were compelled to pursue careers in the service of the various princes of Syria and Egypt. The Banû Mûnkîdh were not only soldiers and petty seigneurs; they also produced several poets and men of letters of some repute, among whom the best known was Usâmâ b. Mûrîdîd (488-584/ 1095-1188).

Like many of those who rose to power in Syria between the mid-4th/10th and the late 5th/11th centuries, the Banû Munkidh were of Arab and Bedouin origin. They were members of the Kinâna [q.v.] section of the Kalb, a "Yamanî" tribe, most of whose branches were active in the region around Damascus; the Kinâna, however, resided in North Syria, in the districts east of the Orontes. The Banû Mûnkîdh seem to make their first appearance in 349/960, when a certain Ali b. Mûnkîdh b. Naźr b. Kinînâwî was captured (along with the other Khânîz b. Fîza [q.v.]) in a disastrous battle against the Byzantines. However, they first emerge as a significant political force in the wake of the seizure of Aleppo by Sâlih b. Mîridâs in 415-16/1024-5. To one of his supporters, Mukallad b. Naźr b. Mûnkîdh, Sâlih assigned the district of Shâyzar as an iktîd. At this time, however, the town was still in Byzantine hands, and Mukallad's most important possession was the town of Kafrâryb (When this place had been acquired by the Banû Mûnkîdh we do not know.)

Mukallad b. Naźr died in 450/1059 and bequeathed his lands to his son Sâfîd al-Mul'ik 'Ali, the true founder of the Mûnkîdhite principality. 'Ali maintained his father's close (if not always friendly) ties with the Mûrîdîdîs of Aleppo, but he soon ceased to be their client, becoming instead almost the arbiter of the dynasty. Thus in 468/1076 he was able to dictate the succession of the last Mûrîdîd prince, Sâbîk b. Mâmûd b. Sâlih, while in 473/1080 he was instrumental in ending this dynasty's rule in Aleppo and turning the city over to the Ukjâyîdîs of Mawşîl, Muslim b. Kûrayshî. In general, 'Ali used his skills as a political broker in the fragmented world of North Syria to secure a considerable degree of autonomy for himself and his rule; his most lasting achievement, however, was his capture of Shâyzar from the bishop of al-Râma (nominally at least, a representative of Byzantine authority) in
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474/1081. This he did by cutting the town off from its hinterland by building a castle (the so-called Kaf'at al-Djur) which controlled a crucial Orontes bridge. For the next three-quarters of a century, Shayzar was to be the seat of the Banū Munkidh, the one stronghold they would retain in the face of every challenge. 'Ali's principality at the time of his death in 475/1082, though it included no major cities, was a significant local power; in addition to Shayzar, he held Kafarjarb, Apamea (Al-Fainiyā), the port of al-Lahdikhiyya, and several smaller places.

The Banū Munkidh enjoyed only a moment of prosperity, however, for in the decades following 'Ali's death they were entangled in the convoluted and unceasing struggles of forces far more powerful than they—the 'Uqaylīds of Mawṣil, Saldjikids and Artuqids, the Franks, the Assassins, not to mention various local Arab chiefs. That they were able to retain their autonomy and prestige (though not the bulk of their lands) is a tribute especially to the courage and astuteness of 'Ali's two sons and successors: Naṣr (reigned 475-92/1082-98) and Abu ʾl-ʾAṣākir Sulṭān (492-549/1098-1154). The critical transition of Naṣr b. 'Ali's reign was the Saldjikids conquest of Syria. Knowing that no Syrian coalition could resist the Saldjikids, he followed a policy of accommodation. Thus in 479/1086-7 he felt compelled to cede Kafarjarb, Apamea and al-Lahdikhiyya to the Saldjikids to secure the Saldjikids' accommodation. Thus in 479/1086-7 he felt compelled to cede Kafarjarb, Apamea and al-Lahdikhiyya to the Saldjikids to secure the Saldjikids' accommodation.

The Saldjikids' occupation, Naṣr normally found his interests best served by aligning himself with the ruler of Aleppo. In 485/1091, this policy gained for him the restoration of the three towns mentioned above, though Kafarjarb and Apamea were lost only five years later to a troublesome and persistent rival, Abu ʾl-Dawla b. Mughīrah (Abu ʾl-Dawla had been ruler of Hims until displaced by the Saldjikids' Tutush in 483/1090-1, and was a constant source of turmoil in North Syria until his death at the hands of the Assassins in 499/1106.) When Naṣr died in 492/1098, he named his brother Mūrūḏīsh as his successor, but upon the latter's refusal, 'Ali's youngest son Sulṭān was called from al-Lahdikhiyya to the latter's brother Muhammad b. Kamil b. AII; (2) his first cousin al-Mubarak b. Kamil b. AII; (3) the latter's brother Muhammad b. Kamil b. AII, usually called Ḥiṭṭān; (4) a nephew of Usāma's, ʾAbd al-Rahmān b. Nakīm b. Munkidh—a place which henceforth would be one of their chief strongholds. The principal Frankish threat came from the princes of Antioch; during the first three decades of the 6th/12th century Shayzar was subject to almost constant raids from this direction. In 504-5/1100-11, the town was seriously threatened by ʿTancred of Antioch, who had built a castle across the river at Tall Ibn Masyaf; and in 505/1115 it was besieged by a Frankish-Muslim coalition (Roger of Antioch, Tughtigīn of Damascus, ʿIl-Ḥāzīr of Mardin) formed to resist a proposed Syrian campaign by the governor of Mawṣil. In the same period, the Turkish governors of Hims and Hamāt—especially the latter—were always in a position to put pressure on the Banū Munkidh, though they made no sustained efforts to take Shayzar. A degree of security was afforded by the rise of Zangī after 522/1127, and Sulṭān was quick to put himself under the suzerainty of this formidable prince. Even so, he had to sustain a brief siege by Shams al-Mulk Ismāʿīl of Damascus in 527/1133, and the far more dangerous assault in 532/1138 of John Comnenus, who was engaged in a campaign to reassert Byzantine supremacy in North Syria. But after this last event Shayzar entered into a period of relative peace, made possible by the power of Zangī and his son Nūr al-Dīn Mahmūd.

In 549/1154 Sulṭān b. 'Ali was succeeded by his son ʿTādj al-Dawlā Muḥammad without incident. In 552/1157, however, everything came to a brutal and utterly unexpected end. In Raḏāb/August a massive earthquake ravaged north and central Syria; in the citadel of Shayzar most of the Banū Munkidh were gathered for a great banquet when the building collapsed on them. None escaped except the wife of ʿTādj al-Dawlā. To prevent such a site from falling into the hands of the Franks or the Assassins, Nūr al-Dīn quickly moved to take possession. Having restored it, he assigned it to his foster brother Maqīd al-Dīn b. al-Dāya. The Banū ʿL-Dāya, like their unfortunate predecessors, were to have a long career as lords of Shayzar, for they held it until 630/1232-3, when they were dispossessed by the Ayyūbīd prince of Aleppo.

In spite of the extent of the disaster, the Banū Munkidh did not fall into complete obscurity. Several members of the clan were not present when the catastrophe occurred, and of these four in particular achieved some prominence: (1) Usāma b. Mūrūḏīsh b. ʿAli; (2) his first cousin al-Muḥārak b. Kāmīl b. ʿAli; (3) the latter's brother Muḥammad b. Kāmīl b. ʿAli, usually called Hitṭān; (4) a nephew of Usāma's, ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Nakīm b. Munkidh b. ʿAli. (1) Usāma b. Mūrūḏīsh b. ʿAli. Often called Usāma b. Munkidh after the clan's eponym, he is by far the best-known member of the Banū Munkidh. Esteemed in his own time as a poet and man of letters, we know him chiefly for his picturesque memoirs, the Kitāb al-Fṣālab ("Book of instruction by example"). In the tradition of his family, however, he spent most of his life as a warrior and politician.

His career was a troubled one, and for this his own actions were purely responsible in large part. He was born in Shayzar in 488/1095 and continued to live there until ca. 526/1131, when he joined the entourage of Zangī. He returned briefly to his birthplace in 531/2/1137-8, to be present at the death of his father and the siege of John Comnenus. But in the summer of
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In the autumn of 570/1174, Usama was called to join the entourage of Salåh al-Din, immediately after the latter's occupation of Damascus. Usåma's oldest son Muråh, an associate of the suñûn since ca.

565/1170, was the person who obtained this invitation. Usåma was at first enthusiastically welcomed at Salåh al-Din's court, but within two years a certain chill set in between them, and the old man was forced to live out his last years in an honourable but bitterly resented retirement. At the very end of his life he completed (in 579/1183) an admirable anthology, the Khandat al-kasr wa- juggarat al-asf, in which he portrays the man he would have been: a person of almost reckless courage, whether in hunting or warfare; calm and patient under pressure; and not to bare his own soul but to depict a human ideal. In the K. al-Fihb, he portrays the man he would like to have been: a person of almost reckless courage, whether in hunting or warfare; calm and

The 7th/13th-century writers rely chiefly on Usåma b. Kâmil b. 'Ali, and (2) Hit-tân b. Kâmil b. 'Ali. Al-Mubârak was born in Shqayzar in 526/1131, but seems not to have remained there very long. After obtaining an education in Mecca and Baghdad, he entered the Egyptian administration under Salâh al-Din and obtained the post of shkâd al-diwan. In 569/1174 he was attached to al-Mu'azzam Turângâh's expedition to the Yaman, where he served as governor of Zabîd. He returned to Egypt with Turângâh in 571/1176, leaving behind his brother Hit-tân as his successor in Zabîd. In 577/1181-2, shortly after the death of his patron Turângâh, al-Mubârak was disgraced by Salâh al-Din for his alleged tyranny and corruption during his tenure in the Yaman. He was soon restored to favour, however, and retained high administrative office until his death in 590/1193. His brother Hit-tân was not so lucky. His régime in Zabîd was exceedingly harsh, and he became embroiled in conflicts and conspiracies with the other Ayyûbîd lieutenants in the country. When Sayf al-Din Tughtîgin came to restore order in 579/1183-4, Hit-tân was soon put under arrest, and shortly thereafter was executed in Ta'izz.

Adil and al-Kâmil; when the latter occupied Harrân in 626/1229, Isma'ilî was named wdt, in charge both of civil and military affairs, but died very shortly after taking up his appointment.

(2) al-Mubârak b. Kâmil b. 'Ali and (3) Hit-tân b. Kâmil b. 'Ali. Al-Mubârak was born in Shqayzar in 526/1131, but seems not to have remained there very long. After obtaining an education in Mecca and Baghdad, he entered the Egyptian administration under Salâh al-Din and obtained the post of shkâd al-diwan. In 569/1174 he was attached to al-Mu'azzam Turângâh's expedition to the Yaman, where he served as governor of Zabîd. He returned to Egypt with Turângâh in 571/1176, leaving behind his brother Hit-tân as his successor in Zabîd. In 577/1181-2, shortly after the death of his patron Turângâh, al-Mubârak was disgraced by Salâh al-Din for his alleged tyranny and corruption during his tenure in the Yaman. He was soon restored to favour, however, and retained high administrative office until his death in 590/1193. His brother Hit-tân was not so lucky. His régime in Zabîd was exceedingly harsh, and he became embroiled in conflicts and conspiracies with the other Ayyûbîd lieutenants in the country. When Sayf al-Din Tughtîgin came to restore order in 579/1183-4, Hit-tân was soon put under arrest, and shortly thereafter was executed in Ta'izz.

Adil and al-Kâmil; when the latter occupied Harrân in 626/1229, Isma'ilî was named wdt, in charge both of civil and military affairs, but died very shortly after taking up his appointment.

(4) 'Abd al-Râhîm b. Mûhâmmad b. Mûr-shid (523-600/1129-1204). He was Salâh al-Din's envoy to the Almohad or al-Muwa'âbid ruler al-Manâshîr Abu Yusûf Ya'bîk in 587/1191, with the aim of obtaining the support of al-Manâshîr's fleet against the Franks then besieging Acre. It was a delicate mission, and 'Abd al-Râhîm's standing is indicated by the fact that it was assigned to him. The mission's ultimate failure must certainly be ascribed to objective circumstances and not his own shortcomings.


The 7th/13th-century writers rely chiefly on Usåma b. Kâmil b. 'Ali and Usåma b. Murshid, but they add important

The writings of Usâma b. Murghid were extensive, and the list in GAL, i, 319-20, S1, 552-3, is very inadequate. The best attempts at a survey are the editors' introductions to Lubâb al-‘âdâb, 25-7, and K. al-Manâmilwâd al-‘âdâb, 50-2. His published works are as follows:

(1) al-Dîdân, ed. A.A. Badawi and H. ‘Abd al-Majîd, Cairo, 1953, based on a unique ms. dated 688 (Dâr al-Kutub);
(2) al-Badî‘i, nakk al-‘âdâb, ed. A.A. Badawi, H. ‘Abd al-Majîd and I. Mustâfâ, Cairo 1960/69;
(4) Lubâb al-‘âdâb, ed. A.M. Shâkir, Cairo 1935/1935, based on an autograph ms. dated 579;
(5) K. al-‘Aṣa‘a, partial ed. H. Dera lorenz, in Usâma ibn Mundîzh, i. Vie d’Usâma, 499-542;

In addition, there are extensive citations of his poetry in the historical sources cited above; see especially Ibn ʿAsâkîr, ʿImâm al-Din, ʿAbî Ṣâma’ and Ibn Khallikan.

The only full-length study on the Banû Mundîzh is Dera lorenz, Usâma ibn Mundîzh: un émir syrien au premier âge des Croisades, i. Vie d’Usâma, Paris 1893. Ch. xii, “Textes arabes inédits, par Usâma et sur Usâma”, was also published separately, Paris 1893. Valuable data can also be gleaned from general historical studies on the period; see especially S. Zakkar, The emirate of Aleppo, 1004-1094, Beirut n.d. [c. 1971]; idem, Makhdîl ilâ ta[rî]kh al-harb al-salîbiyya, Beirut 1972; rev. ed. 1973; N. Eliisseff, ʿArâd ʿArab, 3 vols., Damascus 1967. (R. Stephen Humphreys)
weapons after the fight (They came back with broken lances, whilst we had twisted... Sheikh. Omaggw ad Alessandro Bausani islamista nel sessantesimo compleanno, Venice, 29 May 1981, 29-41. (A. ARIOLI)

...whilst they made those of them weep who could no longer choke back their saliva; (They came back with broken weapons after the fight, both of our sides, with burning wounds; Amr b. ed. Shakir and Harun, Cairo n.d., 230-5).

One may regard these poems as forming a fairly homogenous category on the level of form and of their basis. With reference to the form, the use of the wa'afri metre appears with striking frequency. Furthermore, the terrifying numerousness of the enemy warriors is expressed by Muhalhil b. Rabi'a (Tabakb, 33), Khiḍah b. Zuhayr (op. cit., 121), al-Mufaddal b. Maṣḥar (op. cit., 233) and ʿAbd al-Sharīq al-Ḡuṣaini (Hamāsā of Abū Tammām, i, 177) by means of the same comparison in a hermeneutic common in the four of these poems: fa-djaʿu *-drid? an... "They came [like] a cloud bringing hail, and we came ..."

With reference to their basis, theṣaʿara maṣnaqa constitutes "an elegant means of vaunting oneself whilst at the same time recognising the enemy's bravery, above all, without humiliating him, in such a way as to preserve the conditions of sincere brotherhood". In this respect, there are some verses which make one inevitably think of certain passages in the iṣbāʿa al-ḥadīth which reveal a secret hope of converting the people whom one is combating. To a certain degree, theṣaʿara maṣnaqa can be linked with the concept of bihṣ [q.v.], and are basically opposed to that of ṣaʿdā' [q.v.], which aims at dishonoring the enemy by making him lose his ʿird [q.v.]. Finally, one may note that this type of poetry is no longer attested after the coming of Islam, probably because the Arab tribes had by that time ceased to fight each other in the fashion of the ḏāḥịliyya.

Bibliography: The examples which are extant have been gathered together by the present author in his study Sur l'expression arabe al-ṣāfī m.n.s.fiat, in Milanges Marcel Cohen, Paris [1970], 277-85.

(M. PELLAT)


From this onomastic formula, it may be deduced that he was descended from the family of Bābawāh, originally of Kumm, well-known in circles of Shīfiʿi traditionists (it will suffice to mention his ancestor, the eminent Ibn Bābawāh [q.v.], of which he was to be the last representative to earn equivalent renown as a man of learning. From the tarājdama devoted to him by one of his pupils, the Shīfiʿi ʿAlī b. Kāẓim b. Kāẓim al-Tadwin, and through the information to be found in his Fikrist (see below), it is possible to sketch the basic outline of his biography. Born at Rāyi, where a branch of the Bābawāh family had established itself, possibly in the time of his aforementioned ancestor, he was guided at a very early age towards study of the sciences of ḥadīth, having the opportunity of meeting in Rāyi all the masters who passed through this town. His travels for the purpose of study were to follow the academic itinerary of the period (Iṣfāhān, Bāghdād, al-Hīla, Khārazm, Tabaristān, Kazvin, Kāḡān and Nīḡārāp, and he was to assemble a quite respectable list of teachers, giving him an unrivalled education in the field of ḥadīth.

The works attributed to him by the sources are four in number: (1) K. al-ʿArbaʿīn ʿan al-ʿarbaʿīn min al-ʿarbaʿīn fī ṣalāṭ al-ʿAmīr al-Muʾminin, a collection of forty ḥadīth̄s on ʿAlī b. ʿAbī Tālib heard by forty of his teachers, of which the smads are traced back to forty Ṣadiq̣a; a manuscript copy has been preserved; (2) Taʿrīkh al-Rays, the dubious title of an anecdotal work devoted to the scholars of his city; quotations from it are to be found in the Lisan al-Maʿṣūn of Ibn Ḥaḍjar al-ʿAṣkalānī [q.v.]; (3) al-ʿUṣra, a risāla concerning prayers, of which the authorship is however uncertain; and (4) Fikrist asāmiʿ al-ʿulūm al-Shīʿa wa-maṣṣaṣifiṭa, his most interesting work for the information which may be gleaned from it regarding the Imāmī community of the period.

This is a book devoted to ʿilm al-ridjāl [q.v.] which refers, through its title, to a seminal work on this subject, the Fikrist of Abū Dīfāʾ al-Tūsī [q.v.], of which the author intends it to be an updated version. It contains brief bio-bibliographical articles arranged in alphabetical order and relating to 544 Imāmī ʿulūm, most of them belonging to a period later than that of al-ʿArbaʿīn, in whose momentous aspect the formula ʿulūm-nasab-nisba, ʿulūm-nasab-nisba, until he was his, and even after, the formula ʿulūm-nasab-nisba ʿulūm-nasab-nisba was almost a rule. Through the nisbas of the individuals and the biographical information, the impression is gained that the majority of them were born or resided in towns of Persia.

Hitherto, use has been made of the copy preserved by Maḥdīs in the Bībār al-anwār (lith. Tehran 1315, xxv, 2-13), but henceforward reference will be to the critical edition ofʿAbī al-ʿAzīz al-Ṭabāṭabaʾī (Kumm 1404/1984-5), which is preceded by a well-documented Introduction and enriched by an Appendix containing the quotations borrowed by Ibn Ḥaḍjar al-ʿAṣkalānī from the Taʿrīkh al-Rāy of Muntadjab al-Dīn.


(A. ARIOLI)
AL-MUNTAFIK

AL-MUNTAFIK, a section of the Arab tribe of the Banū 'Ukayl, which in turn is a subdivision of the Banū 'Amr b. al-Muntafik. 1.

1. In Pre-Islamic Arabia and the age of the conquests. Genealogy: al-Muntafik b. 'Amir b. 'Ukayl (Wüstenfeld, Gen. Tab., D. 19). The very scanty information in Wüstenfeld can be supplemented by the notice which Ibn al-Kalbī gives of the Banū 'l-Muntafik (Qumhārat al-nasab = Casket and Strenziök, Tabellen, 104, Register 431); but this little clan nowhere appears to play a great part in early history. The territory inhabited by the Banū 'l-Muntafik is the same as that of the other divisions of the Banū 'Ukayl, in the south-west of Yamāma; some places belonging to them are quoted by al-Bakrī (Mu'ṣāfīn, ed. Wüstenfeld, 567), Yākūt (Mu'ṣafīn, ed. Wüstenfeld, i., 793-4; iv., 712, l. 78; we may note that in these two passages al-Muntafik is said to be the surname of Mu'āwiya b. 'Ukayl, while the usual genealogy makes this Mu'āwiya a son of al-Muntafik) and al-Ḥamdānī (Qazira, ed. D. H. Müller, 177, ll. 12-15: note the mention of gold mines in their territory). The Banū 'l-Muntafik numbered among their clients the Banū Ṭahrīr (Wüstenfeld, Gen. Tab., C 13), whose eponym was said to have been made a prisoner by them (Kitāb al-AGMAI, vii., 110); one of the few episodes of the pre-Islamic period in which this clan is mentioned is that of the Banū Dālam b. Kays b. al-Muntafik distinguished himself (Agāmī, x., 44; Nakā'īd, ed. Bevan, 671 l. 12-672, l. 14, where Ibn Ṭufayl should be deleted). In the history of the origins of Islam, several of them appear as ambassadors of the Banū 'Ukayl to the Prophet: such were Anas b. Kays b. al-Muntafik and Lakīt b. Abī Djabala where Kays b. al-Muntafik was governor of Marw and Ahwaz, also by the mid-19th century, the Sa'dīn and the Afrasiyabs against a Persian attack in 1625. Later of Basra resulted in the Muntafik defending Basra for the Ottomans. Genealogy: al-Muntafik b. 'Amir b. 'Ukayl, which in turn is a subdivision of the Banū 'Amr b. al-Muntafik (Ibn Sa'd, ii. 25, 45, etc.; on the latter, the biographical collections have long discussions as to whether he is to be identified with this or that author; cf. among others Ibn Ḥadjar, Tahdhīb al-tahdhib, viii., 456). In the period of the conquests, the Banū 'l-Muntafik settled in the marshy region between Kūfah and Baṣra (al-Kalbī and Al-Batīha); the same is true of the poet Djahm b. 'Awf b. al-Husayn b. al-Muntafik (Ibn Ḥadjar, Isāba, ed. Shärafasiyā, Cairo 1325, v., 124 follows Ibn al-Kalbī).

Bibliography: Given in the article.

2. In recent times.

Together with the Al Bū Muhammad, the Banū Lām (q.v.), the 'Ubayyid and sections of the Shammar, the Muntafik tribe dominated the area from Baghslād to Baṣra between the 17th to 19th centuries; until the late 19th century, Ottoman political and administrative control was tenuous at best, and always dependent on a delicate balance of alliances with different combinations of tribes. The rise of the Muntafik to power in early modern times began in the early 17th century, when a marriage alliance between the shaykhly house of Sa'dān and the Afrāsāyāb (q.v.) resulted in the Muntafik defending Baṣra for the Afrāsāyāb against a Persian attack in 1625. Later in the century, Shaykh Manṣūr al-Sa'dān captured Baṣra and the city stayed in the hands of the tribe until the Ottomans regained control in 1705 [see Ahmād šalī].

Between 1750 and 1831, the year in which direct Ottoman control was, at least in theory, re-established, the pashāk of Baghslād was ruled by a succession of Mamluks, at least part of whose survival in power depended on placating or cooperating with the major tribes (see T. Nieuhuisen, Politikas und society in early modern Iraq: Mamlūk pashas, tribal shaykhs and local rule between 1802 and 1881, Amsterdam 1992); given the power vacuum in Baghslād, the Muntafik were instrumental in preventing Baṣra from falling to the forces of Karīm Khān Zand (q.v.) in 1775. The tribe played an equally important role in checking Wahhābī incursions into southern ʾIrāq from central Arabia, and took part in an Ottoman expedition to Hulūf in 1798-9 (M. Freiherr von Oppenheim, Die Belagerungen in Nord-Mittelasien und im Irak, ed. W. Caskel, Wiesbaden 1952, 415-29).

By the mid-19th century, the confederation had reached the zenith of its territorial power, controlling the area between Simāwā on the Euphrates and the Shâṭīf al-ʾIrāb, from Kūt on the Tigris southwards to ʾUzayr and from Kūt eastwards to the Persian border, and members of the shaykhly family held the tax farms of much of southern ʾIrāq between 1831 and 1869. However, the increasingly centralising tendency of Ottoman policies meant that the might of the Muntafik was already declining; in 1854 Shaykh Manṣūr al-Sa'dān was forced to recognise the Ottoman occupation of Simāwā; Sūk al-Shūyūk was occupied in 1856, and by 1861 the tribe had given up the area between Shatrah and Kīl'at Sālīh to the Ottomans. Some members of the Sa'dān family, notably Nāṣir Paša, became incorporated into the Ottoman administration, while others, notably Manṣūr Paša and his son Sa'dān, maintained their distance and tried, generally unsuccessfully, to resist the encroachments of the state. Nāṣir was appointed muṣarrīfī of the sanjak of the Muntafik by Midhat Paša (q.v.), founded Nāṣīriyya (q.v.) as an administrative centre in 1874 and became the first mutasarrīf of the Sa'dān from central ʾIrāq in 1875, while Sa'dān b. Manṣūr, who became paramount shaykh in 1903, was eventually exiled by the Ottomans to Aleppo, where he died in 1911. In the First World War, the family generally supported the Ottomans until the capture of ʾAmārā by the British in 1915; its best-known member, 'Abd al-Muḥsin al-Sa'dān, served several times as a parliamentary deputy and was twice Prime Minister of ʾIrāq under the monarchy.

In 1929 (von Oppenheim, op. cit., 448), the Muntafik confederation numbered some 75,000 tribesmen, divided into seven principal sections. It had been ruled at least since the end of the 17th century by members of a single family, the Sa'dān, asḥaf who had migrated to Mesopotamia from the Hijāz, perhaps in the 15th century [see Al-Batīha]; the Sa'dān were Sunnis, while the rank-and-file tribesmen were Shī'īs, originally pastoral nomads, but increasingly through the 19th century sedentary cultivators. In their capacities as guardians and protectors of the transit routes between Baghslād and Baṣra and principal suppliers of horses to British India, the Muntafik leaders generally maintained good relations with the East India Company's representatives, who had played an important political role in the area since the end of the 18th century.

By the beginning of the 20th century, the Sa'dān
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family had lost much of its former authority, largely because of the way in which the Muntafik tribal lands had been transferred out of the hands of their traditional occupiers into its hands. Especially during the rice cultivators, the customary form of land tenure had virtually amounted to private property; they could sell, bequeath, inherit or mortgage their land. When the Sa’dun family acquired lazur rights from the Ottomans in the early 1870s (under the terms of the 1856 Land Law), they proceeded to lease their tithe-collecting rights to sarkals or minor qadhis, with the result that they were “increasingly viewed as merely absentee landlords and were resented accordingly” (Albertine Jwaidhe, Aspects of land tenure and social change in late Ottoman times, in Tarif Khalidi (ed.), Land tenure and social transformation in the Middle East, Beirut 1984; 333–56); in consequence, they lost much of the social and political control which they had traditionally exercised over the Muntafik tribesmen. During and especially after the First World War, the Muntafik area was notorious for its lawlessness, and there were serious tribal risings as late as 1936. A Muntafik Land Commission was set up in 1929 to try to resolve long-standing disputes over title, but its efforts were frustrated by powerful landlord interests, which the British mandatory authorities had done much to bolster and support (P. Sluglett, Britain in Iraq, i, 1917–1932, London 1976).


(Pl. Sluglett)


Towards the end of al-Mutawakkil’s reign, it had been the aim of his vizier ʿUbayd Allāh b. Yahiya b. Khākān to get the succession changed from the caliph’s original choice of waṣli al-ʾabd to another son of al-Mutawakkil. Al-Muntasir was involved in the conspiracy of the Turkish soldiery which led to the caliph’s death (see al-Mutawakkil), and himself received the baytā (q.v.) at the palace of al-Djawäriyya on Wednesday, 4 Shawwal 247/11 December 861, when he was 25 years old. His chief executive was the vizier Ahmad b. al-Khaṣib, his former secretary, whose policy, in concert with the Turkish commanders Ṣawṭī and Bihān b. Ṣagḥīr, was to get the claims of the next heirs, the brother al-Muṭaffāz and al-Muʿayyad, set aside lest, should either of the latter achieve power, he might take vengeance for his father al-Mutawakkil’s murder. Ahmad persuaded al-Muntasir to get the succession changed (Safar 248/April 862) and managed to get his rival Ṣawṭī sent off to lead the summer raid against Byzantium. During his brief six months’ reign, little else is recorded of al-Muntasir’s activities, although the sources stress his intelligence and fairness, and, in contradistinction to his father’s strongly Sunni and anti-Muʿtazī attitudes, his consideration for the ʾAlids; they were one of the first to adopt the title al-Muntasir (q.v.)—a face-muffler, covering the mouth and chin (liṭāḥam [q.v.]) and who were known collectively as the mulaththamun by the Arab

their graves and shrines. Al-Muntasir fell ill and died at Sāmarra on Thursday, 25 Rabī’I 1249/28 May 862 or shortly thereafter; the choice of the Turkish guards and the vizier Ahmad b. al-Khaṣib—a descendant of the legitimate survivors of al-Mutawakkil for the reason mentioned above—now fell on a grandson of al-Muṭawakkil’s, Ahmad b. Muḥammad al-Mustaʿin (q.v.).

geographers, inhabited that region of the Sahara traversed by the Saharan salt [see AZALAY] and slave caravans and known to the Arab geographers as the Kkudam or Nisar desert. They lived a nomadic existence there, as do the Sahrawis and the Tuareg down to the present day.

The Muslim writers by no means agree, in matter of details, over the events that first brought about the creation of the movement of the Murabitan in these remote areas, though in broad terms they trace its genesis as follows.


Two works in particular are our oldest surviving sources for the record of the circumstances that led to the rise of the movement: (a) Tarikh al-madaris wa-takrib al-alisalik li-ma'sirat a'dam madhab Mlik by the Kadi Abu l-Fadl 'Iyad b. Mtsa al-Yahyab al-Sabiti, 476/1083-1149 [q.v] (see H. T. Norris, New evidence on the life of 'Abdallah b. Yasin and the origins of the Almoravid movement, in Jnl. Afr. Hist., xxii [1971], 255-68); and (b) Kitab al-Maslak wa-um-malakik by Abi 'Ubayd 'Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-'Aziz b. Muhammad b. Ayyub al-Bakri, written in 460/1068. One of the most important Arabic sources was that specifically concerned with the Almoravids is now lost. Its author, Ibn al-Shayrafi Abi Bakr Yahya b. Muhammad b. Yusuf al-Ansari al-Ishbili (d. 557/1164) was a supporter of the movement. He left a comprehensive record of the circumstances that led to his father's death, his work being entitled Anwar al-djalil fi akhbar al-Murabitun. Ibn 'Idhari and the anonymous author of the Kitab al-Hulal al-mawshiyya, the Ria de Oro and the Lyad and by Ibn al-Kadi al-Lyad b. Musa al-Yahsubi al-Sabti, 476-544/1083-1149, was a supporter of the movement of the Murabitun.

However, Ibn al-'Idhari and the anonymous author of the Kitab al-Hulal al-mawshiyya appear to have drawn material upon this missing work for their accounts.

In the first half of the 5th/11th century a man of piety, either a tribal chief or a jurist, of the Djaddala or Gudali tribe (who were the chief as 'Abd Allah b. Yasin b. Ibrahim b. Gudali). On his way back to the Western Sahara, he met in Karrayan the teacher of Malik law Abi 'Imran al-Ghadfiimi al-Fasi (a detail omitted by the Kadi 'Iyad, though mentioned by al-Bakri). He in his turn recommended the jurist/chief to visit Wadjadj b. Zalwil, whose Dar al-Murabitun was situated in the Moroccan Sus (at Agul or Malkus). Touched by al-Djwahar's desire to educate his tribe further in Mlik orthodoxy, and seeing in him an ally of military potential, Wadjadj sent him southwards into the desert, accompanied by his chief pupil, 'Abd Allah b. Yasin al-Djazuli, who had studied for seven years in Cordova. 'Abd Allah b. Yasin resided for some time amongst the Djaddala, though he also seems to have become acquainted with the princely families of the Lamtuna [q.v] who were related to the Djaddala, despite frequent tribal conflicts with them, and who were geographically centred in the more southerly region of the Adrar [q.v] of Mauritania and in Tagant. 'Abd Allah b. Yasin was a strict Mlik. He enforced the Shari'a penalties to the letter and even issued a fatwa that authorised the slaying of al-Djwahar b. Sakkum who had first accompanied him into the desert. Both the Kadi 'Iyad and al-Bakri describe the severe discipline that was imposed on those who chose to enter into the tribe of Ibn Yasin. According to the Kadi 'Iyad (Madarik, ed. Bakir, iv, 781) "All were obedient to him and to the faith he followed in the way he conducted his affairs there. His recorded decisions are well known and remembered, and they memorize his fatwas and his answers to legal questions. They do not depart from them. He made all of them observe the congregational prayer and he punished those who did not observe it, ten lashes for every rak'a which one of them missed, since they were in his view those for whom no prayer was proper save if led by an Imam. This was due to their ignorance in reciting (the Kuran) and in praying (the statutory prayers)"

Their disciplinary measures necessitated the return of 'Abd Allah b. Yasin to consult his master Wadjadj b. Zalwi, according to al-Bakri. All the sources, however widely they may differ, are in accord that the movement of the Murabitun was inspired by a militant and expansionist ideology conceived by 'Abd Allah b. Yasin. As far as we can tell from the writings of Kadi 'Iyad, it was not to the fore in the Dar of Wadjadj b. Zalwi which was "built in the Sus for the purpose of study and for pious purposes"

The later historians centre the activities of the Murabitun at this stage in a hermitage base for 'Abd Allah b. Yasin, for Yahyab b. Ibrahim (or al-Djwahar b. Sakkum) and for the princes of the Lamtuna who joined the movement, Yahyab b. 'Umar and Abi Bakri b. Umar. Located near the mouth of the Senegal river, in the ‘Iba' of the coast of the Nounou or on Arguin island, it became the rallying point for neophytes who flocked to join the movement. They, the Lamtuna and Massufa as well as Djaddala, were organised into a raiding force that subdued the adja-cent Sanhadja and they may have made common cause with pious Muslim rulers (such as Wadjabbi b. Rabis) and their subjects along the Senegal river in Takrur.

However, neither the Kadi 'Iyad nor al-Bakri attach any importance to such a waterside centre. Their total silence suggests that later historians may have invented it or given it an inflated significance in order to explain the meaning of ribdt by a more graphical and conventional exegesis. Instead, al-Bakri describes the foundation of a town by 'Abd Allah b. Yasin as his headquarters, in which all its habitations were of a uniform height and which bore the name of Aratnann. This Berber word supplies no clear indication of its location, suggesting either a low-lying or hollow place for water (according to the Znaga-speaking Mauritanian scholar al-Muktir b. Hammadun), or simply "our thing", aret nenna, "la chose que nous avons dite (ordonnee)" (according to the opinion of Salem Chaker) (see M. Brett, Islam and trade in the Bilad al-Sudan, tenth-eleventh century AD, in Jnl. Afr. Hist., xxiv [1983], 431-40).

Whatever changes may have taken place within the Saharan leadership (and it is clear from all the sources that the Lamtuna Sanhadja were rapidly to become the elite group, the "Practitioner Guard" of the Murabitun), 'Abd Allah b. Yasin was to keep for himself the supreme direction of affairs and the political and financial administration of the brotherhood. He entrusted his faithful disciple Yahyab b. 'Umar al-Lamtuni (whom on one occasion he had himself haggled, fled the leadership of the army and named him Amir al-Mustfin. This army fought to the death with spears, arranged in solid phalanxes, and it was to face the Djaddala at the battle of T.ibr.1y in the Rio de Oro region. This was a pyrrhic victory strategically though an important one politically, since it put an end to the period of Djaddala support from the movement and their adoption of a generally hostile attitude towards its Saharan and Sudanic
objectives. The conquest of Saharan border towns such as Awdaghust [q.v.], nominally subject to the rule of Ghana, was undertaken by the Lamtuna who, until almost the very end of the Almoravid dynasty were to hold the reins of power and who were in fact to become synonymous with it.

According to the Kāfiʿ ʿIyād, "The whole Sahara passed under the control of the Murābitūn, likewise that region beyond it in the country of the Masmūda, the ibis and the Sūs after many wars. Then he [Abd Allāh b. Yāsīn] led the people forth to fight the infidel Barghawāta and he raided them with Abū Bakr b. ʿUmar as the chief of a mighty company of Murābitūn and Masmūda. It is said that they were 50,000 men on foot or mounted. He occupied their city of Tamāsān. The Barghawāta fled before him in their mountains and in their thickets and the army advanced after them. Abū Allāh b. Yāsīn was left alone with a few of his companions. A great host of Barghawāta met him and he fought them fiercely. He perished as a martyr (actually at Kurīfālāt), may God have mercy upon him. That was in the year 450/1058. The raids that were carried out in the Wādī Darʿa and the Sūs region were vital to the triumph of the Almoravids in Morocco and indeed in the whole of North Africa.

The spiritual successor of Abū Allāh b. Yāsīn, Abū Bakr, was his cousin and was killed in 452/1060. He was a far sligher personality and a jurist and, like his brother, Abū ʿI-ʿKāsim b. ʿAdīdū, who survived him, had been a companion of Wadjadj b. Zalwi in his Masjd of Aghmār. Another jurist who is mentioned was the legal and spiritual policy amongst the Almoravids, and was to become synonymous with it. One with a hundred thousand fighters without their measure, in order to return to the desert in order to have mercy upon him. That was in the year 450/1058. The raids that were carried out in the Wādī Darʿa and the Sūs region were vital to the triumph of the Almoravids in Morocco and indeed in the whole of North Africa.

The spiritual successor of Abū Allāh b. Yāsīn, Abū Bakr, was his cousin and was killed in 452/1060. He was a far sligher personality and a jurist and, like his brother, Abū ʿI-ʿKāsim b. ʿAdīdū, who survived him, had been a companion of Wadjadj b. Zalwi in his Masjd of Aghmār. Another jurist who is mentioned was the legal and spiritual policy amongst the Almoravids, and was to become synonymous with it. One with a hundred thousand fighters without their measure, in order to return to the desert in order to have mercy upon him. That was in the year 450/1058. The raids that were carried out in the Wādī Darʿa and the Sūs region were vital to the triumph of the Almoravids in Morocco and indeed in the whole of North Africa.

The spiritual successor of Abū Allāh b. Yāsīn, Abū Bakr, was his cousin and was killed in 452/1060. He was a far sligher personality and a jurist and, like his brother, Abū ʿI-ʿKāsim b. ʿAdīdū, who survived him, had been a companion of Wadjadj b. Zalwi in his Masjd of Aghmār. Another jurist who is mentioned was the legal and spiritual policy amongst the Almoravids, and was to become synonymous with it. One with a hundred thousand fighters without their measure, in order to return to the desert in order to have mercy upon him. That was in the year 450/1058. The raids that were carried out in the Wādī Darʿa and the Sūs region were vital to the triumph of the Almoravids in Morocco and indeed in the whole of North Africa.
with the death of the Almoravid governor of Spain Yahyā b. Ghāniya al-Massufa (543/1148-9) the authority of the Almoravids in the peninsula came to an end.

The last stage of decline was rapid, and Nevill Barbour has summarised the reasons for it as follows: "The Empire fell when the Almoravids realised that they could not sustain their struggle on two fronts, against the Christians in al-Andalus and the Masmuda in southern Morocco. They were also faced with internal chaos and dissension in al-Andalus. Their fall took place over a brief period of time. It began in 1121 and rapidly worsened after 1141. The struggle with the Masmuda lasted from 1125 to 1147. Almoravid rule ended save in the Balearic Islands and Ifriqiya, where, under the Massufa Banū Ghāniya, it lasted well into the thirteenth century. Yusuf had counselled his son, 'Ali, not to stir up the people of the Atlas mountains and those Masmuda who were beyond them. The policy failed completely".

To this may be added a further cause. There was a growing tension between the Lamtuna and Massufa Sanhadja who were Murābitūn. This was especially true in the eastern Maghrib where commercial routes linked al-Andalus, particularly Almena, to the Niger bend via Wahrān. The eastern trade routes that developed benefited the Massufa rather than the Lamtuna who controlled the Mauritanian Adrar western route, betwixt Marrakush and the Almoravid capital in the Western Sahara Azuki, the tank Lamtuni which was the axis for the Almoravids invasion of the Maghrib when the movement was in its infancy. In this dispute between Saharan tribes on Moroccan and Algerian soil, some leading commanders of the Massufa sided with the Almohads against the Lamtūna.

Chronological table of the rulers of the Almoravids

1. Yahyā b. Ibrāhīm al-Djaddālī
2. Yahyā b. 'Umar (d. 1105-7)
3. Abū Bakr b. 'Umar (d. 1087)
4. Yusuf b. Tāshufīn, 'Amīr al-Mustālim (d. 1107)
5. 'Ali b. Yusuf, ..., 500-37/1107-43
6. Tāshufīn b. 'Ali, ..., 537-9 or 541/1143-5 or 1147
7. Ibrāhīm b. Tāshufīn, ..., soon dethroned.
8. 'Ishāk b. 'Ali, ..., killed at the taking of Marrakush by the Almohads (541/1146-7).

2. The legacy of the Almoravids in the Maghrib. The Almoravids, especially in al-Andalus, were branded for centuries as arrogant and uncouth, unlettered, legalistic and intolerant barbarians. Describing their rule in al-Andalus, S. Lane-Poole in his The
Moors in Spain, London 1887, 181, remarked: "The reign of the Puritans had come, and without a Milton to aid in the cultivation. The poets who had thriven at the numerous little courts, where the most bloodthirsty despot had always a hearty and appreciative welcome for a man of genius, and would generally cap his verses with impromptu lines, were disgusted with the savage Berbers, who could not understand their refinements, and who when they sometimes attempted to form themselves upon the model of the cultivated tyrants who had preceded them, made so poor an imitation that it was impossible to help laughing. The free-thinkers and men of broad views saw nothing very encouraging in the accession to power of the fanaticial priests who formed the Almoravides' advisers, and who were not only rapidly opposed to anything that savoured of philosophy, but read their Koran exclusively through the spectacles of a single communal sect."

Recent Western writers, N. Barbour amongst them, have adopted a more sympathetic approach. They have sensed an achievement in a number of respects and have pin-pointed several permanent religious and cultural innovations that were introduced within the Maghrib which can confidently be attributed to the Almoravides. These include:

(a) The unification of Morocco. When the Almoravides entered in they found it split into petty tribal principalities; when they were unseated by the Almohads, Morocco had emerged as a unified country.

(b) In Morocco, and in the Maghrib in general, under the rule of the Almoravides, there was a rapid assimilation of Andalusian civilisation. Use was made of Spanish Muslim architects and engineers. Secretaries, who were Andalusians, rose to a high position. Yusuf b. Tâghûfûn took into his service Ibn al-Kâšîra, the former secretary of al-Mu'tamid of Seville whom he had deposed. 'Alî b. Yusuf employed a number of great Andalusian prose writers in his chanceller, for example Ibn 'Abdûn and Ibn Abi 'l-Khâsîl. Influences from the peninsula are apparent in Moorcan and Algerian architecture. Much of the Karawiyûn (q. v.) in Fas (Fas-Meknes) dates from the era of the Almoravides, having been extended by 'Alî's order. Another important monument of the period is the Kubbât al-Bârûdûyyûn in Marrâkûsh. The finest surviving monument of the Almoravides is the great mosque in Tîlimsân, where Andalusian influence is very strong. It was completed in 530/1136 and was modelled on the Grand Mosque in Cordova.

(c) In the Maghrib, the authority of the Almoravide state rested upon two foundations. First, the dominion of the Sânnâhâja who settled in numbers in the cities and who were the governors at a local level, with a particular influence in regions such as Zamûr (the Banû Amghâr). Since the house of Abû Bakr b. 'Umar and Yusuf b. Tâghûfûn proudly declared Berber blood and in agnates boasted of a Himyaric pedigree, a number of Arab judges, especially those of Kaţhândîn stock, were appointed to senior positions. The Sânnâhâja Murâbîtûn constituted a military and political élite, especially the Lamtûnà, Lamţa and Massûfûa. They formed a veritable caste and were distinguished from other Arab-Berber groups by their bîghâm. The Lamtûnà led the social aristocracy, and their fighting men constituted the core of the army. They played a leading role in the navy, and they occupied most of the higher administrative posts. 'Alî b. Tâghûfûn made use of Christian cavalry troops alongside his negro units (which were to play a crucial part in the battle of al-Zallâkâ, see below). He was the first ruler in the Maghrib to employ Christian mercenaries (see, in particular, J. P. F. Hopkins, Medieval Muslim government in Barbary, 54-5). Their military skill and foreign blood enabled the rulers to dispense with African units that were recruited on a tribal basis. Second, the authority of the fukâh,? This axiom of Almoravid Islam had a positive contribution to make, though this was to be outweighed by baleful and negative features. The legal manuals of Mâlikîm were to be cherished, studied in depth, copied and commented upon, notwithstanding the fact that a number of features of customary law and habit and law amongst the Saharan Sânnâhâja, for example the exceedingly free life of their womenfolk in male society, was to be tolerated in the Maghrib, arousing the wrath of Ibn Tûmâr, amongst others. The Qur'ân itself and the Prophetic traditions were relegated to a secondary status, and scholastic theology ('ilm al-kalâm) was condemned as a system of thought which undermined the faith. The lofty moral ethic of the early Almoravides, which appears to have survived 'Abd Allâh b. Yâsin's own breach of some of its principles, was eventually to succumb to the refined and effete life in Spain and the Maghrib. Despite a certain Sûfî flavour in the lifestyle of the Saharan men in their rîbâh, the Almoravides were to become opposed to Sûfîm, which was in some ways, such as the Almoravids in Sahara, to make an appearance at a relatively recent date. The thoughts of al-Ghazâlî, however, made a mark in Almoravid Fez through 'Ali b. Hîrizîm (d. 541/1146). Rîbâhs of a Sûfî character were to be built in the Maghrib at the beginning of the 6th/12th century, notwithstanding the narrowing dogmatic vision of the Almoravide state.

3. The legacy of the Almoravides in the Sahara and in the Western Südân. This legacy was to survive until the present day in Mauritania [see MURITANIA], in Mali [q.v.], in the Niger Republic [q.v.] and in parts of Northern Nigeria. It may be summarised as follows:

(a) The foundation of the town of Azûgî (vars. Azûgî, Azûkî, Azûkî) as the southern capital of the Almoravides. It lies 10 km NW of Atar. According to al-Bakîrî, it was a fortress, surrounded by 20,000 palms, and it had been founded by Yânînî b. 'Umar al-Hâdîdî, a brother of Yahyâ b. 'Umar. It seems likely that Azûgî became the seat of the Kâdî Muhammâb b. al-Hasan al-Murâdî al-Hâdrâmî (to cite both the Kâdî 'Iyâdî and Ibn Bashkuwâl), who died there in 489/1095-6 (assuming Azûgî to be Azkid or Azkd). The town was for long regarded as the "capital of the Almoravides", well after the fall of the dynasty in Spain and even after its fall in the Balearic Islands. It receives a mention by al-Idrîsî, al-Zuhîr and other Arab geographers. It may also have been known in mediaeval Europe, appearing in the romance of Willehalm (see the tr. by Marion E. Gibbs and M. Johnson of Wolfram von Eschenbach, Penguin Classics, Harmondsworth 1894, 174) as Azaqoug ("the blacks from Azaqoug are a stone wall against attacks"). On the archaeology and history of Azûgî, see A. W. Ould Cheikh and B. Saison, Vite(s) et mort(s) de Al-Imâm al-Hâdrâmî. Autour de la postérité saharienne du mouvement almoravide (11e-12e s.), in Arabica, xxxiv/1 (1987), 48-79.

(b) The tradition of Murâbît ancestry, ultimately going back to the Tabûs'î of Hîmyâr, amongst several Mauritanian and Tuareg groups (for example the Lamtûnà, Ùdaw [Ish, Igdalen], Kel Ex-Sûk). This has had a literary importance, as likewise a lineal one.

(c) Linked to the above, a gëste that is widely known as...
in Mauritania, in Senegal and the Western Sahara, about the exploits of Abu Bakr. ‘Umar and his martyred spiritual counsellor, the Imam al-Hadrâni. Associated with this theme is the story of the martyrdom of Abu Bakr in wars against the dog-owning pagan negroes of Bâfir of Ghâna and the “Mountain of Gold” (Djabal al-Dhahab). It is significant that these folk-legends and romances appear to have survived for centuries and to take preference over other Hilâli and non-Hilâli type folk-legends and romances that have penetrated and moulded the legends of later Arabic-speaking communities in North Africa. The longevity of Abu Bakr as a heroic figure is vividly illustrated by the Catalan Map of Charles V (1375), and other such mediaeval maps, where King Abu (Bû) Bakr, mounted and veiled on a camel and carrying a Murâbiti whip, is depicted next to Mansa Musâ [g.o.], King of Mali (for representative examples, see H.T. Norris, Saharan myths and songs, 126-59, and more especially the Kaïâda of Šaqqâ Muhammad Mubârak al-Lamûtîn (in ibid., v., 110-16), who claimed Murâbiti descent, and who attempted (unconvincingly), to bridge the gap in historical records between the fall of the Almoravids in the Maghrib and al-Andalus in the 6th/12th century, and the growth of self-conscious “neo-Murâbit” movements (such as that of Nâšîr al-Dîn) in Mauritania in the 11th/17th century; see also Ould Cheikh and Sâlih Abû Bakr, Les Arabes de l’Algérie, 1866, 193-5. The persistence of an Almoravid tradition in the Zwâya and Inesiemen classes in some tribal groups in Mauritania, Mali, the Western Sahara and amongst some of the Tuareg (especially the Kel Es-Sûk) and also possibly much further (via Imrââbân in 7th/13th century Algeria) to the east amongst the Murâbitûn in Barka and the Western Desert of Egypt (see E. Evans-Pritchard, The Nuer of Omo, Oxford 1949, 69-8. On the Western Saharan, Sahelian and Sudânic Zwâya, see Norris, Muslim Sahâhîa scholars of Mauritania, in Studies in West African Islamic history, i. The cultivators of Islam, ed. J.R. Willis, London 1979, 147-59).

That the 6th/12th century “Murâbitûn” in the Sahara journeyed as far as the Western Desert of Egypt and also, little-known routes along the Senegal and Niger rivers, are also trodden, al-mulaththamun (= the veiled people) followed it with the help of a guide. (e) Almoravid architectural and decorative features in urban architecture in the Mauritanian Hâwîd, in the region of the Niger bend and in parts of the Algerian Sahara (see Dj. Jacques Meunié, Cités anciennes de Mauritanie, Paris 1961, 20-3, 35, 59, 72, 90, 104, 108, 109-10, 132). (f) The Gao epitaphs which were of Andalusian Almoravid workmanship (see J. Cuco, Recueil des sources arabes, 111-14; J.O. Hunwick, Gao and the Almoravids: a hypothesis, in B. Swartz and R. Dumett (eds.), West African culture dynamics: archaeological and historical perspectives, The Hague 1979, 413-30; de Moraes Farias, Du nouveau sur les stèles de Gao: les epitaphes du prince Yama Kuri et du roi F. da (XIII siècle), in Bull. IFAN, xxxvi [1974], 511-26). (g) Cultural and tribal dissemination of Almoravid religious doctrines into the Central Sahara and as far east as the Libyan desert. This is especially true of the region of Tàdâmakkat (Es-Sûk), where a number of Lamûtûn later settled and whence their influence was extended into Air (Ayàr) and adjoining regions. (h) One of the main sources (ca. 532-493H/1137-543H) in his Khâtîl al-Dhûghráfîya, “Near to Ghâna at a distance of fifteen days’ travelling there are two towns, of which one is called NSLÂ and the second Tadmamka (sic). Between these two towns is a distance of nine day’s travelling. The people of these two towns turned Muslim seven years after the people of Ghâna turned Muslim. There had been much warfare between them. The people of Ghâna sought the help of the Almoravids” (see Hopkins and Levitzon, Corpus of early Arabic sources for West African history, 98-9). (i) The dominance of Mâlikî in fàh throughout the whole of West African Islam and the persistence of cultural and literary tastes that may be traced directly to the Almoravids. According to A.D.H. Bivar and M. Hiskett, The Arabic literature of Nigeria to 1800: a provisional account, in BSOAS (1962), 105-6. “It is a commonplace of all historians of West African and North Africa that the Arabic script and the custom of authorship in the Arabic language were introduced to West Africa during the period of the Murâbit (Almoravid) dynasty; that is to say, after the conquest of Old Ghana, and the penetration of the Niger region by Abu Bakr b. ‘Umar al-Murabit between 471/1078 and 475/1082. The inscriptions of Gao are cogent evidence of ready communication between Andalusia and the Niger region around the year 1100, and of the coherence of the Murâbît state, which then included the former, and at least adjoined the latter. With such antecedents it is to be expected that West African writers of Arabic concentrate their chief interest on the subject of fiqh. Like the great majority of West African Muslims, these authors were adherents of the Mâlikî school. They based their systems on a chain of legal authorities which stretch back to the Maghrib of the Murâbit period and preceding epoch of the Spanish Umayyads. This emphasis on the rulings of authorities, characteristic of an orthodox Mâlikî substantially free from innovating tendencies, is typical of the West African Arabic literature; and similar doctrines are largely preserved to the present day amongst the Muslims of Nigeria and the adjoining territories”.

Bibliography: 1. Arabic sources that make reference to the Almoravids are chronologically listed in N. Levitzon’s article, ‘Abd Allâh b. Yasin march in a waterless desert: to Sulêkâya, two days; then to Tämâmât, one day and from there to Sidjilmasa, one day’s journey. This route is rarely trodden, al-mulaththamun (= the veiled people) followed it with the help of a guide. (e) Almoravid architectural and decorative features in urban architecture in the Mauritanian Hâwîd, in the region of the Niger bend and in parts of the Algerian Sahara (see Dj. Jacques Meunié, Cités anciennes de Mauritanie, Paris 1961, 20-3, 35, 59, 72, 90, 104, 108, 109-10, 132). (f) The Gao epitaphs which were of Andalusian Almoravid workmanship (see J. Cuco, Recueil des sources arabes, 111-14; J.O. Hunwick, Gao and the Almoravids: a hypothesis, in B. Swartz and R. Dumett (eds.), West African culture dynamics: archaeological and historical perspectives, The Hague 1979, 413-30; de Moraes Farias, Du nouveau sur les stèles de Gao: les epitaphes du prince Yama Kuri et du roi F. da (XIII siècle), in Bull. IFAN, xxxvi [1974], 511-26). (g) Cultural and tribal dissemination of Almoravid religious doctrines into the Central Sahara and as far east as the Libyan desert. This is especially true of the region of Tàdâmakkat (Es-Sûk), where a number of Lamûtûn later settled and whence their influence was extended into Air (Ayàr) and adjoining regions. (h) One of the main sources (ca. 532-493H/1137-543H) in his Khâtîl al-Dhûghráfîya, “Near to Ghâna at a distance of fifteen days’ travelling there are two towns, of which one is called NSLÂ and the second Tadmamka (sic). Between these two towns is a distance of nine day’s travelling. The people of these two towns turned Muslim seven years after the people of Ghâna turned Muslim. There had been much warfare between them. The people of Ghâna sought the help of the Almoravids” (see Hopkins and Levitzon, Corpus of early Arabic sources for West African history, 98-9). (i) The dominance of Mâlikî in fàh throughout the whole of West African Islam and the persistence of cultural and literary tastes that may be traced directly to the Almoravids. According to A.D.H. Bivar and M. Hiskett, The Arabic literature of Nigeria to 1800: a provisional account, in BSOAS (1962), 105-6. “It is a commonplace of all historians of West African and North Africa that the Arabic script and the custom of authorship in the Arabic language were introduced to West Africa during the period of the Murâbit (Almoravid) dynasty; that is to say, after the conquest of Old Ghana, and the penetration of the Niger region by Abu Bakr b. ‘Umar al-Murabit between 471/1078 and 475/1082. The inscriptions of Gao are cogent evidence of ready communication between Andalusia and the Niger region around the year 1100, and of the coherence of the Murâbît state, which then included the former, and at least adjoined the latter. With such antecedents it is to be expected that West African writers of Arabic concentrate their chief interest on the subject of fiqh. Like the great majority of West African Muslims, these authors were adherents of the Mâlikî school. They based their systems on a chain of legal authorities which stretch back to the Maghrib of the Murâbit period and preceding epoch of the Spanish Umayyads. This emphasis on the rulings of authorities, characteristic of an orthodox Mâlikî substantially free from innovating tendencies, is typical of the West African Arabic literature; and similar doctrines are largely preserved to the present day amongst the Muslims of Nigeria and the adjoining territories”.

Bibliography: 1. Arabic sources that make reference to the Almoravids are chronologically listed in N. Levitzon’s article, ‘Abd Allâh b. Yasin


4. The Almoravids in Spain. The evolution of Almoravid politics would very quickly be conditioned by those of Muslim Spain. And it is no small paradox that an African movement became much more Andalusian than Maghribi, and was to devote the best part of its time and efforts to redressing the situation of a peripheral country.

Already between 470/1077 (the occupation of Tanger) and 476/1083 (the Castilian expedition against Seville, Medina Sidonia and Tarifa was in 1082), Yûsuf b. Tâdhhîf had received several requests for intervention in the affairs of the mulâk al-āṣṣā and the Christians. But the point of no return was to be 1085, the date of the fall of Toledo to Alphonso VI of Castile. This key event was to reveal brutally the precariousness of the units set up by the Andalusian princes, quite incapable of containing the growing pressure of the Christian kingdoms, bolstered by the Western awakening, the power of a warrior class and the Crusader ideology. The Almoravids were thus called upon, by various sections of opinion, to put an end to a situation that was untenable from contradictions that this implied. In the 5th/11th century, this “programme” was symbolised by the Almoravid movement, in as much as its continuing expansion from 454/1062 had become recognisable and had been permitted. Their help was requested —after the fall of Toledo—by...
the princes of Seville, Granada and Badajoz, putting Yūsuf under an obligation to defend them from Chris-
tian pressure, instead of combating other Muslims. But the emissaries, kādis of their respective capitals, also nourished their own afterthoughts: a re-
Islamisation and internal moralisation and a lighten-
ing of taxation. Hence the popular demand from 483/1090, for the application of these two latter measures and the overthrow of the mulūk al-jawāzīf (except for that of the Upper March). But the hesitations of the mulūk al-jawāzīf transformed their “electoral promises” into a programme which would require of them their immediate and complete accomplishment, and its non-realisation would lead to a discontent, directly proportional to the scale of the disappointed hopes.

The Almoravid history of al-Andalus is thus divided into three phases: (1) the Andalusian crisis; (2) reform and (3) progressive failure and opposition.

(1) The conditions of the appeal. The disappearance of the ‘Amīrids [q.v.] in 399/1009 was to allow the Hispanic Christian kingdoms to carry out an infiltra-
tion in the form of assistance (individual mercenaries or coherent groups) —a feature which already con-
stituted a disguised form of domination—, a strong military thrust (Castilian campaigns, loss of Toledo, conquests of the Cid [see al-sīf], fall of Huesca, Saragossa, Lerida and Tortosa), doubling of a pressure that was ideological (attempts at proselytism by the “Monk of France”, first Crusades), economic (mercenaries’ salaries, exaction of the “pariahs”’ booty), political (imposition of protectorates — vassalages, zones of influence).

These various factors created a situation where Andalusiyya was finally losing the monopoly and effective control of the Christians beyond the borders, the re-establishment of an internal Islamic order, the reduction of taxes and a certain return to caliphal unity. In fact, it was a case of simple consequences, all caused by one and the same problem. This implied that the military crisis (the tip of the iceberg) could not be remedied in a lasting fashion without simulta-
neously providing a solution to the economic and socio-ideological aspects which were connected with it. The option represented by recourse to the Murābitūn was either to win this bet or to face up to the dissatisfaction provoked by the non-achievement of the programme.

(2) Reform. Moved by initial enthusiasm on having finally found a solution to their problems, the Andalu-
sians began by seeing nothing but Almoravid suc-
cesses.

On the military level, the simple announcement of Yūsuf’s crossing forced Alphonso VI to lift the siege of Saragossa, and the victory of Zallāk drove the Zlrid amir al-mūsīlim to order the beating of drums and decree official celebrations... During the campaign [of Zallāk] it was wonderful, the purity of our intentions and sincerity; to the point that you would have thought that our hearts were united in one and the same objective.... We were all impatient to take part in the īzhād, without sparing our efforts....

(3) Failure. All these successes were real, but they were ephemeral. To preserve its Andalusian legitimacy, the Almoravid régime was forced to show itself always irreproachable, strong and effective, and, without being able to suppress the Chris-
tian pressure which, moreover, was growing. Not being able—for demographic reasons of lack of Andalusian collaboration—to deploy sufficient troops so as to have an offensive strategy, it had to confine itself to building up a defensive system (and using Christian mercenaries in the Maghrib). But to restore or build fortresses, maintain them, provision them, balance the garrisons’ accounts and pay mercenaries, assumed increased and growing costs. Hence the necessity of heavy taxation, far in excess of the possible return from canonical taxes only. Finally, many Zukkābīya and ‘ulamā’ who had endorsed and par-
ticipated in the decisions taken by the state lost their independence, their intellectual and moral prestige, and their old capacity as spokesmen for the aspirations of the ‘āmma.

Very soon we hear speak of Almoravid rapacity (hubbukun fi ‘l-māl), and all kinds of ma‘ūsūn, ważāfī, lauāzīm, ka‘bī, fitra, ta‘ābī and maghāram al-suljūn were to flourish once more. We know that some correspond to “charges for restoring walls” but, however necessary they may have been, they were resented no less as being so much more intolerable than those that were suppressed.

Generalised corruption and abuses of power became clichés, as the verses of Ibn al-Bani or the cases of Ibn ‘Abd Allāh show, and all means are seen as good in order to enrich oneself (Abū ʿUmar Inālah), to favour friends, carry out a number of fraudulent operatic schemes, etc. But, what was far worse, incompetence and cowardice became the attributes of generals, incapable of organising their troops and of exploiting a victory, easily put to rout by an enemy much inferior in numbers, etc. Al-Marrākūsh speaks of the “deliquescence of the state, the appearance of highway bandits, thieves and rogues, drunkards and libertines,....sheltered by the great ladies of the Lam-
tūnā and Massūla,...while the amīr al-mulūkīn, sceptics of piety and ascetism, was completely neglect-
ing the affairs of his subjects....

There was also an oppressive intellectual atmosphere. “The amīr did not value the Mālikī
The people were ter-
orised by there being accused of infidelity all those who were concerned with dogmatic theology. (the same story is given by Ibn al-Kalbi, Djamhard); according to Yakut, on the other hand, by Hubayra b. Abd

During the reign of 'Abd b. Yúsuf circulars were sent out throughout the country to reinforce the prohibition of being involved in kalâm and to threaten those who were found to be in possession of one of these books. When the works of Abú Hámid al-Qhâzâlî [q.v.] penetrated to the West, the amîr al-muwmîn ordered them to be burnt, adding threats of owâd and confiscation of goods for those who withheld them'.

The reaction in the beginning would be far more socio-intellectual than political. Two hotbeds of opposition (Ibn Tûmrât in the Maghrib and the ascetics of the south of Andalusia) arose independently of each other. While we should cer-
tainly not speak of formal, organised coordination, there existed a kind of indirect "collaboration of ains". According to the Ḥudâl, "the circumstance which was of most help to the Almohads [see AL-
MURABÎTUN] against the Almoravids was the upris-
ing of the Andalusians, which forced them to strip the land of its defenders and arms'". If they had not had to face the Almohads, the Murâbitûn would not have had great difficulty in eliminating the various small hotbeds of agitation which erupted in the east and west of Andalûs and it is very doubtful whether the Muwâwîyihûddin would have been able to succeed in supplanting the Almoravids, if the latter had not been enmeshed in the Andalusian imbroglio. It is debatable whether the strict Mâlikî legalism adopted by the Muwâwîyihûdd in was said to have been the first to rebel (tamarrâda) was said to have been the first to rebel (tamarrâda) against the Almoravids and it was therefore a brother of the Ansâr. According to the Sa'dî, the Almohads conquered (fatâk Murad; cf. below) the first of the Murad and by their neighbours, the Ansâr, by being under the Aghâm, the Murad was without a future and, in 542/1147, limited themselves to occupying and to enacting the Almohads on the first occasion (540/1145, by Yahya b. Ghânîyâ (Côrdova, Carmona and Jaén) was without a future and, in 542/1147, Alphonso VII of Castile occupied Almeria for several months.
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Yaghuth, surnamed al-Makshuh; the latter's son Kays seems to have been one of the most powerful chieftains of the Yaman at that time.

The Murad had just then suffered a disastrous defeat, which had considerably weakened them, at the hands of the Hamdan, as the result of a quarrel which had arisen in connection with the control of the worship of the god Yaghuth (cf. Wellhausen, *Reize arab. Heidentum*), 19-22, and the sources mentioned by him). It is probably this defeat (Yazan al-Razam), which tradition places in the same year as the battle of Badr, which made a section of the Murad think it advisable to seek an alliance with Muhammad; but Kays b. al-Makshuh refused to join in this. It was therefore another Murad chief, Farwa b. Musayk, who went to Medina in the year 10 A.H., and concluded a treaty there with the Prophet (cf. Caetani, *Annali dell’Islam*, ii, 332). To what extent tradition is right in saying that Farwa was given authority to levy *zakat* there with the Prophet (cf. Caetani, *Annali dell’Islam*, ii, 332), is very difficult to ascertain. In any case, the policy of the Murad was not oriented towards Muhammad under the leadership of Kays b. al-Makshuh. In the great rising led by al-Aswad al-Ansi against Persian hegemony in the Yaman, the Murad were against him. But if, as tradition has it, Muhammad used his connections with some chiefs of the Yaman to prevent al-Aswad’s success, after the death of the Prophet these chiefs refused obedience to Abü Bakr and resolutely threw themselves into the struggle against Islam. It is again Kays b. al-Makshuh who plays the chief part in these events. Taken prisoner, Abü Bakr granted him his life and henceforth the chief of the Murad and his tribe played their part bravely in the conquests. We find them sometimes in Syria, sometimes in Irāk, and Kays himself everywhere distinguishing himself by his exploits. He lost an eye at the battle of Yarmūk (cf. Caetani, *Annali*, i-v, index s.v. Qays b. Hubayrah). But the account of his death in the civil war between Ali and Mu‘awiya at the battle of Siffin is based on confusion with another man of the same name of the tribe of Badjia (this fact, which is clearly indicated by Ibn al-Kalbi, Dzhambana, and al-Tabari, i, 3301-2, has already been noted by Ibn Hajar Isḥāq, by Ibn Khaldun, and by others; hence *Annali*, i, 638, should be corrected). We also find the Murad in the conquest of Egypt (*Annali*, iv, 573, 21 A.H., § 191 & 29). But it was at Kūfah that they settled in the largest numbers. It was there that one of them, Abd al-Rahmān b. Mu‘ājam [see ibn Müljam], assassinated the caliph *Ali*; it was there also that in 60/679 Hāni b. Urwa al-Murad was executed by orders of the governor Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād after being found guilty of conspiring with Muslim b. ‘Akil in favour of al-Ḥusayn (al-Tabari, ii, 227). He was a descendant of the poet ‘Amr b. Ḵīṣās (*Rṣo*, xiii, 58, 327?), one of the very few poets of this tribe, which does not seem to have produced many individuals of note either during the Dāhiluya or under Islam. We may however mention ‘Uways al-Karanī (of the Banu Karan) b. Radmān b. Nādiya b. Murad; Wustenfeld, *Genal. Tab.*, 7, 25), one of the prototypes of Muslim ascetism. At the beginning of the 4th/10th century, the remnants of Murad were settled in the Sarw Madhīḥidā, according to al-Hamdānī, *Ṣīfa*, 92, 94, 102.

**Bibliography:** In addition to sources given in the article, see Ibn al-Kalbi-Caskel, *Gamharat an-nasab*, i, Tafel 271, ii, Register, 432, 1928, 2nd ed., Oxford 1919; *MG. LEVI DELLA VIDA*.

**MURAD** (correctly Shāh Murād), nicknamed Pahari, second son of the Mughal Emperor Akbar [q.v.], born on 3 Muharram 978/8 June 1570, died 1007/1599. Faydī was appointed to educate the prince. In 988/1580 Father Monserrate, and later Aquaviva, taught him Portuguese and the principles of Christianity. He seems to have impressed his Jesuit tutors. His first rank (*mansab* [q.v.]), of 7,000 was granted in 985/1577, followed by a promotion in 982/1584 to the rank of 9,000. His important assignment came in 999/1595 when he was appointed governor of Malvā in 1000/1592 he was entrusted with the governorship of Gudjarāt. In 1000/1593 he led the Mughal army into the Deccan, where in 1004/1596 the ruler of Ahmadnagar [q.v.] was forced to accept the cession of Berār [q.v.] to the Mughals. Murad stayed in the Deccan as governor, but the military operations in the Deccan met with little success, partly because of Murad’s lack of interest in the undertaking. He died in *Shawwāl* 1007/May 1599.


(M. ATHAR ALI)

**MURAD I** (761-91/1360-89), according to the common tradition the third ruler of the Ottoman state, was a son of Orkhan and the Byzantine lady Nilüfer. Although some Ottoman sources profess to know the year of his birth (Sīdīqī’s *al-Wakīla*, i, 74, gives the year 761/1360, this date, like all dates given by Turkish sources relating to this period, is far from certain. The name Murad (Greek sources such as Phrantzes have *'Aqubāt*, from which later Latin sources make Amurath, while contemporary Latin sources from Italy have Morathībe) must have originated in mystical circles and hardly occurs in earlier times. An Abdal Murad lived in Orkhan’s time (cf. *Sīdīqī’s al-Wakīla*, i, 344) and an Abdal Murad (of the Banu Karan b. Radman b. Nadjiyab. Orkhan invaded the lands called Mevlebiyya and then settled in the region of Karam (of the Banu Karan b. Radman b. Nadjiyab. Orkhan invaded the lands called Mevlebiyya and then settled in the region of Karam, later Turkish historians *Khudavendīgār* [q.v.]). During his father’s lifetime, Murad had already been entrusted with the governorship of In Īlīa and later of Bursa. His brother Suleymān Paşa had held the more important *sandık* and was destined to become Orkhan’s successor. Suleymān’s untimely death, shortly before that of Orkhan himself, placed Murad unexpectedly at the head of the Ottoman principality. This happened about 761/1360; the date of Orkhan’s death is uncertain. Murad I became the first great Ottoman conqueror on European soil. In this he followed the footsteps of his brother Süleyman Paşa and of other Turkish amirs before him.

It is not yet possible to gain a clear idea of the series of the military achievements by which the Ottomans succeeded in establishing themselves firmly in the Balkan Peninsula. Even the outstanding victories are confounded with each other in the Ottoman and Western sources, and the exact dating of even important events is subject to great difficulties. The Ottoman sources, the more reliable of all, are mainly concerned with the tortuous policy of the Byzantine rulers. On the other hand, many tales of a legendary
character have entered the historical accounts of later
times. The impression on the whole is, that the
Ottoman successes were mainly due to the mutual
rivalry between the then existing Balkan states,
Byzantium, and the Bulgarian and Serbian
kingdoms, complicated by the struggle of Venice and
Genoa for an advantageous position in the Levant,
and the zeal of the Popes for bringing the Greek
culture back to Rome. This secured the Ottomans
at all times allies in the Christian camp itself. Nor is it
possible to ascertain which Ottoman expeditions were
really planned by Murad and his councillors and
which were merely successful raids by Turkish bands.
All this makes it extremely difficult to form an ade-
quately judgment of Murad's personality as a warrior
and as a statesman.

Provisionally, three periods can be distinguished.
The first begins shortly after Murad's accession
with the conquest of Western Thrace, in which were taken
Corfu, Demotika (Dumetica [q.v.]) (if this town had not
already been taken under Orkhan), Gümüldже, Adrianopole
(about 763/1362; see Edirne) and Philip-
popolis, mainly through the activity of the beglerbeg
Lala Şahin and Ewrenos Beg [q.v.]. These conquests
provoked a coalition ofSerbians, Bosnians and
Hungarians, who were beaten on the river Maritza
[see Meric] by Hâjîdji Ilbici. The western part of
Bulgaria was raided up to the Balkan Mountains, and the
Byzantine Emperor John Palaeologus made his first
submission as vassal to Murad. Murad himself
had been on a campaign in Anatolia, which brought
him as far as Tokat [q.v.], during which he con-
solidated the Ottoman hold on Angora (Ankara [q.v.])
(already taken by Süleyman Paşa in 755/1354; cf.
Witteck, in Festschrift Georg Jacob, Leipzig 1932, 547,
351 ff.). He engaged also in the conquest of the
promontory of the small island of Maritza [see MERIC],
where he himself lost his life, although the
modern historian can only approach the subject
through the Sultân Ögiz's biographies [q.v.], which
where he himself lost his life, although the
Serbians, partly owing to treachery in their own
ranks, were defeated. The most probable date is 20
June 1389 (Gibbons, cf. also Giese, in Ephemerides
Orientalis, no. 34 [April 1928], 2-3). The way in which
Murad was killed, during or after the battle, is not
clear from the early sources; the later Serbian epic
tradition has the well-known tale that Murad was
murdered by Milos Obranović, Lazar's son-in-law,
who, claiming to be a deserter, had obtained an
audience with Murad after the battle, was admitted
to his presence and killed him with a dagger. Murad's
body was transported to Bursa and buried in a türbe
near the mosque which he had built in Čekirge in
Bursa (cf. Ahmed Tewhid, in TOEM, iii).
Murad I was the first ruler under whom the state
founded by Orkhan rose to be more than one of the
then existing Turkman principalities in Asia Minor.
This development is symbolised in the successive
change of titles given to him in different building
inscriptions dated in his reign (cf. Tascchner, in Isl.,
xx, 131 ff.). While the oldest inscription calls him
simply Bey, like his father Orkhan, and gives him a
hakâb (Şahâb al-Dunya wa-l-Dîn) after the Sâlûqân
fashion, he is already called Sultan [q.v.] in 785/1385,
where he pretends to be the successor to Orkhan and
reign over the small piece of Byzantine territory,
build by him in Iznik, we find the style which after-
wards became a tradition with the Ottoman sultans
his dependency went so far as to help the Turks,
together with his son Manuel, in the conquest of
Philadelphia (Aia Schéhir), the only remaining Greek
fortress in Asia Minor. The end of this second period
is marked by an increased activity in Anatolia. A part
of the territory of the Germiyân-Ögûlu [q.v.] was
acquired as a wedding gift to Prince Bâyêzîd when he
married the daughter of that ruler (probably in 1381);
this territorial accession was followed by the sale of
the greater part of the lands of the Hamîd-Ögûlu [q.v.]
to Murad and by the conquest of a part of the prin-
cipality of Thrace.

About 787/1385 there followed new conquests in
Europe. Turkish troops intervened in Epirus and
Albania (under Kâlidji Pasqa), but decisive for the
establishment of Ottoman power in the Balkans was
the taking of Sofia (1385?) and Niš (1386?). About
the same time, the Italian republics, Genoa and
Venice, obtained by treaties with Murad, concluded
residencies and set the example, henceforward traditional,
of leniency in dealing with the Anatolian population.
This caused a lively discontent amongst the Serbian
soldiers who had taken part in the battle of Konya.
These Serbians are said to have contributed to the
anti-Turkish feeling among the Serbians in general,
who, under the leadership of Lazar Grganović, and
the Bosnian king Twrtko as a powerful ally, were
preparing a last effort to free themselves from Turkish
sovereignty. They succeeded in defeating an Ottoman
army at Pločnik (790/1388). The results were meagre,
however, for at the same time the Turks made new
conquests in Bulgaria (Shumla and Tîrnovo) and even
raided Morea. In 791/1389 Murad himself marched
against the Serbians and their allies and fought the
famous battle of Vodca (790/1389). These
expeditions and set the example, henceforward traditional,
of leniency in dealing with the Anatolian population.
This caused a lively discontent amongst the Serbian
soldiers who had taken part in the battle of Konya.
These Serbians are said to have contributed to the
anti-Turkish feeling among the Serbians in general,
who, under the leadership of Lazar Grganović, and
the Bosnian king Twrtko as a powerful ally, were
preparing a last effort to free themselves from Turkish
sovereignty. They succeeded in defeating an Ottoman
army at Pločnik (790/1388). The results were meagre,
however, for at the same time the Turks made new
conquests in Bulgaria (Shumla and Tîrnovo) and even
raided Morea. In 791/1389 Murad himself marched
against the Serbians and their allies and fought the
famous battle of Vodca (790/1389). These
expeditions and set the example, henceforward traditional,
of leniency in dealing with the Anatolian population.
This caused a lively discontent amongst the Serbian
soldiers who had taken part in the battle of Konya.
These Serbians are said to have contributed to the
anti-Turkish feeling among the Serbians in general,
who, under the leadership of Lazar Grganović, and
the Bosnian king Twrtko as a powerful ally, were
preparing a last effort to free themselves from Turkish
sovereignty. They succeeded in defeating an Ottoman
army at Pločnik (790/1388). The results were meagre,
however, for at the same time the Turks made new
conquests in Bulgaria (Shumla and Tîrnovo) and even
raided Morea. In 791/1389 Murad himself marched
against the Serbians and their allies and fought the
famous battle of Vodca (790/1389). These
expeditions and set the example, henceforward traditional,
of leniency in dealing with the Anatolian population.
This caused a lively discontent amongst the Serbian
soldiers who had taken part in the battle of Konya.
These Serbians are said to have contributed to the
anti-Turkish feeling among the Serbians in general,
who, under the leadership of Lazar Grganović, and
the Bosnian king Twrtko as a powerful ally, were
preparing a last effort to free themselves from Turkish
sovereignty. They succeeded in defeating an Ottoman
army at Pločnik (790/1388). The results were meagre,
however, for at the same time the Turks made new
conquests in Bulgaria (Shumla and Tîrnovo) and even
raided Morea. In 791/1389 Murad himself marched
against the Serbians and their allies and fought the
famous battle of Vodca (790/1389). These
expeditions and set the example, henceforward traditional,
of leniency in dealing with the Anatolian population.
This caused a lively discontent amongst the Serbian
soldiers who had taken part in the battle of Konya.
These Serbians are said to have contributed to the
anti-Turkish feeling among the Serbians in general,
who, under the leadership of Lazar Grganović, and
the Bosnian king Twrtko as a powerful ally, were
preparing a last effort to free themselves from Turkish
sovereignty. They succeeded in defeating an Ottoman
army at Pločnik (790/1388). The results were meagre,
MURAD I — MURAD II

(al-malik al-mu`azzam al-khakan al-mukarram ibn al-sultan). It was a time when the old Saljuq traditional institutions no longer held, and new forms of government and administration came into being, to which the example of Byzantine institutions, and also those of Mamluk Egypt, may have contributed. Even if it is not true that Djalalur Khayr al-Din Khalil Pasha — who was appointed Murad's vizier at the beginning of his reign and died about 789/1387 — was the first Ottoman grand vizier, it cannot be denied that the activity of this man — who by origin belonged to a higher culture than the Ottoman — was Murad's councillor as well as his military deputy and administrator in Macedonia, makes him a true prototype of the grand viziers of a later age (cf. Taeschner and Wittek, in Isd., xviii, 66 ff.). His son 'Ali Pasha began also to play an important military part during the later years of Murad's reign. It is also with Khalil Pasha that the old Turkish sources connect the institution of the janissaries [see V. II 3] as troops formed from converted Christian prisoners of war. In the administration of the timars [q. v.] a khanun of Murad I is said to have brought improvements. Some of these measures were closely connected with the problem of acquiring a quiet and loyal population in the newly-conquered Christian territories; this was not possible by Turkish colonisation only but succeeded mainly through humane treatment of the original inhabitants, after the region had once been conquered.

The more important buildings of Murad I are all in Asia Minor. The best known are the Khudawendigär Djam'i in Çekirge, near Bursa, where Murad himself is buried, and the Ulû Djamî in Bursa; further, a mosque in Bilecik, the Nilüfer İmaretı in İznik (described by Taeschner, in Isd., xx, 127 ff.). There is also a mosque of Murad in Serres. The old Ottoman chronicles enumerate his foundations; see also on them, G. Goodwin, A history of Ottoman architecture, London 1971, 40-6. On Murad I's coins cf. 'Ali, in TTEM, xiv, 224.

bians, Poles and Germans; the Turks were thrown back at Nish, after which Sofia was taken. The campaign ended with a heavy defeat of the Turks at Philippopolis. In the same year, Murad had to oppose again the Karaman-Oghlu, who supported the Christian allies. But the peace with Hungary, concluded in Rabî' 1 848/July 1444 at Szeged, though advantageous to Hungary, maintained the former frontiers of the zone of Ottoman political influence; only Wallachia (Efîlât [q.v.]) became tributary to Hungary, which was to last ten years and seemed to Murad a guarantee for the future, he abdicated in favour of his son Mehmed, leaving with him Khâlid Pasha, son of Îbrahim Pasha (who had died of the plague in 832/1429) and Khâsrew Molla [q.v.] as counsellors. He retired himself to Maghînis, but had to come back when, in Dhu 'l-Hijja/September of the same year, the Hungarians, flouting the peace treaty, were preparing a new crusade. They marched south of the Danube to Varna; here the army of Murad inflicted on them a crushing defeat, in which King Ladislas of Hungary was killed. Again Murad II went back to Maghînis, but in the following year a Janissary revolt broke out in Adrianople, and it was the vizier Khâlid who invited Murad to return a second time, as the young Mehmed did not seem to be able to face the situation.

During the last six years of his reign Murad led again several campaigns in the Balkan peninsula. In 850/1446 an action was undertaken against the Palæologi in the Morea (destruction of the Hexamilion, capture of Corinth and Patras); in 851/1447 against Albania, where the activity of Iskender Beg [q.v.] had begun in 847/1443; in 852/1448 he faced again a Hungarian invading army, which was beaten on the plain of Kosowa [q.v.] or Kosovo; and in 854/1450 he was again in Albania (siege of Croja). In that year Constantine Palæologus became, by the grace of Murad II, the last Byzantine Emperor, after the death of John. Shortly afterwards, in the first days of Muḥarram 853/February 1451, Murad died at Edirne. He was buried in Bursa at the side of his father, the Dag Yayla near Manisa (cf. Ahmed Tewhîd, in TOEM, iii, 1856).

His reign was of extraordinary importance for the future political and cultural development of the Ottoman Empire. After the first critical years, he continued his father's work of consolidation. His aim was mainly to live on peaceful terms with the vassal princes, of whom the ruler of Sinûb and the despot of Serbia gave their daughters to Murad. This peaceful policy was in concordance with his character; the Byzantine historians and other Christian sources describe him as a truthful, mild and humane ruler. His most influential viziers were not yet the renegades of later times; they belonged to the old families that had supported the cause of Murad's forefathers and were becoming a kind of hereditary nobility: Îbrahim Pasha and Khâlid Pasha of the Qandarî-Oghullarî (F. Taeschner and P. Wittek, in Id., xviii, 92 ff.), Hâdîgî 'Îwad Pasha (Taeschner, in Id., x, 154 ff.), the sons of Timurtash, of Ewrenos and others. The mystical tradition was strong in his surroundings, as is proved by the great influence of a man like the Shaykh Amir Bukharî; other shaykhs came to his court from Persia and Irân. This determined also the direction which classical Ottoman literature was to take in following centuries. Murad II was the first Ottoman prince to have a court circle of poets, literary men and Muslim scholars. But also to non-Islamic envoys and visitors, Murad's court seemed a centre of culture (cf. Jorga, i, 464 ff., which description applies principally to Murad II). Amongst the sultan's buildings a mosque in Bursa (cf. H. Wilde, Bursa, 51) and one in Adrianople (the Ule Şerefeli Djrâmî), are notable (see G. Goodwin, A. History of Ottoman architecture, London 1971, 66 ff., 70-1, 93-100) and some large bridges. His army organisation is well-known from a full description by Chalcondyles.

Bibliography: The older Turkish sources: Neghî (Haniwaldanus), Ashk-Pasha-Zâde, Orûdji, Anonymous Giese, are completed by the Byzantine historians Phrantzes (who himself played a part in the diplomatic history of the time), Ducas and Chalcondyles, and also by the later Ottoman authors Sa'd al-Dîn, 'Ali and Mûnedjdjim Bashi. A curious contemporary description is that of an unknown captive from Mülendebach in Transylvania (captured in 1438) in his Tacattât-six moribus conditionibus et notissim Turcorum (cf. K. Foy, in MOOS, iv, v.).


MURAD III, twelfth Ottoman Sultan (ruled 982-1003/1574-95). He was born on 5 Dju'mâda I 1553/July 1546 in the princely summer camp at Bokhârîa Yâyâlî near Manisa [q.v.] where his father, the later Sultan Selim II [q.v.], resided as sandjak-begi. His mother was the Venetian-born khdsseki Nûr Bûnî [q.v.].

His ceremonial circumcision took place at Manisa in April 1557. At the time, prince Selim was appointed sandjak-begi of Karamanjâl [q.v.] and Sultan Süleyman I [q.v.] made his grandson sandjak-begi of Adîbeyrîn. In 1562 Murad stayed with his grandfather in Istanbul, and in 1562, when his father fought the battle with his brother Prince Bâyezit on the plain of Konya, Murad was in command at Konya castle. Afterwards he was made sandjak-begi of Sarukhân, residing at Manisa like his father. Here he lived till his accession to the throne (1 Ramadân 982/15 December 1574). In this provincial town he was given a suitable court and household. He took the Albanian-born Şâfiye as his first consort. She was given to him by his cousin, the Princess Humâû Şâhî, in 1563, when she was probably thirteen years old. Early in Dhu 'l-Ka'da 973/20-29 May 1566, she gave him his first son, his later successor, Mehmed III [q.v.], born likewise in the summer camp on Bokhârî. Till he became sultan, Şâfiye, who also gave him two daughters, 'Alişhe (d. 1013/1605) and Fâtima Sultan, probably remained Murad's only wife. In 1574 the influence of his mother, now at his side as Wîlîde Sultan [q.v.], became supreme. She and Murad's sister Esmaîlân, married to the Grand Vizier Şokollû Mehmed Paşa [q.v.], prevailed upon him to diversify his erotic attractions. He only had one son alive then. Like his father and his son, Murad III was to remain subject to the kadÎnasalnânat ('rule of women') all his ruling days.

During the years at Manisa, Murad formed lifelong
bonds of trust and companionship with members of his household, e.g. his tutor Khodja Sa'd al-Din Efendi [q.v.], his finance director (defterdar) Kara Üweys Celebi, and Râdiye "Kalfa", the controller of dreams. In spite of this man's illiterate, ecstatic brand of mysticism and his morally corrupt character, he remained spiritual adviser to the prince all his life.

Sokollu Mehmed Pasha and Nur Bânû informed Murâd of his father's death in secret in order to ensure a smooth succession. Immediately setting off for Istanbul and embarking at Mudanya in the first available vessel, the small open boat of the Nîşângâ'î Ferûdîn Beg [q.v.], he managed to reach the capital in five days, in spite of the raging winter gales. The day after his arrival, 21 December 1574, the death of the old sultan and the accession of the new one were publicly announced. The principal officers of state paid their homage (bay'at resmi) to their new ruler. The ceremonial burial of Selim II and his five other sons, who had been strangled inside the saray that day, took place afterwards. Then the Wâlide Sultan was ceremonially buried in the imperial cemetery. On 11 Ramazân 982/23 December 1574, Murad III held his first council; eleven days later, he proceeded to the mosque of Eyüp to be girded with the sword by the şeykh-ül-islâm, the naşîh-ül-erâbi and the silâhder ağası.

On the way back, the new sultan visited the tombs of his illustrious predecessors. On the way back, the new sultan visited the tombs of his illustrious predecessors.

The accession of the new monarch led to the formation of a new palace faction which was set on counter-balancing the dominant position of the Grand Vizier, who had the reputation of being an excellent interpreter of dreams. In spite of this man's illiterate, ecstatic brand of mysticism and his morally corrupt character, he remained spiritual adviser to the prince all his life.

Sokollu Mehmed Pasha and Nur Bânû informed Murâd of his father's death in secret in order to ensure a smooth succession. Immediately setting off for Istanbul and embarking at Mudanya in the first available vessel, the small open boat of the Nîşângâ'î Ferûdîn Beg [q.v.], he managed to reach the capital in five days, in spite of the raging winter gales. The day after his arrival, 21 December 1574, the death of the old sultan and the accession of the new one were publicly announced. The principal officers of state paid their homage (bay'at resmi) to their new ruler. The ceremonial burial of Selim II and his five other sons, who had been strangled inside the saray that day, took place afterwards. Then the Wâlide Sultan was ceremonially buried in the imperial cemetery. On 11 Ramazân 982/23 December 1574, Murad III held his first council; eleven days later, he proceeded to the mosque of Eyüp to be girded with the sword by the şeykh-ül-islâm, the naşîh-ül-erâbi and the silâhder ağası.

On the way back, the new sultan visited the tombs of his illustrious predecessors.

The accession of the new monarch led to the formation of a new palace faction which was set on counter-balancing the dominant position of the Grand Vizier, who had the reputation of being an excellent interpreter of dreams. In spite of this man's illiterate, ecstatic brand of mysticism and his morally corrupt character, he remained spiritual adviser to the prince all his life.

Murâd's limited interferences seems to have occurred as a result of conflicts of rival parties in the palace which were deeply involved in petty politics and the system of favours. The promptings of the war party led by Sinân Pasha and his successor were not likely to be a cause of worry for the Habsburg empire. The vizier Ferhâd Pasha, his rival, supported by the inter alios Khodja Sa'd al-Din Efendi, opposed war. Murad III convened an extraordinary council to debate the question (according to an eyewitness account reported by Pécewi, Ta'rîh, ii, 132-3). Sinân Pasha's side gained the upper hand and the "Long War" between Sultan and Emperor began on 4 Shawwâl 1001/4 June 1593.

Murad III died on 6 Dümâyâdâ I, 1003/16 January 1595, 49 years old, in his palace, probably because of a stomach illness. His death had been presaged by dreams of his astrologer and announced by bad omens, according to contemporary historians (Selânikî, Ta'rîh, new ed. i, 425-8; 'Ali, quoted in Fleischer, 151-2). His death was kept secret. The new Wâlide Sultan Sâfiye wished her son Mehemmed to succeed to the throne in an indisputable manner, and thus to continue her "Woman's Sultanate".

Murad III is buried in his beautiful türbe situated next to the Aya Sofya, which contains 54 coffins of his wives and children. Next to it stands a small türbe, where his 19 sons who were executed at the accession of their brother Mehemmed III [q.v.], lie.

Murad III was a keen swordsman, archer and horseman. His particular craft was the making of arrows. He seems to have had a generous and kind hearted personality. He was not cruel; he never had dismissed viziers executed; and he argued at length against having his younger brothers killed at the time of his accession. Nor was he addicted to drink. He rather liked to spend a great deal of his time in the harem. Next to his lifelong principal favourite Sâfiye, he probably took forty kâşîs into his bed. At the time of his death, 49 of his children were alive, and seven of his women were pregnant. He filled his palace with clowns, dwarfs and mutes. All kinds of festivities were arranged in the saray, as well as in other palaces and pavilions along the Bosphorus. Murad also liked to enjoy the civilised company of his muşâhid who, as a rule, remained with him for life. The most noteworthy of celebrations organised for him was the series of ceremonies surrounding the circumcision of his son Mehemmed (sur) which lasted for two months till 1 Râcjab 990/22 July 1582.

Women played an important part in his life. Next to his mother and his principal kâşî, his sisters

The Sultan occasionally interfered in the government of his realm. Dismissal of viziers and appointments were mostly effected at the instigation of the palace clique. The careers of Khodja Sinân Pasha [q.v.], three times his Grand Vizier, Siyâvush Pasha [q.v.] also three times vizier, Özdemir-oglu "Othman Pasha [q.v.] and Ferhâd Pasha [q.v.], are in evidence. Revolts of the Janissary Corps and Sipahis of the Forte were especially awe-inspiring. The so-called "Beglerbegi Incident" of 16 Dümâyâdâ I 997/2 April 1589, made a direct impact on Murâd III's private life. He had to sacrifice the life of one of his most trusted muşâhid and boons-companions, Doghânî Mehmed Pasha, beglerbegi of Rumeli (by origin an Armenian dewshîrme boy from Zeytun, see KHÂLÎ PASHA, KAŞlâRÎYELÎ). Together with the defterdar Mâmûd Efendi, who also was executed, he had operated a depreciation of the silver akâ, debasing its content by half. The consequent rise of prices caused the troops to revolt, to refuse pay and to demand the heads of those whom they held responsible for their plight.

According to an eyewitness account reported by Pécewi, Ta'rîh, ii, 132-3. Sinân Pasha's side gained the upper hand and the "Long War" between Sultan and Emperor began on 4 Shawwâl 1001/4 June 1593.

Murad III died on 6 Dümâyâdâ I, 1003/16 January 1595, 49 years old, in his palace, probably because of a stomach illness. His death had been presaged by dreams of his astrologer and announced by bad omens, according to contemporary historians (Selânikî, Ta'rîh, new ed. i, 425-8; 'Ali, quoted in Fleischer, 151-2). His death was kept secret. The new Wâlide Sultan Sâfiye wished her son Mehemmed to succeed to the throne in an indisputable manner, and thus to continue her "Woman's Sultanate".

Murad III is buried in his beautiful türbe situated next to the Aya Sofya, which contains 54 coffins of his wives and children. Next to it stands a small türbe, where his 19 sons who were executed at the accession of their brother Mehemmed III [q.v.], lie.

Murad III was a keen swordsman, archer and horseman. His particular craft was the making of arrows. He seems to have had a generous and kind hearted personality. He was not cruel; he never had dismissed viziers executed; and he argued at length against having his younger brothers killed at the time of his accession. Nor was he addicted to drink. He rather liked to spend a great deal of his time in the harem. Next to his lifelong principal favourite Sâfiye, he probably took forty kâşîs into his bed. At the time of his death, 49 of his children were alive, and seven of his women were pregnant. He filled his palace with clowns, dwarfs and mutes. All kinds of festivities were arranged in the saray, as well as in other palaces and pavilions along the Bosphorus. Murad also liked to enjoy the civilised company of his muşâhid who, as a rule, remained with him for life. The most noteworthy of celebrations organised for him was the series of ceremonies surrounding the circumcision of his son Mehemmed (sur) which lasted for two months till 1 Râcjab 990/22 July 1582.

Women played an important part in his life. Next to his mother and his principal kâşî, his sisters...
MURAD III — MURAD IV

Esmâkhan (1545-85) the wife first of Sokollu Mehmed Pasha and then of Kalaylikoz Çâhî Pasha (d. 1574) and to Zal Mahmud Pasha (d. 1580); and Shah (d. 1580), wife to Câkîrджf Bâshî Hasan Efendi (1526-1600), the Ottoman poet of mystic verse. He also wrote probably five mystical verses of the sultan. Murad III's principal mystical affiliation was with the Kâhlwetî order of dervishes [see Kâhlwetiyya].

Under the meghlî Murâdi, he was a minor Ottoman poet of mystic verse. He also wrote probably a theological treatise Futûhdâ al-ayyâm ("The revelations of fasting") (? contained in a paraphrase) and a theological treatise Futuhât al-siyâm ("The revelations of fasting") and to Zal Mahmud Pasha (d. 1580); and Shah (d. 1580), wife to Câkîrджf Bâshî Hasan Efendi (1526-1600), the Ottoman poet of mystic verse. He also wrote probably five mystical verses of the sultan. Murad III's principal mystical affiliation was with the Kâhlwetî order of dervishes [see Kâhlwetiyya].

Murad III led an active spiritual life. He was deeply involved in the esoteric forms of popular mysticism as well as astrology, cosmology and numerology. Hence a book on Nâchefbândî hagiography of 1420 was translated for him from the original Persian by Murâdi, who likewise wrote a commentary on five mystical verses of the sultan. Murad III's principal mystical affiliation was with the Kâhlwetî order of dervishes [see Kâhlwetiyya].

Murad III was also a patron of architecture. The last mosque complex designed by Sinân [q.v.] is the Murâdishâne, built between 1583 and 1593. Splendidly decorated building took place inside Topkapâ Imperial Chancery, as his palace by his command, as well as the Sinân Paşâ Köşkî at the seaside facing Ghalata [q.v. in Suppl.]. The patriarchal church of St. Mary Pammakaristos was turned into the Fethiye Dîmîsî in 1586 to celebrate the recent conquests in Georgia and Athbarbâyyân. Restoration and extension works were done at Mecca and Medina, e.g. to the walls of the Kaaba in 983/1573.


(A.H. de Groot)


Born in Istanbul in a palace on the Bosphorus on 28 Dinârâd I 1021/27 July 1612, son of the reigning sultan Ahmed I [q.v.] and his principal consort, hâkî Setfik, Kösem [q.v.] Mâhayepî, a woman of Greek origin (Anastasia, 1585-1651). He grew up in the palace together with his brother İbrahimîn, confined in the komîs apartmens, since he was five years old. The princes Süleymenî, Kâsinî and İbrahimînî were his full brothers and he had two full sisters, Şâhîye Sultan and Fatima Sultan. In 1032/1623 the Grand Vizier Kemânkeşî ‘Ali Paşâ (1623-4) in agreement with the Şehîkî-î-‘l-îslâm Zakariyyâ-zâde Yahâyî Efendî and his already very influential mother, decided to depose Sultan Mustafânaî in order to put young Murâd in the place of his uncle. This being the fourth accession in six years, the dîlîsî bakhshishi was dispensed with for once. The day after the accession (16 Dhu ’l-Ka’dâ 1032/11 September 1623), Murâd IV was girded with the sword at Eveyûbî the venerative mystic of Uskûdar, Şehîkîî (‘Azîz Mahmûdî Hûdâî (d. 1038/1628 [q.v.]), with the Şehîkî-î-‘l-îslâm, the nakhî il-‘alîfrî and the silâhûdâr agha also attending. Being too young to rule, the Wâlide Sultan exercised power as the virtual head of state. To the great joy of the members of the household, Ingeliz, the 16-year old Murâd IV for the first time slept with a woman, a 13-year old slave girl, presented to him by his sister ‘Alişîye (wife to the Grand Vizier Hâfîz Ahmed Paşâ) on ca. 4 April 1626 (cf. the Dutch ambassador Haga’s despatch of 4 April 1626, SG 6898 ARA-General Record Office The Hague). On 25 August 1628 Murâd IV took a former consort of his brother and predecessor 0lxêmînî ‘Ali Şehîkî (q.v.), called Kalender, as his principal consort (cf. Tarih-i Seldniki, iii/1-2, SG 6898 ARA. In Şahwâl 1041/16 May 1632, Murâd’s personal
rule began. Till then he had merely followed events and reacted upon them privately, e.g. the famous exchange in verse between him and the Grand Vizier Hafiz Ahmed Paşa, in trouble at the siege of Baghdad (1626). (cf. Gibb, _HOP_, iii, 207-8, 248-51). Aware of a series of rebellions and troubles in the capital, he became restive. Together with the _kizlar aghasi_ Hâdji Mustafa Agha he began to make tours through the city in disguise to become acquainted with the true state of affairs.

An army mutiny broke out in Radjab 1041/February 1632. Probably instigated by the _kâbûn_-mâdûm Redjeb Paşa, the soldiers marched to the palace and demanded the heads of the Grand Vizier, the _sheykh_ uî-l-Islâm, the Janissary Agha and the Sultan's companion. Thus his counsellor Kocî Beg was received with all honours and the sultan recruited him into his service and gave him the appointment of _beglerbeg_ of Tarâbullus-Shâm. Soon afterwards, the new Emirgîne-oghlu Yusuf Paşa came to live at Istanbul, where Murâd IV presented him with a palace and a pleasure garden on the Bosphorus (Emîrgân).

While still on campaign, the sultan ordered the killing of his brothers Bâyezid and Süleyman at the time, when the news from Erivan reached the capital. In Rabî' II 1045/October 1635 he fell ill and retreated to Van and via Bitlis to Diyar Bakr. Emirgîne-oghlu Yusuf was awaiting him at Izmir, and upon his return to the capital, the victory celebrations lasted seven days and nights.

Next year, Murâd ordered a counter offensive, since Erivan in the meantime had fallen into Persian hands again. A peace offer by Şah Şafî I (1038-52/1629-42) was turned down, with the counter-demand of the surrender of Baghdad.

Having put to death his brother Kâsim (23 Dhu 'l-Ka'da 1047/8 April 1638), the sultan, accompanied by _sheykh_ uî-l-Islâm Zakariyâ-zâde Yahya Efendi and the Kapodîn-paşa, left for Baghdad. Murâd's progress was a long bloody dispensation of rough justice on local oppressors, and he acquired among the common people the fame of a _mahdi_ in the Arab provinces.

On 8 Radjab 1048/15 November 1638 Murâd IV came to Baghdad. The old and the new, the sultan began, the Persian commander surrendered with all honours. The restoration of the town and fortifications was begun immediately. A sick man, the sultan left for home on 12 Radjam 1048/17 January 1639.

Half-paralysed from the middle downwards for a time, he had to rest at Diyar Bakr, where he had left behind his _kâsî_ redi. Rumours of his death began to spread, but somewhat recuperated, he marched again. A quarrel between his _kâsî_ redi and the wife of the famous local mystic (Rumi) Urmiyâ Shîykli Mûhîmbî led to the latter's execution (Pécwî, _Ta'wîl_, ii, 461 ff.).

Travelling overland till Izmir and then by galley, Murâd landed at the seraglio on 8 Şafar 1049/10 June 1639, and insisted on a triumphal entry into his capital.

In the meantime, peace was concluded between the Ottomans and the Safawids, and the treaty of Kasr Shirin of 14 Muḥarram 1049/17 May 1639 meant a lasting peace. The sultan reacted violently upon the Venetian attack destroying the Algéro-Tunisian squadron in the harbour of Aklounya (q.v.). Diplomacy, however, prevailed and new capitulations given to Venice ensured peace in the West two months later.

Murâd regained his health to the extent that he dared to go out hunting again, but was advised to stop his heavy drinking and other dissipations. He could still receive congratulations on 1 Shawwâl 1049 in the Sinan Koshk. He watched horse races in the hippodrome and again took to drinking in the company of his intimates, Şahâdât Mûsâ Paşa and Emirgîne-oghlu Yusuf Paşa. But he fell seriously ill next day, lost consciousness and died on 16 Shawwâl 1049/Thursday 8 February 1640, being buried in his father's _têrêbîne_ in the complex of the Blue Mosque.

According to contemporary sources (Ottoman and Venetian), Murâd IV was a man of tall stature, broad shouldered, of majestic and beautiful appearance. He had a light black beard, hazel eyes and possessed an extraordinary bodily strength. He was an accomplished swordsman, archer, pikeman and _girât_-thrower.

He had at least sixteen children, among whom were...
five sons who all died before their father. His daughter Kaya Ismikhan married the Grand... 1962; Ali Haydar Midhat, The life of Midhat Pasha, London 1903. (E.J. ZURCHER)

MURAD BAKHSH. Muhammad, fourth and... 1865 onwards. He was especially close to... q. v.)... Rycaut), the Walide Sultan Kosem Mahpeyker... He found... 1945, 93-4; B. Araz, Das Osmanische Reich um die Mitte des 17. Jahrhunderts nach den... (popular ed.); V. Cabuk (ed.), Solak-zdde Mehmed Halife Tarih-i Gilmdni (popular ed.); C. Cabuk (ed.), Yayiniz Osmanl... Mehmed Halifa (1633-1660),... Mehmet Halife Tarih-i Gilmdni (popular ed.); C. Cabuk (ed.), Solak-zdde Mehmed Halife Tarih-i Gilmdni... A.D. Alderson, The structure of the Ottoman dynasty... 1630-1640, unpubl. diss. Chicago 1979; idem, Regional structure in the Ottoman economy. A sultanic memorandum of 1636 A.D. ... in Turkey, 23, 452-86; I.H. Uzunçarşı, Saray tarihleri, Ankara, 1945, 1946, 93-4; B. Araz, Das Osmanische Reich um die Mitte des 17. Jahrhunderts nach den Chroniken des Vezihi (1637-1660) and des Mehmed Halifa (1633-1660), Munich 1977; K. Su (ed.), Mehrmet Halife Tahir-i Gilmâni Istanbul 1840-1876, The young Ottomans, only a vague statement on reforms was included in the Khatî-i Hâmâyân after the accession.

On 5 June 1876, the former sultan ʻAbd al-ʻAzîz committed suicide. Then, on the 15th, a Circassian army captain called Hasan, motivated by personal grievances, shot and killed Husayn ʻAwni Pasha, the Minister of Foreign Affairs Râghîd Pasha and several others through a cabinet meeting. The Grand Council decided to proclaim a constitution, but this could not be carried through because of the rapidly deteriorating mental state of Sultan Murad.

Murâd, who had already become an alcoholic by this time, had shown signs of extreme nervousness and rapid mental deterioration. After having the Sultan's health examined by Ottoman and foreign medical experts, the Grand Council had concluded that he was unfit to rule. It first tried to get the Sultan's younger brother, Hamid Efendi, to act as regent, but on his refusal had no choice but to depose Murad and replace him with his brother, who ascended the throne as ʻAbd al-Hamîd II on 1 September 1876. Murad was taken to the Cirâghân palace on the Bosphorus, where he continued to live in captivity for nearly thirty years. On 20 May 1876, after ʻAbd al-Hamîd had prorogued parliament, a group led by the young Ottoman activist ʻAli Su'ârî made an unsuccessful attempt to execute a coup d'etat and liberate Murad. After that, the prince was kept under even closer guard, and any mention of Murad or any reference to his condition was prohibited by the Hamidian censorship. Murâd died on 29 August 1904.


(M.E. ZÜCHER)
youngest son of the Mughal Emperor Shah Djan [q.v.], born on 25 Dhu 'l-Hijja 1035/28 September 1624 and died 1072/1661. He was given a mansab of 10,000/4,000 in 1048/1639, and after a year, of 10,000/7,000, being promoted in 1051/1641 to 12,000/8,000 (2,000 x 2-3h). His first important assignment came in 1052/1642 when he was appointed subadar of Multan [q.v.]. In 1055/1645 he received the rank of 12,000/10,000 (2,000 x 2-3h). He led the Mughal army to Balkh and Badakhshan in 1056/1646, but after a successful campaign abandoned his command without permission and returned to India in Radjab 1056/August 1646. He was deprived of his rank and dismissed from the governorship of Multan, but the same year was pardoned and restored to his rank. In 1057/1647 he was appointed as subadar of Kashmir and in 1058/1648 as subadar of the Deccan. His term there was short, and in 1060/1650 he was appointed subadar of Kâbul and in 1061/1651 of Mâlwa. In 1064/1654 he received appointment to Gudjarat and was promoted to the rank of 12,000/10,000 (5,000 x 2-3h). Shah Djanâ fell ill in Dhu 'l-Hijja 1067/September 1657, and Murâd Bâkhsh crowned himself Emperor in Safar 1068/November 1657 at Ahmadâbad. In 1068/1658 Arangzib and Murâd Bâkhsh entered into an agreement in which Arangzib promised his brother the Pandjab, Multan, Thaffa, Kashmir and Kabul in the event of success. In Radjab 1068/April 1658, their joint armies united to inflict a defeat on the Imperial forces at Dharmat. This was followed by Dara Shukuh's Pandjab, Multan, Thaffa, Kashmir and Kabul in the summer in which Awrangzib promised his brother the governorship of Multan, but the same year was appointed subadar and in 1060/1650 he was appointed subadar of Kabul as reward of the Deccan. His term there was short, pardoned and restored to his rank. In 1057/1647 he was appointed as subadar of Kashmir and in 1058/1648 as subadar of the Deccan. His term there was short, and in 1060/1650 he was appointed subadar of Kâbul and in 1061/1651 of Mâlwa. In 1064/1654 he received appointment to Gudjarat and was promoted to the rank of 12,000/10,000 (5,000 x 2-3h). Shah Djanâ fell ill in Dhu 'l-Hijja 1067/September 1657, and Murâd Bâkhsh crowned himself Emperor in Safar 1068/November 1657 at Ahmadâbad. In 1068/1658 Arangzib and Murâd Bâkhsh entered into an agreement in which Arangzib promised his brother the Pandjab, Multan, Thaffa, Kashmir and Kabul in the event of success. In Radjab 1068/April 1658, their joint armies united to inflict a defeat on the Imperial forces at Dharmat. This was followed by Dara Shukuh's campaign against the rebels in Anatolia and Syria; Murâd Bâkhsh met the chief rebel pasha himself in battle Djanbulat's follower Djemshid near Adana, an area from Aleppo to Adana. Having put out of play the insurgent Djanbulatoghlu Agha, Murâd Bâkhsh immediately left his command to the sheykh ul-islam (Engurus Serddr). In this capacity he began to work towards peace. As Grand Vizier and beglerbegi of the Western Front Lala serddr was appointed as Grand Vizier (10 Sha'Bân 1015/11 October 1605 he became as Grand Vizier a member of the imperial diwan. When the Grand Vizier and serdar of the Western Front Lala Mehmed Pasha [q.v.] died (15 Muharram 1015/25 May 1606), Murâd Pasha, by now one of the most experienced commanders in the field, was made Commander-in-Chief in Hungary (Engurus Serddr). In this capacity he began to work towards peace. As a result, a treaty of peace was negotiated at Zsitvatorok on 17 Dju$mâdâ II-10 Radjab 1015/20 October-11 November 1606. Peace in the West made it possible for the Ottoman government to direct its forces to the East, where Anatolia was ravaged by the so-called Djelâli revolts [q.v. in Suppl.] and where the Safawid Shah Abbas I (996-1038/1588-1629) had started a war in 1603. A month after concluding the peace in Hungary, Murâd Bâkhsh received his appointment as Grand Vizier (10 Sha'Bân 1015/11 December 1606). The advice of the sheykh ul-islam Sun'ullah Efendi seems to have been decisive in the matter. “Old” (Koja) Murâd Pasha immediately left his headquarters at Belgrade and arrived at Istanbul on 15 Sha'wwal 1015/13 February 1607: “this man hath come from the West with the large estate raised from death to life by his wisdome and good fortune being indeed wise and a ancient soldier”, was the commentary of the English ambassador Henry Lello. Appointed serdar in the East, the new Grand Vizier left Uskûdâr on 6 RabîI 1016/2 July 1607 for his campaign against the rebels in Anatolia and Syria; Kalenderoghlu Mehmed Pasha [q.v.] near Ankara, Muslu Câwash at Silifke and the main target, the insurgent Djanbulatoghlu ‘Ali Pasha, who dominated an area from Aleppo to Adana. Having put out of action Djanbulat's follower Djemshid near Adana, Murâd Pasha met the chief rebel pasha himself in battle in the Oruc Owasi near Baylan in the region of Anakya (2 Radjab 1016/23 October 1607). The united forces of Djanbulat ‘Ali Pasha and the other renowned rebel Pashâr al-Din Ma'rûn [q.v.] were defeated and for the greater part massacred. ‘Ali Pasha managed to escape, at first to Aleppo and then to Istanbul, where he received a pardon from the Sultan and was made beglerbegi of Temesvâr (Temesvár), but Murâd Pasha had him executed soon after at Belgrade. One prominent prisoner, Djanbulat ‘Ali Pasha's treasurer, the young Abaza Mehmed Pasha [q.v., was spared upon the intercession of the Janissaries and Pasha Kaysariyeh [q.v.], who took him into his personal service. Murâd Pasha re-established government control in
Having come far from the capital a long time ago, the Grand Vizier decided to return thither in spite of the Sultan's order to remain in winter quarters in eastern Asia Minor, and entered Istanbul on 10 (or 21?) Ramadan 1017/7 September 1608. The remaining Djelâli leaders in the regions of Aydın [q. v.], Saruhan [q. v.] and Silifke [İel [q. v.]] both Yusuf Paşa and Musul Câwush were taken prisoner and executed.

The following year, on 1 Rabî' 1101/24 May 1610, he set out to meet Şâh 'Abbâs in battle and to reconquer the territories lost in Transcaucasia. In Persia he fell on 27 Qumâzân i 16/10 September 1610 he received Şâmsâl-Dîn Aka, ambassador of Şâh 'Abbâs, who carried his master's proposals for peace on basis of the Treaty of Amasya (962/1555). The Ottoman demand was restitution of all territory formerly conquered by Sultan Murâd III [q. v.]. Murâd Paşa marched on to Kars, but did not break off negotiations. Avoiding a military confrontation, he marched on via Çıldır [q. v.] Kâfû and Salmas to Tafriz, which city was evacuated by the Şâh. North of Tafriz at Adîr Çay the two armies came face-to-face. (11 November 1610). Negotiations were resumed, but no agreement reached. Şâh 'Abbâs's playing for time placed Murâd Pasha in a difficult position. He could no longer remain in the field at such a distance from his base. He withdrew with the army to Dâyrär Sârî (29 Şâban 1019/16 November 1610). A Safavid embassy was permitted to go to the Porte.

Next spring, Murâd Paşa established his headquarters at Culek, where he died suddenly on 25 Qumâzân i 1102/5 August 1611.

His surname Kuyûşû is explained either by the pit (şayû) in which he was found when taken prisoner of war in 1585 or by the pits which he had dug all over Anatolia to bury the dead rebels. (e.g. Na'îmî, confirming Pêcewî)

He was buried in Istanbul in the türbe attached to the medrese which he had founded together with a šâbîl in the Weznedjiler quarter near Şehzade Baglî (nowadays housing the Department of Art History of Istanbul University). A daughter of his is known to have married a şerîfî of Buda, Kâdîzâde 'Ali Paşa. Murâd Paşa was a devout Muslim and member of the Naqshbandîya [q. v.] order of dervishes. He supported convents of the Khalwatîyya [q. v.] and Şahâbîyya as well. The young Abâza Mehmed became his spiritual son and was buried after his execution in Murâd Paşa's türbe.


(A. H. DE GROOT)
shown here. The **Djami** of Muradabaad is a Hindu temple converted into a mosque in the reign of the Dhilli Sultan Mu'izz al-Din Kaykubad. It is most visited by pilgrims, mainly Hindus who seek relief from mental diseases through the power of Sadr al-Din, a former mu'adhdhin of the mosque, whose virtues are still believed to be efficacious. There are over a hundred other mosques in the town.


**MURADABAAD — MURAKKA**

AL-MURADI, the name of a family of sayyids and scholars established at Damascus in the 11th-12th/17-18th centuries.

1. The founder of the family, **MURAD B. ʿALĪ AL-MUSAYNI AL-MURADI**, born 1050/1640, was the son of the ʿakib al-ʿaṣrāf of Samarkand. He travelled in his youth to India, where he was initiated into the Nakhibandi tariqa by Shaykh Muhammad Maṣūm al-Fārūkī, and after extensive journeys through Persia, the Arab lands and Egypt settled in Damascus about 1081/1670. He subsequently made several visits to Mecca and Istanbul, where he acquired considerable learning and was invited in the latter city in 1132/1720. He was an ardent missionary of the Nakhibandi order, and was instrumental in spreading it in the lands of the Ottoman empire, himself founding two madrasas for the purpose in Damascus. His literary works consisted mainly of treatises relating to the tariqa, and included a work on Kurʿānī exegesis, entitled al-Mufakada al-kunʿīyya.


4. **ABU ’L-MAWADDA MUHAMMAD KHALIL AL-MURADI**, son of Sayyid ʿAli, succeeded his uncle as Hanafi mujtahid and was appointed also to the office of nakib al-ʿaṣrāf there. He devoted himself to the collection of biographical notices of his contemporaries and their predecessors, and on the basis of the personal information and written works available to him composed in Arabic a biographical dictionary of the notable men and scholars of the 12th century of the Hijra, entitled *Silk al-durar fi ʿulāmāʾ al-karim al-Imām ʿasib* (printed at Cairo in 4 volumes, 1291–1301). The work contains about 1,000 notices; in comparison with the work of his predecessor al-Mubībī, it is more limited in range and somewhat more literary in style. A lengthy biography of his father and other relatives (Maṭnaʿ al-waṣīlī fi tarājimat al-walid al-nādīṣī) is still extant in ms. B.L. Suppl. 659. Sayyid Muhammad Khalil deserves the credit also for encouraging al-Djabarti [q.v.] to undertake the composition of his history of Egypt (the statement in Brockelmann (see Bibl. below) that al-Djabarti translated the Murardi’s *Silk al-durar* into Arabic is apparently due to a misunderstanding of the colophon to vol. ii of the printed text). He died in Aleyppo in 1206/1791. See al-Munadji, *op. cit.*, 375–9.

the preceding, succeeded to the office of Hanafi mufti of Damascus, and was put to death in 1218/1803 on secret instructions from *Dājażār Pāsha* [q.v.].


**MURĀKABA** [see MURBASHA, I.]

**MURĀKKA** [ā], lit. "that which is put together from several pieces", sc. an album. Unlike their European counterparts, who hung or attached their pictures on walls, Muslim connoisseurs and collectors mounted theirs in albums. In the classic murakkās, paintings and drawings alternate with specimens of calligraphy, the whole being generally provided with a handsome binding and sometimes with an illuminated frontispiece. These albums were usually large, the stiff pages having wide and often decorated margins. But considerable variety, both in size and quality, is encountered, from the large and lavish, such as the Clive Album in the Victoria and Albert Museum, to comparatively small and modest volumes put together by less wealthy collectors. Over the years the great majority of these albums have been broken up and their contents widely scattered. It is likely that the say waqf of 1272/1855 arose; no actual examples earlier than the 16th century have survived. But we find references in the literature to a *dājūn* (or *dāng*, a term originally applied to the prophet Mānī’s album of paintings) made for Sultan Ahmad Dājalāyir at the end of the 14th century, and to another for Bāysunghur (ca. 1430); while the historian Khāvandamīr [q.v.] preserves the preface to an album collected by the painter Bihzād [q.v.] at the end of the 15th century. So it would appear that the period of the murakkā (at least of those containing paintings as well as calligraphy) is coextensive with that of classical Persian painting.

The largest and finest range of complete albums is in the Topkapi Museum Library, Istanbul, and among them the best-known and most remarkable are those numbered H. 2152 and H. 2160. With these must be bracketed the Diez albums in the Berlin Library, which form part of the same series. This group of albums remains controversial, but it seems likely that they are the result of the Ottoman capture of Tabriz in 1514, the contents of the royal kitāb-ḵānā, mostly inherited from the 15th century Turkmen rulers, but including a quantity of material from the Mongol period and earlier, being transported to the Turkish capital and hurriedly mounted in these albums. But they are far from typical. No order or system is observed: Turkmen, Dājalāyir and Mongol miniatures, drawings, rough sketches and fragments, European and Chinese drawings, specimens of calligraphy and pages of poetry jostle one another higgledy-piggledy, sometimes mounted sideways or even upside down, in these huge albums, and little or no margin is allowed. But most of the other Topkapi albums date from the later 16th century onwards, and are of the normal "classical" form. They include the celebrated album of Bahrām Mirzā, in which he commissioned the court painter Dūst Muhammad to mount a series of pictures to illustrate the history of painting. Dūst Muhammad prefaced the album with an essay on the subject which remains our most important and reliable source. In making up such albums, whether put together by royal patrons, the compilers did not hesitate to plunder manuscripts in the royal library. Thus Bahrām
MURAKKA — MURAKKISH

Mirza's album contains a miniature cut from the celebrated Khwadju Kirmanl manuscript of 1396 (now British Library Add. 18113) which was then in the Safawid library.

By about 1350 it was not uncommon for separate paintings and drawings to be produced expressly for mounting in albums. Much of the work of such painters as Muhammad, Shâykh Muhammad and Šâdîki is of this nature, and in the 17th century the best work of artists like Rîdî, Muhammad Kâsim and Mu'sâ is no longer to be found in manuscript illustrations but in album pictures. A number of magnificent albums were made for the Mughal emperors at the same period, and these sometimes contained one or two European prints in addition to Persian and Mughal paintings, drawings and calligraphy.

A splendid album from the end of the Safawid period is preserved in Leningrad containing, in addition to much Indian (Mughal) work which was greatly admired at the time, elaborate figure compositions and meticulous flower paintings by Muhammad Žamân and his contemporaries at the Safawid court. The Topkapî Library possesses albums made up in the 18th and 19th centuries for the Ottoman sultans with works by Lewln and other Turkish artists as well as examples of "thumb-nail" calligraphy, cut-out work and other varieties.

The practice of album compilation continued throughout the 19th century. Thus there is a splendid album of royal portraits put together for Fath ʻAlî Shâh and perhaps painted by Mihr ʻAlî; and another made for Naṣîr al-Dîn of miscellaneous (largely Safawid) content appeared on the market not long ago.

Bibliography: The only publication that gives a good idea of a complete album is A.A. Ivanov, T.V. Grek and O.F. Akimushkin, Albom indiiskikh persidskikh miniatyur XVI-XVIII vv., ed. L.T. Gyuazalian, Moscow 1962 (with English summary of the text). The Istanbul and Berlin albums have been the subject of several publications, e.g. (Istanbul) M.S. Ispirgolu, Painting and culture of the Mongols, London 1963, and (Berlin) idem, Snay-Alben: Deutsche Klebebnde aus den Berliner Sammlungen (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Band VIII), Wiesbaden 1964, but these are concerned with the contents, and not the albums themselves.

MURAKKISH, cognomen by which two pre-Islamic Arab poets are known, belonging to a family of which several members have made their mark in the history of poetry in the Arabic language.

1. The Elder, AL-ĂKBA, was called either Rabl a, or ʻAwf, or even ʻAmr, the uncertainty deriving from the fact that his father, Sa'd b. Malik b. Duhayyâ, had eleven sons (see Ibn al-Kalbi-Caskel, Tab. 155) whom the historians and biographers may have confused; ʻAmr b. Sa'd seems however to be the form that should be retained. The Arab authors of the Middle Ages state that Murakkish (and not al-Murakkish, which is inadmissible) is a cognomen drawn, as is not uncommon (see Ibn Ḥabîb, Aṭbâ al-ḥawârî, 320; al-Ḍâjibî, Bayân, i, 374; Barbir de Meynard, Surnoms et sobriquets, etc.), from one of the poet's verses, which would be the following: 'The abode is deserted, and the relics resemble the fine marks that a pen has traced (nakkâ) on the back of a skin' (metre baṣî, rhyme -ān), and other various remains, whether this is in fact a genuine name or, at a pinch, a pseudonym. *Markus = Mark, which would not be at all surprising in the vicinity of the Christians of al-Ĥîrâ and in an individual who had blue eyes (al-Ḍâjibî, Hayawan, v, 331) and who is moreover believed to have served as the secretary of a Ghassanid.

Murakkish al-Ăkbar was a brave and resourceful soldier who took part, under his father's command, in the famous war of al-Bâstâs [q.v.] and in other conflicts between the Bakr and the Taghîb. Father L. Cheikh arbitrarily dates his death around the year 552 A.D. He owes his reputation less to his poetic works than to the fact that he is reckoned one of the famous lovers (ṣâhibâd al-ʻArâb) and that he became, probably in the 2nd/8th century, the hero of an anonymous romance the text of which was still in circulation in the 4th/10th century, in the time of Ibn al-Nâdîm (Fihrist, ed. Cairo, 525, Kitâb M. r. k. wa-Asmâ). This romance, of which the Agânî supplies a fairly detailed version, may be summarised as follows: 'Amr b. Sa'd wishes to marry his cousin Asmâ bint ʻAwf, who is also a childhood friend. The girl's father demands, as a condition of giving her hand, that ʻAmr proves his worth but, during the absence of the latter, he finds a way of improving his situation, giving Asmâ in marriage to a wealthy Murâdī. ʻAmr's brothers hide the truth from him on his return, declaring to him that his loved one is dead; to convince him, they show him her apparent tomb, which in fact contains the carcasse of a goat which they have slaughtered for this purpose. The young man playing in the yard, the secret, and ʻAmr sets out in pursuit of the Murâdī with a couple of slaves belonging to his household, but he falls ill during the journey, and his two companions abandon him in a cave. He has time to write on a sadle his disappointment, and describes his condition and, when the companions return to the family of Murakkish, his brother Harmala who, like him, has learned to write under the tutelage of a Christian of al-Ĥîrâ, decipheres the message and forces the two slaves, before killing them, to reveal to him the place where they have left their master. By a fortunate chance, the shepherd of the husband of Asmâ finds Murakkish, who entrusts his ring to him, charging him to have it delivered to his loved one. The latter finds it in a jug of milk, recognises it, and sets out at once with her husband to the home of a Christian of al-Ĥîrâ, to their home, but he dies immediately after.

Anthologists have preserved about a dozen compositions comprising a total of 140 verses which evoke Asmâ and other women, military campaigns, the death of a cousin, the aggression of a Ghassânî against the Dûbab'a. Ibn Kutayba attributes to Murakkish al-Ăkbar the invention of certain original themes and, in a verse quoted by al-Ḍâjibî (Bayân, ii, 215), the purity of his language appears to be somehow proverbial. He is moreover considered by Ibn Abî Iṣâk (apud Ibn Sallâm, 44) the best poet of the Dâjihîyya, a view contested by Ibn Râshîk (Umdâ, i, 80). However, the work attributed to him is not easily separated from that attributed to his nephew, especially since both led the same nomadic and warlike existence and benefited from the popularity of the romantic tales which were current in 'Irâk society from the 2nd/8th century onward.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Kalbi-Caskel, Djambara, Tab. 155; Ibn Kutayba, Šûrî, 103-5 (ed. Šâkirî, i, 162-5); Muṣaffaladîyûs, 457-93; Dâjibî, Bayân, i, 374-5, ii, 183, 215; idem, Hayawan, index; Aghânî, vi, 127-35 (ed. Beirut, vi, 121, 8); Anbarl, Nunach, 457-60, 484; Marzûbânî, Muṣamâî, 201; Washhâ, Muṣafâ, index; Râshîk, Al-Salâm, 514-4; Cheikhro, Narmâna, 292-92; N. H. al-Kavâs, Al-Murakkish al-Ăkbar, akhârât wa-ši'ârîh, in al-Ărâb, iv/6 (1389/1970), 485-95; R. Blachere, HLA, 252
His theology can only partially be reconstructed from fragments and reports in the heresiographical literature. His Mu'tazili doctrine of God's "oneness" (tawhid) forms the starting-point for his critical perception of God "in whatever manner"—by explicitly excluding the balqafa by his contemporary Ahmad b. Hanbal. This accentuation of God's transcendence, however, has not induced him to keep to Mu'ammar b. 'Abbād's [q.v.] doctrine of an endless chain of determining causes ('maʿanī) which are inherent between God and his creation; against Abu ʿl-Hudhayl, he did not simply classify the cause of created things as "creative act" (khāliq [q.v.]), as God's "will" or ordering "word" (cf. Kurān, XVI, 40/42). As cause of creation appears the final purpose of every "creative act", the created things (cf. Daiber, 230-2). Thus God remains remote from the created world in a much stricter sense than can be found in the doctrines of his fellow-Mu'tazilis.

This remoteness of God may have been the background of al-Murdār in his refutation of the Dāhiyimya and generally the determinists (al-Muḍğāri). God has neither created the Kurān nor the acts of man: al-Murdār denied the "creation" (khāliq) of man's acts by God; man has not "acquired" (kavaba/iskasaba) his acts. These polemics against the ghāl-kash theory were apparently directed against his fellow-Mu'tazil, his nearest and closest friend and against al-Nazẓām's doctrine of "generation by God's acting", who provided things created by God with their casual "nature" (Daiber 400). Al-Murdār kept to the tawlid/tawallud theory as taught by his teacher Bīghr b. al-Mu'tamīr; according to it, things are caused by man's action which "generates" them. Consequently, al-Murdār could postulate two kinds of acting causes: (1) those induced by man's acting and (2) those inducing, "generating" causal effects. Against Bīghr b. al-Mu'tamīr, the "generated" effects do not include "colour, taste, smell and perception" ('Abd al-Khārī al-Baghdādī, al-Fark, 166, 18). Al-Murdār's doctrine of "generation" presupposes man's independence from any determination by God. This enables al-Murdār to give an answer to the problem of God's almighty and divine power by the denial of the "vanishing of God's abilities" (khalk-kasb), the 'answer on the problem of theodicy by offering a confirmation of the thesis of God's almightiness with that of man's sovereignty: "God wills man's sins in the sense that he gives him a free hand in them (khalkāliq)" (al-Ash'ārī, 190, 9 f. = 512, 11 f.; cf. 228, 14), "God has the power over injustice and deceit; however, He shall not do that" (al-Ash'ārī, 555, 9 f.; cf. 201, 1 f., and Daiber 261). This power of God suggests that He is all-powerful and also that He wills man's sins. According to al-Murdār and his teacher Bīghr b. al-Mu'tamīr, God's endless power is not real power; it will not be realised (contrary to al-Nazẓām and 'Ali al-Uswārī, but in conformity with Abu 'l-Hudhayl, Dīfār b. Hārīb al-Ash'ārī and al-Iṣkāfī, cf. al-Baghdādī, al-Fark, 198, 15-200, 17; idem, al-Mīlāl, 136, 11-138, 3; Daiber, 261 f f.). However, al-Murdār criticises Abu 'l-Hudhayl for his doctrine of the "vanishing of God's abilities" (khalk al-maktabāt al-Baghdādī, al-Fark, 166, 17; cf. Daiber 247) which in his eyes led to a restriction of God's almightiness.

The described separation between man's acting and God's power forms the starting-point of al-Murdār's doctrine of the Kurān: in conformity with the Mu'tazīlī thesis of the createdness of the Kurān and as a result of his theory of tawlid/tawallud, al-Murdār could maintain that "man is able to (produce) something (tawlih) in himself and also change his language, his arrangement and eloquence" (al-Shahrastānī, 6, 17; cf. al-Baghdādī, al-Fark, 165, 4 f.).
Little is known about al-Murdar’s doctrine of Imāma [q.v.]. According to al-NashP (cf. van Ess, 44 ff.), his theory, as reflected in al-Malād, 227 f. and in an early manuscript, 231 ff.), al-Murdar, like his teacher Bishr b. al-Mu’tamir and generally the “school” of Baghdād, held the view that after the death of the Prophet Muhammad, an Imām may be chosen who is inferior; al-NāshP speaks of īmāmat al-mafaḍul in contrast to īmāmat al-fāḍil. We do not know whether al-Murdar, like his teacher, classified āli as afḍil, for various reasons, it may be doubted, if we can believe the report of al-Khayyāt (74-8), al-Murdar, like his pupil Dji’far b. Mubashshir, followed the Mu’tazili principle of neutrality (wukuf) and restraint from any condemnation of ‘Uthmān. According to the heresiographers (al-Baghdādī, al-Fark, 165, 9 f.; idem, al-Malād, 109, 9; al-Shahrastānī, i, 68, 2 f.)* someone who is concerned with the reign of his time (or: who joins the ruler of his time) is an infidel”; “He can neither inherit (power) nor can he bequeath (it)”. This utterance sounds like criticism of al-Mu’āammad’s decision to designate ‘Ali al-Riẓā [q. v.] as heir to the caliphate; ‘Ali al-Riḍā was designated in 817 in the absence of Bishr b. al-Mu’tamir and Thumāmā as witnesses (Watt, Formative period, 176 ff., German version, 180 f.).

The early politico-religious movement. It is now generally accepted that the movement arose in the aftermath of the Kūfān Shi’ī revolt under al-Mukhtar [q. v.] in favour of Muhammad b. al-Hanāfiyya [q. v.]. Ibn Sa’d and other sources describe Muhammad b. al-Hanāfiyya’s son al-Hasan as the author of the doctrine of ārāḍ, which he first defended in a circle of scholars debating the conflict between ‘Uthmān, ‘Ali, Talḥa and al-Zubayr. Al-Hasan argued that the judgment about the right and wrong in this conflict should be deferred to God, and Muslims should abstain from declaring either solidarity with them or dissociation from them. He then composed an open letter on his doctrine of ārāḍ and had it read in public. Although some doubt has been cast on his status as author of the movement and the writings of the Kitāb al-Īrāḍ attributed to him (M. Cook), there are no cogent reasons to reject them. Other early sources name either Kays b. Abū Muḥammad al-Maṣir or Dhrā’ b. Abū Allāḥ, both Kūfān, as the first propagator of ārāḍ. These reports, if not understood as a denial of al-Hasan’s role, certainly reflect the importance of Kūfā as the main centre of the early Murdijṭa. The movement had also adherents in Baṣra and in Mecca. From Irāk it spread to Khurāsān at an early date.

The earliest Murdijṭite doctrine, as reflected in particular in the Kitāb al-Īrāḍ attributed to al-Hasan and in the lḥādī anti-Murdijṭite polemics of the Sīrāt Sālim, affirmed unconditional solidarity with Abū Bakr and ‘Umar and suspension of judgment with respect to ‘Uthmān and ‘Ali. This was justified by the unanimous backing which the former two caliphs had enjoyed among contemporary Muslims, in contrast to the decision of opinion under the latter two. Suspension of judgment was obligatory in regard to the past which could no longer be witnessed. It was not proper for the present, and the early Murdijṭa upheld the principle of justice (ṣaf) against contemporary rulers. They held that Muslims would not lose their status of believers by any actions, but they were prepared to condemn wrongdoers as aberrant believers (mu’taminīn dullaḥ) who might ultimately be punished or forgiven by God. The identification of faith with true belief to the exclusion of acts, which later became the essential trait of ārāḍ, was clearly implied, though not central, in the earliest Murdijṭite teaching.

Politically, the early Murdijṭa were primarily concerned to restore the concord in the Muslim community by opposing radical religious groups. In Kūfā they pitted them primarily against the Sābā’yīyya, the radical Shī’ī movement which had recently emerged under al-Muḥtār and which repudiated the caliphate of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar. In the Kitāb al-Īrāḍ of al-Hasan, the Sābā’yīyya are accused of taking a single family (ahl bayt) of Arabs as the Īmām and of judging people’s religion by their attitude to them, of claiming that on the role of Īmām been suppressed, of exacerbating discord and hoping for their reign through the return of the dead before the Resurrection. The Murdijṭa evidently also distanced themselves from the
Kharidjite condemnation of both Uthman and 'Ali as infidels. In some early sources and older orientalist studies, they have been described both as loyalist supporters of the early Umayyads and as political quietists. This is clearly mistaken. Their suspension of judgment concerning 'Ali clashed with the official Umayyad condemnation of him, and their insistence on their right to criticise the injustice of the rulers quickly led to conflict. Many of them, including Kay's al-Masir and Dharr b. 'Abd Allāh, joined the broadly-based rebellion of Ibn al-Asq'ath [q. v.], fought in the battle of Dār al-Dhmām (62/701), and were subsequently persecuted by the Umayyad governor al-Haddādja. The sharply anti-Umayyad attitude which the Sīr Salīm ascribes to them probably reflects the situation at this time. The Murdji'a backed the caliphate of 'Umar II and maintained friendly relations with him. Under Yazid II, the Baṣran Murdji'ite Abu Ru'ba actively supported the revolt of Yazid b. al-Muhallab [see Muḥalladb]. In general, however, the Murdji'ite held that Muslims must not draw the sword against fellow-Muslims except in self-defence.

Around the turn of the 1st/7th century, the Murdji'a took on a new political role, associating themselves with the struggle for equality of the new non-Arab converts to Islam, especially in eastern Khurasan. This was occasioned, and for their exemption as Muslims from the jīza which the Umayyad authorities continued to impose on them. Doctrinally, this effort was based on the older Murdji'ite thesis that the status of faith depended on the mere confession of faith to the exclusion of all acts such as the performance of the ritual and legal obligations of Islam. The converts thus could not deny their full status of Muslims by the government on the pretext that they still ignored, or failed to fulfill, some of their most basic duties under Islam.

In 100/718-19, a Murdji'ite mawla, Abu 'l-Saydāb Sālih b. Tariq or Sa'id al-Nahwī, complained to 'Umar II about the fact that some 20,000 clients in Khurāsān were serving in the army without stipend and a similar number of new converts were being forced to pay the jīza. 'Umar ordered the governor to lift the jīza from all those praying in the direction of the Ka'ba and, when the governor responded with a subterfuge, dismissed him. In 110/728-9 the governor of Khurāsān commissioned Abu 'l-Saydāb with the propagation of Islam in Transoxania, pledging that the converts would be exempted from jīza. When the pledge was broken and the Soghdian converts put up resistance, Abu 'l-Saydāb and several associates sided with them against the authorities. He and Thābit Kuṭna, a prominent fighter of the faith and propagator of irḍa, were imprisoned. In 116/734 the great revolt of the radical Murdji'a under al-Hārīth b. Suraydā [q. v.], who was closely associated with several companions of Abu 'l-Saydāb, broke out. His religious spokesman in the later stages of the revolt, Dājam b. Sa'wān [q. v.], is commonly associated with the extreme Murdji'ite thesis that faith consists of mere knowledge in the heart. Although Ibn Suraydā's call for reform on the basis of the Kurān and the Sunna of the Prophet, for the overthrow of the Umayyad régime, went well beyond the common political programme of irḍa, his movement sprang out of the Murdji'ite struggle for the equality of the non-Arab converts to Islam.

Ibn Suraydā's armed rebellion against the caliphate and the persecution of the infidel enemies led to a break with the moderate Murdji'a who had backed the more peaceful struggle of Abu 'l-Saydāb. The schism, however, was not complete, as is revealed by the fact that Abu Hanīfa, the leading representative of irḍa in 'Irāq at the time, personally facilitated Ibn Suraydā's pardon by the caliph Yazid III in 126/744. Abu Hanīfa was fundamentally opposed to armed revolt, yet he unconditionally backed the claim of the converts to equal treatment by affirming that a Muslim convert in the territory of polytheism who confessed Islam without any knowledge of the Kurān or any of the religious obligations of Islam is a true believer (mu'min).

Abū Hanīfa's strong engagement in the struggle for equality of the non-Arab converts to Islam paved the way for the spread of his teaching, including irḍa, throughout eastern Īrān, Transoxania and among the Turks adopting Islam. Initially Bālkī became the eastern stronghold of his school. The town was nicknamed Murdji'abad on account of the devotion of its scholars and inhabitants to Abū Hanīfa and his doctrine. Murdji'ite tenets were propagated in the east by Abu Hanīfa's disciples Abu Murūj al-Balḳī in his al-Fṣāk al-abṣāt containing Abu Hanīfa's answers to theological questions and Abū Muṣṭāfī al-Sawmadī in his Kīāb al-Allīn wa l-muta'allīm, an exposition of irḍa attributed to the master. These works formed the basis of all later Hanfī Murdji'ite theology, including Māturīdism. Murdji'ite doctrine was also espoused by a similar number of non-Arab converts to Islam without any knowledge of the Kurān or any of its scholars and inhabitants to Abu Hanīfa, Murdji'ite doctrine on faith has maintained its place within Sunnī orthodoxy. Despite the vigorous opposition of traditionalist Sunnis to it.

In his Risāla ilā 'Uthmān al-Battī, Abū Hanīfa rejected the name Murdji'a for himself, asserting that it had been given by the innovators (ahl al-bida) to those who were in fact the People of Justice ('adl) and the Sunna. The term 'adl must be understood here as implying political justice and reform and not the Mu'tazili doctrine of free will. Abū Hanīfa was, like the early Murdji'a in general, a strict predeterminist. The name Murdji'a, however, had become a nomen odiosum used only by opponents. As recognition of 'Ali as the fourth rightly-guided caliph gradually became in 'Abbāsid times universal Sunnī doctrine, the primary demand of the early Murdji'a, suspension of judgment in the conflict between 'Uthmān and 'Ali, lost its significance. The meaning of Murdji' and irḍa was henceforth focused on the definition of faith as excluding acts, a theological doctrine strongly opposed by both Sunnī traditionalists and the Mu'tazila.

The theological Murdji'a. The new theological definition of irḍa facilitated the heresiographers' classification as Murdji'a of various groups and theological schools who were not connected with the early movement. Thus they counted among the Murdji'a the Kadiarī Ghaylānīya [see Ghaylanī b. Mūsān and Kadariyya] and Mu'tazili theologians like Abu 'l-Husayn al-Salībī, Abū S̄amir, Muḥammad b. Šāhīb and sometimes Ibn al-Rawandi, who deviated from Mu'tazili school doctrine in the question of God's unconditional threat (wa'ad) to the unrepentant sinner and the intermediate state of the grave sinner (jāziq) or his faithfulness and the infidel (kāfir). Other groups classified as Murdji'a, like the Nadabārīya [q. v.], the school of Biḫr al-Mārisī [q. v.] and the Karrāmiyya [q. v.] arose out of the school of Abū Hanīfa.

The influence of the teaching of the Murdji'a, in the broad definition of the heresiographers, primarily involved the following questions: Faith (imān) was
mostly defined as both knowledge (ma'rifah) and public affirmation (i'kidah) of God, of His prophets and their messages. The Murdjiite doctrine of the Karramiyya was often defined as including submission (khadif) to Him and love (mahabbah) of Him. The position of the Qahmiyya that faith consisted only of knowledge in the heart to the exclusion of affirmation with the tongue, submission and love, was generally condemned as extremist. Some heresiographers accused the Karramiyyah [q.v.] of the opposite extreme in teaching that faith consisted only of affirmation by the tongue to the exclusion of knowledge and belief (tasdik), thus holding that the Hypocrites (munafikun) in the time of the Prophet had been true believers. As al-Shahrastani correctly explained, this doctrine of the Karramiyya referred merely to the legal status in this world. The munafik verbally professing Islam while concealing unbelief was in their view truly a believer in this world but deserved eternal punishment in the hereafter. Their position thus agreed in substance with the doctrine of Abu Hanifa.

Faith was generally described as an indivisible (tā yatabaad) whole of beliefs and affirmation. Partial belief thus could not constitute it. On this basis, the earlier Murdjiite, including Abu Hanifa, generally held that faith can neither decrease nor increase. Under the pressure of Kharidjite passages expressly mentioning an increase of faith among Muslims, believers, the later Murdjiites of the school of Abu Hanifa, the Naḍḍāriyya, Māturidiyya and others, mostly affirmed that faith can increase but not decrease. This increase was variously explained as an additional knowledge of details of the ghari'a beyond the indispensable minimum, as an increase of conviction (ja'ān), or more broadly, of the subjective traits (shukkāt) of the believers in relation to the unchangeable essence (dā'ī) of faith.

The Murdjiite doctrine of istisla'h, i.e. the addition of the formula "if God wills (in sha'Allah, [q.v.])" to the affirmation "I am a believer (anā'ummin)" as implying doubt in one's own faith. They called their opponents in this question doubters (gusakāk), a nickname deeply resented by these last.

The Murdjiites generally did not distinguish between Islam and imān and considered all Muslims as mu'minun except for those excluded by Muslim consensus. Muslims falsely interpreting (mutawwiliun) aspects of the message of Islam were mostly recognised as believers. Those committing forbidden acts were called sinful believers (mu'mmīn fasāk). While the Murdjiite rejected the Khaḍirdjite and Mu'tazili doctrine of wu'ud, the unconditional punishment of the unrepentant sinner in the hereafter, they generally admitted that God might either punish or forgive Muslim offenders. While some held that this punishment of Muslims could be eternal, others affirmed that it would be temporal and that all would eventually enter paradise through the intercession (ghafla) of Muhammad. The latter view agrees with predominant Sunni traditionalist doctrine. Only the eccentric theologian Mukātīl b. Sulaymān is described as a Murdjiite who taught that true faith inevitably outweighs any offence before God and that He would not punish any Muslim affirming His unity. Any description of the Murdjiite as either laxists or as raising excessive hope for divine forgiveness, even though suggested by some early anti-Murdjiite polemics, is basically mistaken.

A religious opposition to Murdjiite doctrine in early Sunnism came from traditionalist circles in Kufa and Basra associated with al-'A'māgh, Sufyān al-'Thawrī, Wābi b. al-Dārārī and Ayyūb al-

Salğuyānī. These circles affirmed the absolute requirement of istisla'h and tried to exclude the Murdjiites from the Sunnites. Moreover, an extremist rejection was also adopted and espoused by Ahmad b. Hanbal, who in one of his creeds counted the Murdjiites together with the Karātariyya, the Ṭāfṣida and the Dāhiyya, among the innovators whom the Prophet had excluded from Islam and for whom Muslims must not perform funerary prayers. Later non-Murdjiite Sunnism was mostly more tolerant and often tended to minimise differences, especially with Ḥanāfīe Muḥāfrīrīn. A major factor in this change of attitude was the fact that a large section of the school of al-Asbā'ari came to define imān basically as belief (tasdik) in God, while assigning acts to a secondary rank, a doctrine not far removed from ībarī.


AL-MURDJIBI, HĀMĪD B. MUHIMMAD (ca. 1837-1905), a personality in the history of East Africa and the Congo during the 19th century. Hāmīd b. Muḥammad al-Murdjibi, alias Tippu Tip, was born of Afro-Arab parentage in Zanzibar ca. 1837. His great-grandfather, Raḥjlā b. Muḥammad al-Saʿūdī al-Murdjibi from Muscat [see M asc], had established himself on the coast opposite Zanzibar where he had married an Afro-Arab wife, the daughter of a member of the famous Nabhānī clan, Džuma b. Muḥammad al-Nabhanī. Hāmīd b. Muḥammad's grandfather, Džuma b. Raḥjlā al-Murdjibi, was among the earliest Arabs to lead caravans into the interior, where he supported Mirambo, ruler of Unyamwezi. His son Muḥammad b. Džuma b. Raḥjlā continued to expand his father's business interests in the interior, ensuring it by marrying one of the daughters of Pun-dikura, chief of the Nyamwezi. At his death in 1881 (cf. J. Becker, La vie en Afrique, Brussels 1887, ii, 45-8, 139) he owned large plantations at Ituru near Tabora. At the age of twenty, Hāmīd was leading expeditions on behalf of his father to the area around Lake Tanganyika. During these expeditions he encountered David Livingstone (The last journals of David Livingstone in Central Africa from 1865 to his decease repr. London 1974, i, 222, 228, 230). (An Editor's footnote explains the name Tippu Tip as one which he gave himself after conquering Nsama. As he stood
over the spoil he gathered it closer together and said
"Now I am Tippu Tip", that is, "the ... penetration there in the mid-
19th century; see on his movement, SHAMIL.
For the Murlds of West Africa, see MURIDIYYA.
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MURID (A.), literally "he who seeks", in Sufi
mystical parlance, the noviciate or postulant or
apprentice".

Bibliography: Maïsha ya Hamed bin Muhammad el
Murghi yaani Tippu Tip, Kiswati manake yakwamuwe,
tr. W.H. Whiteley, Suppl. to the East African
Swahili Ctee. journals, no. 28/2 (July 1958), 29/1
(January 1959); F. Bontinck, L’Autobiographie de Hamed ben Mohammed el-Murjebi
Tippo Tip (ca. 1840-1905), 200, n. 95; V.L. Cameron,
Across Africa, London 1885, 292 ff., 300; H.M. Stanley, In Darkest Africa, or Quest, rescue, and retreat of
Emir, Governor of Equatoria, New York 1890, i, 53, 63
et. passim and others.

Cameron describes him as "...a good looking man,
and the greatest dandy I had seen among the traders.
And, notwithstanding his being perfectly black,
he was a thorough Arab, for curiously enough the admix-
ture of negro blood had not rendered him less of an
Arab in his ideas and manners" (293). Stanley, who
met him in 1876, described him as a tall,
blackbearded man ... His tout-ensemble was that of an
Arab gentleman in very comfortable circumstances"

(Through the Dark Continent, London 1878, ii, 95-6),
and T.H. Parke noted an Arab "with bright
intelligent black eyes, displaying manners of imperial
dignity and courtesy" (My personal experiences in
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MURGHAB, a river of Inner Asia, and like
many rivers in that region, one without outlet to the
sea or to any more extensive river system. It rises in
the Küh-i Hisar mountains in north-central
Afghanistan, flows westwards and receives tributaries from the
Band-i Turkistan and Paropamisus moun-
tains in north-western Afghanistan. Some 250 miles
from its source, it reaches the town of Bâlû-Murghâb
in the modern Bâdghis province of Afghanistan,
and then enters the Turkmen SSR and flows for another
250 miles northwards towards the Kara Kum desert
([q.v.]) to New Marw (Russ. Mary), and then peters
out. Its only major tributary is the Kuhâkh, flowing
northwards to join the Murghâb at Taghkopiri.

In mediaeval Islamic times, the upper course of the
Murghâb (usually called by the geographers "the
river of Marw") flowed from the regions of Dar-
mağhân and Revšâhâr through Ghârâstân [see
GHÂRÂSTÂN], and then had on its lower course the
towns of Marw al-Rûdh [q.v.] and Marw [see MARW
al-qâhârâgân]. At this period, a complex irrigation
system utilised the Murghâb’s waters at Marw; at the
present time, the culture is dependent on artificial
irrigation waters at Taghkopiri and Iolotan. On this lower
course of the river, some 30 miles on the Russian side of the
modern frontier, lies the Pândjdhîsh oasis [q.v.],
occupied by the advancing Russians in 1885 and the
scene of a battle between the Russians and Afghâns
and then the focus of diplomatic tension between
Russia and Britain [see PÄNĐJÎDHÎS].
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MURID — MURIDIYYA

MURIDism, a West African religious brotherhood which was originally nothing more than a ramification of the Kadiiriyya [q.v.]. Around the figure of Amadu Bamba, its founder, a distinct tarika gradually came into being, quite specific to the milieu of Senegal, on the history of which it was to leave a lasting impression.

Amadu Bamba, Marabout Habib Allah, known by the name of Amadu Bamba, was born in the Wolof country, around 1850, into a religious family. His father, Momar Anta Sali, was a scholar associated with the Kadiiriyya and a regular visitor to the courts of local princes. At the time of the extension of French colonisation, Amadu Bamba, convinced of the futility of any armed resistance, became known as the advocate of pacific policies. On the ruins of the Wolof state of Kajoor (the defeat of Dekkile, 1886), Amadu Bamba gathered together in the South of the country, in Baol, a party of followers from all strata of society, including former dignitaries and warriors, alleged "pagans", and former adversaries of the "marabouts". Thus he offered to the demoralized Wolof peoples an alternative structure for living, a refuge: such was the principal social function of the Murid brotherhood in the history of contemporary Senegal.

His personal charisma worried the French authorities; suspected of subversion, Amadu Bamba was arrested in 1895. Thus began a long period of hardships which—supplemented by miraculous tales—definitely established his status as a saint in the popular imagination: exile to Gabon (1895-1902), followed by house-arrest in Mauritania until 1907 and then in the village of Cheyen, in the north of the country, until 1912. Having given numerous pledges of his peaceful intentions—in particular a fatae of 1910 calling upon his supporters to obey the authorities—Amadu Bamba was permitted to return to Baol in 1912. The shaykh then lived quietly at Dioarbel until his death, devoting himself to study and to pious observance. He died on 19 July 1927 and was buried in the village of Touba, in the heartland of Bambian mysticism. The brotherhood then had a membership of about a hundred thousand.

The social and political role of Amadu Bamba has tended to obscure his own vocation, which was that of a mystic. Around 1889, he had been initiated into the Kadiiriyya by its Mauritanian master, Shaykh Siidyya Baba, who later conferred on him the title of muqaddam. In 1891 or thereabouts, Amadu Bamba had a vision of the Prophet, in a place which Murid tradition identifies with the site of Touba. It does not seem that he intended to create a distinct tarika: he never used this term in speaking of his doctrine and of his followers. The phenomenon, which proceeded gradually, probably dates from the Mauritanian exile (1907) or, at the latest, from 1912.

The written work of Amadu Bamba consists essentially of kasidas in Arabic. Forty-one printed collections, part of a broader corpus, have been edited and studied (F. Dumont, 1975). Examination of these texts shows that, in common with other brotherhoods of the period, Amadu Bamba, who adopted the title of khidim Rasul Allah (servant of the Messenger of God), stressed the need for imitation of the sira of the Prophet, an imitation through which his teaching, an impeccably orthodox, some of his local disciples felt at liberty to develop a form of religious exclusivism in which Amadu Bamba tended to occupy the place of the Prophet, and the monumental mosque of Touba replaced that of Mecca. But such a trend, by no means peculiar to Muridism, was the product of popular piety and not the teaching of the founder.

The first and the second sons of the founder, Mamadu Mustafa Mbacke (1927-45) and Falilu Mbacke (1945-68) succeeded their father, bearing the title of "Caliph-general of the Murids", but contests between candidates never ceased absolutely, since no rule or consensus had been established for succession in the leadership of the brotherhood. Such contests led to the elimination, with the active participation of the colonial power, of a brother of the founder, Shaykh Anta and, later, of the elder son of Mamadu Mustafa, Shaykh Mbacke.

The "Caliph-general" stands at the apex of a complex pyramidal structure consisting, in descending order, of "caliphs" (chiefkings of religious lineages), local sheikhs and simple "talibes". Unconditional obedience of the disciple to his shaykh, who is himself the dispenser of the baraka the founder, is the cornerstone of a brotherhood renowned for its discipline and the power of its hierarchy.

The major movement towards development of the new territories of the Baol, which began at the end of the 1920s, conferred on this hierarchy considerable land-owning, economic and financial power, earning it its reputation as "Black Islam". It is Paul Marty (1913) who is to be thanked for this term, which came to be used in Senegal for the brotherhood of Amadu Bamba, its leader Shaykh Mbacke. Under the distant control of the colonial authorities, who saw their interests served by this form of indirect administration, the Murid zones constituted virtually autonomous enclaves. In these zones—this was one of the advantages of the system from the point of view of the local people—the colonial influence was absent from daily life. Negotiations with the French power over matters such as taxation and labour were conducted directly, at the top of the hierarchy. Henceforward, both before and after independence, the Murid brotherhood was to constitute a kind of state within a state, exerting considerable influence in the life of the country (for example supporting Leopold Senghor, although a Catholic, against Mamadou Dia in 1962). This political role, more that of a demanding client than of a challenger in power, has constituted to this day one of the dominant features of Senegalese politics.

The contemporary brotherhood—image and reality

Although limited to the Senegalese sphere, where furthermore it stands in second place, after the Tijâniyya, in terms of membership, the Murid brotherhood has enjoyed a celebrity which far exceeds its real influence in Africa. The particular interest shown in it by the French administration and its economic role account for this renown. After the period of repression, colonial observers chose to see it as a model of an ethnicised Islam, contaminated by local practices and, as such, deprived of any subversive potential, a prototype of what was then called "Black Islam". It is Paul Marty (1913) who is to be credited with the invention of hyperbolic formulas, subsequently to enjoy wide circulation, such as "new religion born of Islam" and "Islamic vagabondage".

In fact, Muridism is seen today as a major component of Sundeed Islam in Senegal, and its fundamental orthodoxy is undisputed.

Since its inception, the brotherhood has above all...
demonstrated its remarkable capacity for adaptation, in economic as well as in political areas: first as an instrument of passive resistance to colonisation, then as a structure of compromise and cooperation with it, it has presented itself since independence as the major national brotherhood. The crisis in ground-nut cultivation could have been fatal for it; it then transformed its structures and investments, setting up powerful commercial networks and extensive real estate holdings in the towns, also undertaking, in the south of the country (Sinesaloum and Casamance), the development of new territories. It thus constitutes, in contemporary Senegal, as well as in its expatriate communities in Europe and America, a social reality with renewed dynamism and propagandist skills, which is not really threatened by the new concurrence of reformist and Islamist associations.
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pressure on the irrigable regions of the country. Certain cantons in the Senegal valley have a density of population which now exceeds 45 inhabitants per km². In general, the inhabitants are relatively numerous and concentrated in the Sahelian zone to the north of the river where the negro sedentaries mostly live. The Saharan zone, which is predominantly Moor, becomes increasingly depopulated the further north one travels. In the Adrăr, the figure had been estimated at 50,000 inhabitants for 489,000 km². Some desert areas such as the Miraya, al-Jawf and Arg Shagh are all but destitute of humanity, even of the desert traveller.

In general, two races inhabit Mauritania. The Moors form a majority amounting to some four-fifths of the total. Some of them are descended from the ancient Sanhadja Berbers who, with some intermarriage with the negroes and non-negro peoples (the so-called Bâfuř) who preceded their arrival, were masters of the desert zone until the 9th/10th century, after which time small groups of the Banū Makīl [q.v.] Arabs, who later called themselves Awlād Hassān, entered Mauritania. The Moors today are the descendants of earlier intermarriage between these two peoples. Other small groups, Żanāta Berber Ibāḍī, Jews (who are also identified with the Bafur), and destitute of humanity, even of the desert traveller.

[31x427]Jews (who are also identified with the Bafur), and destitute of humanity, even of the desert traveller.

[32x470][q. v.]

[32x470]kil

[32x548]as al-Mirayya, al-Djawf and Arg Shash are all but predominant Moor, becomes increasingly

[32x401]dants of earlier intermarriage between these two peoples. Other small groups, Żanāta Berber Ibāḍī, Jews (who are also identified with the Bafur), and destitute of humanity, even of the desert traveller.

[32x444]dants of earlier intermarriage between these two peoples. Other small groups, Żanāta Berber Ibāḍī, Jews (who are also identified with the Bafur), and destitute of humanity, even of the desert traveller.

[32x453]dants of earlier intermarriage between these two peoples. Other small groups, Żanāta Berber Ibāḍī, Jews (who are also identified with the Bafur), and destitute of humanity, even of the desert traveller.

[32x505]Moors form a majority amounting to some four-fifths of the total. Some of them are descended from the ancient Sanhadja Berbers who, with some intermarriage with the negroes and non-negro peoples (the so-called Bâfuř) who preceded their arrival, were masters of the desert zone until the 9th/10th century, after which time small groups of the Banū Makīl [q.v.] Arabs, who later called themselves Awlād Hassān, entered Mauritania. The Moors today are the descendants of earlier intermarriage between these two peoples. Other small groups, Żanāta Berber Ibāḍī, Jews (who are also identified with the Bafur), and destitute of humanity, even of the desert traveller.

[32x557]some desert areas such as the Miraya, al-Jawf and Arg Shagh are all but destitute of humanity, even of the desert traveller.

[32x557]2

[32x557]inhabitants for 489,000 km². Some desert areas such as the Miraya, al-Jawf and Arg Shagh are all but destitute of humanity, even of the desert traveller.

[32x617]and negroes in the Sahelian lands to the east of Mauritania.

[32x618]and negroes in the Sahelian lands to the east of Mauritania.

[32x627]of population which now exceeds 45 inhabitants per km². In general, the inhabitants are relatively numerous and concentrated in the Sahelian zone to the north of the river where the negro sedentaries mostly live. The Saharan zone, which is predominantly Moor, becomes increasingly depopulated the further north one travels. In the Adrăr, the figure had been estimated at 50,000 inhabitants for 489,000 km². Some desert areas such as the Miraya, al-Jawf and Arg Shagh are all but destitute of humanity, even of the desert traveller.

[32x644]Mauritania has suffered from, and its very existence is increasingly threatened by, desiccation. The climate was at that time more humid...
They seem to have also ruled parts of Tagant and, for a time, the town of Awdaghust (Ghast). Lewicki (Les origines de l'Islam dans les tribus berbères du Sahara occiden-
tal, in BIFAN, 1970, 125-34) notes that this early islamicisation and part-Arabisation was principally the achievement of the Arab governor 'Abd Allah b. al- Habhāb and his son Ismā‘īl, between 735-6 and 739-40 A.D. Strategic wells were dug, Arab-organised expeditions launched as far south as the Senegal river and regular commerce with Awadhgust and Ghāna was established, especially from Suffī Ṣālāḥmāsa [q.v.]. The Berber or Arab-Berber kingdoms of Tin Yarūtān (Tayalātān, d. 222/837) and his successors of Tin Yarūtān (Kays b. Yarwātik, etc., ca. 350/961) of Awadhgust, and, even more so, of Tārāshnī (d. ca. 414/1023), father-in-law of Yahyā b. Ibrāhīm, one of the alleged founders of the Almoravid movement, were all nominally Muslim, the last of them militantly so. The Arab accounts describe these chiefs as enjoying greater power than they were probably ever entitled to, adjacent to regal Ghāna. Nevertheless, they probably were the most noteworthy and richest of the chiefs of early mediaeval Mauritania (see Norris, Saharan myth and saga, Oxford 1968, 56-66).

(c) The Almoravid movement and post-Almoravid Mauritania. The movement of the 'men of the riṣāḥā', the Almoravids [see Al-
moravides et Maraboutes, in WI, xxi, 80-163]. However, the raids of the Saharan who joined the movement were primarily launched from within against Morocco itself, so that Mauritania never became its major centre. Only Azzugl, the capital of the southern wing, under Abū Bakr b. 'Umar and his successors, was considered worthy of mention by such geographers as al-Idrīsī and Ibn Sa‘d al-Maghribī. The Almoravids are important in Mauritanian history for the following reasons: (i) the legacy left by 'Abd Allah b. Yāsīn, founder of the Mauritanian state, and his followers, the deep-rooted jurists in the Maghrib and the tradition of al-
Kāyrawān, Ibn Yāsīn’s fatwās which laid down rules for the administration of Sanhadja society and the first establishment of urban communities, Aratnanna (see Norris, New evidence on the life of ‘Abdullāh b. Yāsīn and the origins of the Almoravid movement, in Inal. of African History, xii [1971], 253-68), and M. Brett, Islam and trade in the Bilād al-Sūdān, tenth-eleventh century AD, in ibid., xxiv [1983], 437-440). (ii) The authority and tribal cohesion which was established by the Lamtūnī [q.v.], which became the leading tribe in the Western Sahara for several centuries. Under Yahyā b. ‘Umar, Abū Bakr b. ‘Umar and, above all, Yūsuf b. Ṭāhufīn, Mauritians, for once in their history, produced leaders of international renown who changed world history. The most important of these for the future of Mauritania was Abū Bakr b. ‘Umar, who until 480/1097 and after his split with Yūsuf, ruled Mauritania from Azzugl. He reputedly died in Tagant fighting negro infidels. Latest research sug-
gests that accounts of the conquest of Ghāna by him, or by one of the Almoravid leaders, in 1076, cannot be substantiated from the evidence (see H.J. Fisher, Early Arabic sources and the Almoravid conquest of Ghana, in JAH, xviii [1982], 549-60). (iii) The appointment of the Imam, ‘Abd al-Muṣṭaf b. al-Hassān al-
Mūrādī al-Hādramī as the kāli of Azzugl. He is mentioned by al-Ṭādīlī, Ibn Bashkūwā and al-
Makārī (see P.F. de Moraes Farias, The Almoravids: some questions concerning the character of the movement during its period of closest contact with the Western Saharan tribes, in BIFAN, 1969, 3-4 [1967], 851-7). Accord-
ing to al-Muṣṭafī (‘Aṣhār al-riṣāḥā fi al-khāṭir al-‘I'yād, Cairo 1942, iii, 161), ‘This Al-Mūrādī was the first to intro-
duce the dogma and the doctrines of the faith to the furthest Maghrib. He resided at Aghmat. When Abū Bakr betook himself to the Sahara, he brought him with him and he appointed him to administer the šākh’s law. He died in Arkār (Azzugl) in the descent of the Maghrib in 489/1096’.

Some Mauritians claim descent from him. (iv) Other Almoravid legacies amongst the Moors include the genealogy of Abū Bakr b. ‘Umar (‘Umar); the décor and the domestic archite-
ture of Walata and Tishiti; commerce with the Maghrib and al-Andalus; and a lineal claim to the ancient Yemenites among the Mauritanian Zwāyā.

(d) The entry of the Banū Ma‘kīl [q.v.] into the Western Sahara and their domination of Mauritania. The decline of the Almoravids in the Saharan regions which they had ruled and the geographical extent of the rule of the kingdom of Mali beyond Walata is undocumented. The ḥāṣīd of Ṣāhīḥ Muhammad Mābārāk al-Lamṭūnī states that the tribe became divided into four groups which appear to denote its existing principal divisions, the ḫādī Salīḥ Bāḥrī, al-Iḥāsī, ḫādī Hasān b. Yūsuf, al-Imām, and ḫādī Abī Bakr, ḫādī Imām b. Ḥā discredit the Morāfīns [q.v.], who used them as tax collectors in the areas they claimed beyond the Atlas. Driven by drought, by punitive measures taken against them on account of insubordination, by the prospect of plunder from Saharan commerce, or as mercenaries, they moved south into the Sahara. They called them-
selves Awlād (Dhwāw) Ḥāṣān, which is the name still employed by all branches which descend from them. In the 9th/15th century, the Awlād Nājir reduced to vassalage (allegedly aided by the Kunta) the Sanḥāda of Zamūr and Ḫadīl (Dhbaal Ḥassān); other Ḥassānīs of the area of Wādān and Tagant in the 10th/16th century, and the gbīla in the Ḥaww were conquered in the 11th/17th century. The prominent tribes which took part in and contributed to numbers of originally Berber client tribes,
included the Awlad Rizg, the Awlad Mubarak, the Brakna, the Trarza and the Awlad Yahya b. Uthman. Other tribes of importance which occupied areas beyond Mauritania’s existing frontiers in the Western Sahara included the Awlad Dalim, the Awlad Mubarak, the Brakna, the Trarza and the Awlad Yahya b. Uthman. (c) The War of Shurbubba and the amirates of the Awdal Hassân. Until recently, it was believed that the so-called “War of Shurbubba” (named after a Zanaga war cry, though the form wuk’at Aqrawibba is found in the text of the Walata chronicle), which allegedly lasted from 1055/1645 to 1085/1675, was the important watershed in Mauritanian history. The class divisions which became a marked feature throughout Western Saharan society, it is said, came into being following the triumph of the Arab “Hassân” in this war. Since such classes characterise Saharan and Sahelian societies far beyond Mauritania’s borders, it is clear that such was not the case. One reason for the notoriety of this “war”, or rather, series of tribal engagements, was the fact that two of Mauritania’s leading historians of the 12th/18th century, Muhammad al-Yadall and his pupil Wâlid b. Khâljûn, had familial reasons for giving a particular emphasis to the war, and it featured prominently in their literary works. Outside the gebla its importance was given far less prominence.

A number of factors led to this war taking place in the gebla: (i) the expansion of the negroes, more especially the Peul to the north of the Senegal river, and the impact which this had on the Taghumah and Hassânî commercial and trading posts on the banks of the river; (ii) the growing tribal rivalries between the Awdal Hassân and Zenâga-speaking groups; (iii) the ill-treatment of the latter by the former; (iv) and Islamic revival amongst Zenaga speakers and in the commercial towns of the Adrâr. This revival was encouraged through a greater number of religious texts, of all kinds, in Arabic, entering Mauritania from Morocco or from the Middle East. Outside stimulus and European hostility combined and brought about an Islamic movement which reflected Sufism and the growth of the tarik, Mahdism and a “neo-Almoravid” patriotism, exemplified by the cult of the Imâm al-Hadrâmî amongst the Shamsâdî in the Adrâr. This led to raids locally between tribal groups and individual scholars (cf. Abdel Wedoud Ould Cheikh and B. Saison, Vo(ë) et mort(ë) de l’Imam Al-Hadrâmî. Autour de la prospérité saharienne du mouvement almornasde (11e-17e siècles), in Nouvelles études mauritaniennes, i/2 [1984], 55-104); and (v) especially in the gebla, the charismatic personality of Awbik b. Aâlghâ Ababd b. Ya’kûb b. Awbik al-Daymânî al-Lâmûnî, known as Nâşîr al-Dîn.

During his brief life, and the lives of his successors, a qâidî was launched in order to subdue the nominally Muslim rulers of the negro states to the north and to the south of the Senegal river and to curb the power and to impose Muslim observances on the Awdal Hassân. After the defeat and death of Nâşîr al-Dîn at Tin-Yifîdî in 1674, this movement lost its momentum and the gebla was reduced to vassalage to the Awdal Hassân. Only in Taghâmî did the Sandaga Mâdaw 5âhî, led by their chief, Muhammad Shayn, attain a total independence from the continuing encroachments of the Awdal Hassân towards the end of the 18th century. In the 19th century, the Idaw 5âhî expanded into the Adrâr and they maintained their independence until the French occupation. They claimed a direct descent from the Almoravids; nevertheless, they forsook the Zenâga language and they assumed all the princely titles, the Arab status and the courtly bardic traditions of the Hassânî amirs.

The “War of Shurbubba” was only an important episode amongst many in the continuous process of Arabisation of Mauritanian society. As part of this social and linguistic process, the political and economic relations between the tribes became stabilised. Small chiefly states were formed. The dynasty of the Awdal Ahmad b. Dâmân ruled amongst the Trârza with noteworthy kings, such as ‘Ali Shânzûrî (1073-27). Aided militarily by the Moroccan sultan Mawlây Ismâ’il, he delivered his tribe from the rule of the Brakna. Muhammad al-Hâbîb (1827-60) shouldered the burden of Moorish resistance when it was first threatened by permanent European penetration and domination. Amongst the Brakna, the amirs of the Awdal ‘Abîd Allâh played a predominant role during the age following the “War of Shurbubba” and their authority, at times, extended from Taghâmî to the Atlantic. Their power declined in the 19th century, excluding the note-worthy reign of Ahmadîd I (1818-41). They were reduced to the status of vassalage to the monarchy of Morocco by the French. In the Adrâr, the Awdal Yâhîb b. ‘Uthman produced several famous princes: the strong-minded Ahmad b. Muhammad (1871-91), who sought to revive trans-Saharan commerce, and Ahmad b. ‘Abîd Ahmad (1891-9). Nevertheless, the greatest Mauritanian princely ruler of the 19th century was Bakkar b. Sâwîd Ahmad of the Idaw 5âhî of Taghâmî, who was a descendant of Muhammad Shayn. In view of the threats to the authority of these Hassânî princes within their tribal society and from without, whether from negro rulers to the south or from European encroachment along the coast or from the river, or from the officialdom of the sultans of Morocco, it was their achievement to have preserved a Mauritanian identity during two to three centuries and to have been the protectors and patrons of Mauritania’s most famous scholars and men of letters.

(f) European rivalries on the coast of Mauritania. During the first half of the 15th century, the Portuguese explored the Mauritanian coast and made their first landings there. In 1434 Gil Eanes reached Cape Bojador, and between 1442 and 1445, at the instigation of Henry the Navigator, expeditions commanded by Gonçalvez and Lanzarote discovered Naar, Tiéda and Arguin. The town of Wâdin in the Adrâr was a focus of attention on account of its trading connections with Tishit and with the Sudân interior. It received special mention in the descriptions of Ca da Mosto (1455-7) and, yet more so, in the writings of Valentin Fernandez in the 16th century, who for the first time reports the salt mine at Idjdjil in the north of the Adrâr. In 1448 the Portuguese established a permanent settlement on Arguin island. This lay in a key geographical situation for their African activities (cf. Th. Monod, L’île d’Arguin (Mauritanie), essai historique, Instituto de Investigacao Cientifica Tropical, Centro de Estudos do Cartographia Antiga, Lisbon 1983). It was from Arguin that the Portuguese endeavoured to extend their power into the interior, and especially into the Adrâr, with the final aim of commanding, or cutting, the major caravan routes between the Sudân and Morocco. Their factories were principally, though not exclusively, sited on the coast,
and the trade which took place between them and the merchants of the Awlad Hassan entailed the exchange of woven cotton garments, silver, coral and cornelian for slave gold, oryx skins, gum arabic, civet and ostrich eggs.

The Portuguese enjoyed the profit of the Arguin trade for two centuries; then it passed to the Spaniards. From Arguin, European activity spread to Portendick in the gebia (Marsa Djarida). In 1626 the French established themselves at the mouth of the Senegal River. In 1658 the Dutch, as a prize in their war with Spain, took Arguin. Twenty-seven years later they lost it to the English. For a century Arguin and Portendick remained a bone of contention between the three powers. In the meantime, France consolidated her commercial position at the mouth of the Senegal river. The Treaty of Versailles (3 September 1783) recognised French sovereignty over the Atlantic coast between the river and Cap Blanc, which was regarded by the Sultan of Morocco as the southernmost limit of his domain at that time, (cf. the letter sent by Muhammad I b. 'Abd Allah to the letter sent by Muhammad I b. 'Abd Allah to the

For a time during the 19th century, the British challenged French control and influence. However, in 1891 the British sold their monopoly of the slave trade and gave up to the French their claim to the kingdom of Fez. Before the end of the century, the ceded part of the territory of the Fez was incorporated into the protectorate of Morocco. In 1905 the French took Portendick and Arguin, and arguin and Portendick had lost their importance, although the British retained the right to trade in the latter until 1857. European rivalries enabled the princes of the Trarza to prolong their independence.

The French occupation. In 1854, with the appointment of Louis Faidherbe as governor of Senegal and the establishment at St. Louis of a "Bureau des affaires extérieures", a more vigorous French policy was pursued towards the gebia. After four years, Walo, on the Senegalese bank of the river, was subdued and the Moors who were established there were driven out. The amirs of the Trarza and the Brakna were made to sign a treaty which acknowledged that France had a right of suzerainty over Senegal and the establishment at St. Louis of a trade in freedom was guaranteed. However, as C.G. Stewart has remarked, "The actual implementation of French policy in Mauritania in the early nineteenth century was misdirected, owing to the assumption that Brakna and Trarza constituted amirates, each led by a powerful and absolute ruler. In fact, ... the so-called 'amirs' had neither authority nor power inherent to their positions. Their influence, rather, depended upon their personality, patronage, social position, and the composition of the jamada within the dominant Hassani tribe or tribes in the region" (Islam and social order in Mauritania, Oxford 1973, 93). For nearly fifty years these treaties were respected, and this allowed the French to make commercial agreements as far as Tagantit and the Adrar. By the end of the century, however, the situation in the gebia had gravely deteriorated, to the point that commerce was seriously threatened on both banks of the Senegal river. A conquest of Mauritania, despite the formidable logistic problems this entailed, became imperative. Attempts to use the influence of the marabouts was only partially successful. M. Coppolani, Commissaire-Général of the government since 1902, backed by military force, achieved the occupation of the Trarza in 1903, the Brakna in 1904 and Tagantit in 1905. The effective occupation of the northern part of Mauritania was to follow in 1913, though only after Coppolani himself had been assassinated in 1905 and Shaykh Ma‘al-Al-Aynan [q.v.] had been defeated.

The Islamic Republic of Mauritania. The French protectorate over the territory of the Moors of French West Africa was created in 1905. On 17 October 1904 it was transformed by decree into a civil territory, placed under control of a Commissaire of the Gouvernement-Général de A.O.F. The decree of 4 December 1920 transformed Mauritania (Mūritāniyā) into a French colony. Up to the eve of the World War II, Mauritania was regarded as a territory principally administered through "chefs de milice" tenue." The prime task of the French administrators was to ensure that government at the level of these chiefs was carried out peacefully and at minimum cost.

Following reforms which were introduced immediately after the war, Mauritania was made a part of the French Republic in the same manner and with the same status as the seven other territories which formed part of the Fédération de l'Afrique Occidentale Française. Ten years later, the Islamic Republic of Mauritania was proclaimed on 28 November 1958. It became a member state of the Communauté, endowed with internal independence. There was to be a progressive transfer of the services which then existed at Saint-Louis, Senegal, to the new capital, Nouakchott (Anwākhūt). A National Assembly was elected on 17 February 1959 through direct and equal suffrage of the male population. On 23 June 1959 the National Assembly unanimously agreed to the investiture of Moktar Ould Daddah (al-Mukhārār wulā Dāddāh) as Prime Minister. After the signature in Paris on 19 October 1960 of the agreement dealing with the transfer of jurisdictions, the independence of Mauritania was proclaimed on 28 November 1960. On 20 May 1961 the National Assembly adopted a new constitution on a presidential type. In June of the following year, agreements signed in Paris defined the future of French and Mauritanian co-operation. On 20 August 1961, Moktar Ould Daddah, sole National Union candidate, was elected by universal suffrage to be the first President of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania.

It was the aim of Moktar Ould Daddah to see his country adopt a more broad view of its history, view of her history, as a bridge between the Maghreb and the bidāl al-Sūdān. Ironically, it was the partition of another trait d'union between the Maghrib and the bidāl al-Sūdān. Ironically, it was the partition of the former trait d'union, the former Spanish Sahara, which was to lead to the fall of his Presidency and, together with the disastrous consequences of the Sahelian droughts, to question the viability of the original goals of the state and even the viability of the state itself.

On 7 August 1966, Moktar Ould Daddah was elected President of the Republic for a further five years. In September 1969 he attended the Islamic Summit in Rabat and met King Hassan II. This marked a change in Moroccan policy towards his country, the independence of which had never been acknowledged. The resumption of diplomatic relations took place in June 1970. The following year, Moktar Ould Daddah was re-elected as President of the Republic. On 4 December 1973 Mauritania became a member of the Arab League. Between 1975 and 1978, the occupation by Mauritania of the southern part of the partitioned Spanish Sahara (Río de Oro) had as its consequence a skillfully planned and effected series of raids and frightening attacks by the Polisario Front, which sought self-determination for the territories formerly Spanish. These disrupted Mauritania's export of iron ore and even reached the outskirts of the capital. On 10th July 1978, coup d'état took place. The government of President Moktar Ould Daddah was replaced by a Comité
Militaire de Redressement National directed by Colone l Ould Salek. Mauritania subsequently withdrew from the Western Sahara conflict.

4. Ethnography and social groups.

The people of Mauritania are divided into Arab-Berber Bi'dân or Moors, and the Sidâdûn, the negro minorities. The country takes a pride in being a hamzat al-wasl, a cultural bridge link so to speak between the Maghrib countries and the peoples of former Takrûr and, far later, French West Africa, fulfilling a role in the west of Africa comparable to that of the Sudan in one important respect, namely that its entire population, of whatever ethnic origins, is Muslim by religion. There is no religious minority group. The people were once subdivided into clear-cut social classes, some of which may have originated for ethnic or historical reasons. In this respect of class, the Moors have similarities to the Tuareg and, to some extent, to the Tubu. In broadest terms the Moors may be categorized into three descending social tiers: “warrior”, “cleric”; and “tributary” or “plebeian”. By tradition, it was believed that this has come about due to one traumatic historical event, the “War of Shurubba”. However, this is to oversimplify and to telescope a complex and evolving historical process. Nor, as Captain A.C. De Laiglesia has shown, does the above accepted and simplified class structure furnish an accurate or meaningful description of a people whose social overlap is within the unit of the tribe (kabila), its subdivisions (husseyn) and protected clients (tiyyib, lahma, etc.).

Supreme amongst the “free” (abdr) are the ‘Arab. This term denotes the aristocracy of the Awlîd Hassan, and it also indicates the chiefs of the Ìdaw’ Ish, who are allegedly descended from the Lamtûna “father Arab”, ‘Arab al-Nikâh. This claim to Arabhood by the Ìdaw’ Ish is acknowledged in the opening verses of the rasm of the Ìgıtîw poet Saddûm, composed in the mid-18th century: “the prince of the Arabs of Tinzilât, Gir, Irâ, Inyîrîz and Tasîm, and of great renown. Chief of the Anbât (sc. Şânhdja), of the chiefs of the Ìdaw’ Ish, the leader in whom inherited, deeply rooted, not chieftainship (beliefs)!”

In another sense, all who claim to be Hassanûn are ‘Arab, likewise those who speak Hassaniyya. It is this wider sense of “Arab” that had inspired the Mauritanian poet Muḥammad Fâl wûlîd Ḥa’ynnîn a taqsim to compose his often-cited couplet: “We are the Banû Hassan (Hassân), the purity and eloquence of our tongue proves that we are descended from the ancient Arabs (al-‘Arab al-‘arâb).”

If no self-evident signs clearly prove that we are Arabs, then in our tongue there is a clear and unequivocal proof that we are so”. In former times, the camp (maḥjar) of an ‘Arab amir became a veritable village with fifty tents or more, and indeed assumed the status or reached the size of a town if the camp was a hâla of a chief. Within it were located tents and quarters for scholars, artisans, minstrels, hârîn and slaves (see P. Dubié, La vie matérielle des Marocains, in Méms. IFAN, no. 33 [Dakar 1953], 110-252).

The Hassanûn, Banû ‘Awlîd Hassan, were principally warriors, fighting men who were subject to an ‘Arab amir. However, their title lacks the latter’s status and honour; furthermore the name had, at times, a certain pejorative sense. Occasionally it denoted “irreligious”, “unruly” and “collectors of protection money (ghafara)”. From the conquered. Marriage is always within the clan, and usually within the joint family. All Hassanûn claim descent from Hassân b. Ma’kîl in the line of descent given on p. 617.

The second major division in Mauritanian society is that of the maraboutic class, the Zâwya, whose eponyms are frequently Berber and occasionally merge with Moroccan or with Almoravid tribes or saints. They enjoyed, and enjoyed, a wide reputation for knowledge of Classical Arabic, Islamic studies, the ability to perform religious duties and to teach, more especially the Qur’an. In some localities the Zâwya established peripatetic “universities” (mašâdir) where the students whom they taught (tâlîmîn) continued their herding and their studies (see al-Wa’îlî, 478, 517-21). The term Zâwya comes from Arabic zuwa‘a, pl. of zuwaya, indicating a fixed centre for Sûfi teaching and practice. In Mauritania, it may ultimately hark back to the notion of the Almoravid rîbât, although devoid of the militant sense of the latter. The Zâwya are divided into two broad categories, Znâyat al-Qâmîs (Zâwya “of the sun”) and independent religious groups of a high religious reputation, e.g. the Lamtûna of the qibla. They were self-reliant and were sufficiently powerful to need no protection and had no need to pay protection money. It is out of such groups, e.g. the Awlîd Abîyârî, that modern Mauritania has been supplied with leading political figures, outstanding scholars, men of law and teachers, not only from the nomadic groups but also from the Zwaya who were formerly famous as men of learning, pious men of letters, philosophers and jurists. These were the most unusually well-versed and cultured people of the country’s caravan towns and whose non-academic activities were principally commercial. Znâyat al-Zîl (Zâwya “of the shade”), indicated tribes which were in need of defence and protection, although they were not of the status of tributaries (the Awlîd Daymân were in this category, needing Hassânî protection, prior to the movement of Nâṣîr al-Dîn and the “War of Shurubba”). Some of the Znûga were Etnographic zda’wa, warrior Hassânîs, who had “repented” and, having foresaken their arms, had taken to study and to a religious life as their divine calling. Considered separate from the bulk of the Zâwya, although fulfilling much of their role in religion, in study and in trade, are those tribes which claimed to be Şuqûf (Şuqûfî). They allege descent from the family of the Prophet (al-ṣîhâ), that modern historians have not found to be true, and also controlled Tâjît and Walâta. Others are from the family of Shâykh Mâ al-‘Aynayn or are related by marriage to the Şuqûfî of Morocco.

The tributaries, the Znûga or Laḥmâ, were tribute-paying members of tribes that were either Hassanûn or Zâwya. None of them could claim any blood kinship to the eponym of the tribe. Their activities involved herding and menial tasks in the camp, and occasionally, agriculture. They were and are predominantly bi’dân, and their name indicates that their ancestors were of Şânhdja Berber stock. There are a number of categories of Znûga, some of lower status than others. A few, like the Idâyyûlî, once carried weapons and paid no tribute. Others, like the Tâyzigga of the Adrâr, cultivated dates and may once have been makers of the Lamtû shields. Znûga have intermarried with negroes.

The coloured tributaries, the hârîn, are, legally, manumitted slaves and their descendants. They are sedentary and live in separate tribal groups and unprotected by their former master. They are usually landless negroid folk who work as share croppers in the plantations of landlords who furnish the land and the water and who receive half of the crop which is produced. The status of the hârîn, though “free”, is so low in the social hierarchy that they distinguish between those whom they respect and those legally slaves, ‘abîd, some of whom
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were better treated amongst the Zwâya than the former by the Awläd Hassan, who paid little heed to the qabar. Slaves were the frequent cause for raiding in past centuries, together with other riches of the African peoples to the south of Mauritania, especially Walo, Futa and Gajaga. Le Brasseur indicated in 1778 that in Gajaga, Moorish commerce with the Sarakolé and the Malinké supplied more than 3,000 slaves per year. The Moors exchanged horses for slaves at the rate of ten to eighteen slaves per horse.

The lack of any meaningful distinction between harâm and 'abd in terms of personal freedom or in social status, has led to the establishment of a social "liberation" movement throughout Mauritania amongst the hrâtàin called al-hurr. They have been aided by anti-slavery movements from abroad, pressure from within the Mauritania government itself and made more necessary by the destitute state of the drought refugees amongst all classes of Mauritania society. All of these have brought attention to bear on the injustices and inequalities, almost beyond belief, which traditional Moorish society was prepared to tolerate, even though such abuses very frequently flouted or disregarded Muslim law, and, indeed, were not infrequently attacked by enlightened members of the Zwâya.

There were other despised and degraded classes in Mauritanian society. However, their well-being was frequently ensured by their own efforts or by their indispensable services in society. Among such were the artisans, the mâllâmin or sunûd, who as makers of weapons, tools and implements received fixed payments for the objects they made or repaired, in the form of meat, live animals or cereals. The smiths were held to be descended from Jews (especially from King David) or negroes.

The author of al-Wasit (359-60) makes the observation that the tribe of the Lihrakât, noted for their skill in Hassâniyya verse, claimed to be descended from smiths (mâllâmîn or sunûd) and were regarded as men of low status on account of this. He points out that such a view was peculiar to the people in the Western Sahara. He found it bizarre, illogical and reprehensible. His suggestion that it arose in Zwâya circles due to a lampoon by Djarfr on al-Farazdak wherein the former accused the latter of being the grandson of a blacksmith, cannot be accepted as likely in view of the low status of smiths in almost all Saharan societies.

The Nmâdi hunters in the Hawd, aided by their dogs, still survive in very small numbers. More numerous are the fisherfolk, the Imouzens, on the Atlantic coast, where they extend northwards into the Rio de Oro, a primitive people who seem to be descendants of very ancient races of the Western Saharan littoral. Very different are the often decired, yet individually admired and feared, Lgäuen, the bards, men and women, whose verse and song, praise and satire, were an indispensable adjunct to the country life of the princes of the Awd Hassan. They play an important part in the Mauritanian media and many of them have become extremely wealthy and influential. Hated in particular by the puritanical Zwâya, in far earlier days, like their negro counterparts to the south, they once sustained in battle the ardour of the warriors with their heroic and rigorous airs played on the taldën guitar in the warlike mode of fazili.

5. Economic activity.

Traditional Mauritanian economic activity over past centuries, and up to quite recent times, was centred around trans-Saharan caravan commerce in salt, slaves, and dates, in gum-arabic trafficking, pastoral nomadism, cattle-breeding and the sale of skins. Millet and rice cultivation, in plots and small farms, is especially characteristic of the region along the northern bank of the Senegal river, whereas date tree cultivation and the harvesting of dates, in the large Drâr and Tagâtîn palm groves. There is some fishing along the Atlantic seaboard. Hunting of gazelles, guinea fowl and bustards also once played a part in desert life. In the days of the Almoravids and in the remoter areas of the desert after them, the famous Lamît (oryx) shelters were fabricated [see lâmît]. They were dearly prized and fetched a high price in Andalus and the Middle East.

Endemic drought conditions, tribal and social upheavals and the impact of the modern age have now totally altered most of these past activities. Prospecting for copper, for oil, iron ore, gypsum, phosphates and uranium, and the exploration of fishing resources, are now the essential economic activities of Mauritania, in as far as foreign revenue is concerned, the mining and the Adelaide representing for 50% of all receipts and 80% of return payments. Even so, the dominion of this sector has been subject to variation, reflecting world demand. The copper mines at Akiout, which were closed in May 1978, following the collapse in the world price of copper, have now been reopened and are currently exploited by SÂMIN (La Société Arabe des Mines de l’Inchiri).

The iron-ore deposits at Zouerat still face an uncertain future. Started by MIFERMA in 1952, they were seen as the great white hope for the new state. Times and circumstances changed. The war in the Western Sahara directly threatened the railway line, 670 km. in length, which brought the ore to the port of Nwadhibou (Anwadhibu). Today, the dwindling deposits are now worked by SNIM, a mixed society in which a number of states are associated, including Mauritania, France, the Islamic Bank of Iraq, Morocco and Kuwait. The deposits are all but exhausted. The new project of “Guelbs El Rhein” envisages the development of new deposits, some 25 km. from Zouerat, and this will take place when the Zouerat mines close at the end of the 1980s. To finance the new exploration and exploitation, the 500 million dollars needed have been supplied by Arab states (Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Abu Dhabi and Iraq), and by Japan, France and the World Bank. When fully exploited, the “Guelbs project” will enable the costly railway line to stay open and it will help to maintain jobs for 6,000 employees.

Fishing is the growing major economic activity, second only to mining and seeming to overtake it. Mauritania has some 800 km. of coastline and has one of the richest fishing grounds in the world, with an annual catch of 600,000 tons, one of a great variety of fish. But the operation of making the industry successful and competitive has yet to be achieved, more especially as these coasts have been exposed to pirate fishing vessels. Mixed national and foreign commercial societies have been formed to exploit the catch, but the full potential of fishing for Mauritania’s economy is still a matter for the future until such time as the country has a patrol boat fleet with the capability to control, ameliorate and supervise its sea catch. Very few Mauritanians are engaged in fishing activities.

The Sahel droughts have hit Mauritania badly. Rainless years have destroyed its livestock and ruined much of its agriculture. The survival of the state depends on the success of the regional plan, which involves Mali and Senegal as well, to develop and to make the maximum of the Senegal river. On the 10th December, 1979, the then President of Mauritania, Colonel Haydallah, visited Saint-Louis, at the mouth of the river, and there he laid the first stone of the Diama barrage, in the presence of President Senghor of Senegal and Moussa Traore of Mali. Work has now begun and already some irrigated land has been cultivated and crops planted. When completed, there will be two barrages. The Diama barrage will hold back 500 million cubic metres of water, the second barrage will be at Manaralti, 1000 km. further up the river. The plan envisages two large river ports, Saint-Louis and Kayes, ten landing stages and around 500,000 hectares of irrigated land, although only a part of this will be in Mauritania itself.

This grand design is to prevent saline water returning upstream during the drop in water level in the dry season and, in general, to maintain the water level at one that is most desirable and most productive for cultivation. The regulation and the control of the water will take place at Manaralti. It will allow Mauritania to double the amount of its rice cultivation and to allow the creation of artificial lakes in the Afoutou es Sahel, extending to the south of Nouakchott. The development of fish is also being considered. The aim of the Mauritanian government is that, by 1988, it will cover 40% of its cereal demand, 20% of vegetables, 50% of its milk products and its meat. The ports of Nouakchott and Nwadhibou in 1983 handled 398,000 and 385,000 tons of goods respectively. Exports have doubled in the last five years and now attain the figure of 294 million dollars.

The Mauritanian government plans to attract foreign capital on a co-operative basis. At present the OMVS (L’Organisation de mise en valeur du fleuve Sénégal) is subject to foreign financing. Here again, the Arab states are playing a major role, Saudi Arabia with 150 million dollars, Kuwait with 70 million, Iraq with 40 million, and, from Europe, the European Development Fund with 100 million dollars, the German Federal Republic with 100 million, France with 70 million, Italy with 35 million and the United States, the Agency of which for international development, USAID, brings 85 million dollars. Its purpose is economic research. Other projects which are planned include the promotion of light industries, and iron and steel complex at Nwadhibou, a dairy at Nouakchott and a textile factory at Rosso.

The future for Mauritania is not a pleasant one. Sedentarisation is the future faced by most Mauritanians, although the influx into the capital has to be curbed. In towns of 5,000 inhabitants or more, seden-
tarisation in 1960 was only 3.5% of the population; in
1977 it rose to 23%; and today has surpassed ... of the
Muslim "mixers" amongst all the populations which
have lived as neighbours of the negro peoples along
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better future also demands more and improved com-

munications. Mauritania has 7,534 km. of road, two
International airports and ten secondary airports. Bet-

ter water resources are needed. Only 15% of the
Mauritanian population has proper drinking water
and 30% of the villages have no water at all. Above
all, it is the education of the younger generation in
Mauritania which will decide its future. Here there is
great promise and there is a strong national senti-
ment. In 1960 some 5% of the population received a
school education. By 1984 this figure had risen to
30.6%. The teaching of Arabic to everyone has also
made rapid strides.

6. Languages.
The predominant language, both written and
spoken, in Mauritania is Arabic, both Classical
Arabic and Coloquial. The latter is the very
individual Bedouin dialect of Hassānīyya. It is also the
lingua franca of the Moors of south-western Morocco, the former Spanish Sahara and much of
northern Mali and parts of the Niger Republic.
Hassānīyya has created its own verse and prosody
which is influenced by Classical Arabic, both in form
and theme. Such verse was composed as early as the
15th century, since reference is made to this activity
by the voyager Marmol and by others. The poetry is of two kinds: (a) popular zajāf and ḥaseel, consisting of
a gāf of two rhyming verses (a,b,a,b) and laṭa’, three
verses which rhyme in the pattern c,c,c,b. A laṭa’
must be crowned, or tailed, by a gāf. (b) legyna, sung poetry,
which is accompanied by the minstrels and the
popular ballad singers (the ḥdgawen) on the Mauritania
guitar (tsinţit) played by the men, or, by women,
on a kind of harp (ardin). Legyna is often performed as
part of a recital of the art of azaín, that is, an ensem-
ble of air and improvised moods selected for such
verses. The stances are well attended, and this art form
blends negro music and Senegalese and Malian names
of modes with other airs classified by colours in
Hassānīyya and with poetic metres derived from those
of Classical Arabic, ḥaţţīf, waṣfar and basţī, though
the prevailing metre is a truncated form of basţī.
Hassānīyya prosody is based on the aggregate number
of open and closed syllables in each verse. In earlier
times, even down to the late 18th century, a number
of these sung poems were martial odes and panegyrics,
occasionally of epic dimensions, known as
kerza, rasim, ṭaydina, Bū ‘Umān, etc. One of the most
famous of rażms was composed by the singer Saddūn
wuld Njagur in praise of amir Ahmad, the uncle of
Wuld Bakkar wuld A’mar (d. 1761; cf. Norris, Shīn-
qītī folk literature and song, 79-81). Hassānīyya is com-
monly used in local broadcasting and, in the past, was
occasionally used in verse and prose by the lettered.
Shaṭkh Muhammad al-Māni was especially famous
for his written compositions in Hassānīyya.
Zenaga Berber (ażnāq) is the second language of less
than 7,000 speakers in the gebla, especially in the
Trārzā to the south of Nouakchott. It is close to
Moroccan Chelteu and it incorporates the pre-Hassānī-
language of the Almoravid Sahara (where the Libyco-
Berber alphabet, akin to Arabic tifnagh, was engraved
on rocks and epitaphs, for example in the
cemeteries at Tinigi) and extensive borrowings from
Hassānīyya. Many toponyms and names of plants are
Zenaga. A little verse has survived.
Azafrani, known especially in the regions of Sāwīdān and Tāhtī, was a form of Soninké, and was a language of Old
Ghana. It is now all but extinct (see Ch. Monteil, La
langue Azafrani. Publications du Comité d’Études histori-
es et scientifiques de l’Afrique Occidentale Fran-
caise, série B, no. 5, 1939, 213-41). The negro
population along the Senegal river speak Pulbar
Sarakollé and Wolof, some opposition to Arabic is still
expressed by these peoples, (cf. Anfani, op. cit., p.
187). See C. Cheikh, Aperçu sur la situation socio-linguistique en
Mauritanie, in Introduction à la Mauritanie, Paris 1979,
167-73.)

(a) The taruk in Mauritanian Islam.
The Islamisation of Mauritania is sometimes held
to be a direct result of the Almoravid movement.
However, there is little evidence to suggest that either
an early penetration of ḲibṭISM from Sīţiılmās or
from within Awdaghust, or even the Almoravid
movement itself, other than its strict Malikism (see
Stewart, Islam and social order in Mauritania, 67-77,
and Mourad Teffahi, Traité de successions musulmanes d’après
erite malekite, Études Mauritanienne, no. 1, Centre
IFAN, St.-Louis 1948) has left any particularly per-
manent and deep mark on the Mauritanians as a
whole. The Awdāl Hassan were the most at home
after the Almoravid movement, nor is it certain that
those Zwāya tribes, such as the Lamtūna and the
Taghmgha, who, without a doubt, have some blood
relationship and spiritual kinship with the historical
Almoravids, maintained their sacred and perennial
tradition intact from the 5th/11th century, a tradition
and a way of life which had not been radically changed
during subsequent centuries. The Tuareg Insēlen are
remarkably similar to the Zwāya, yet (if one excludes the Kel Ntassar) they do not seem to have been
involved, as a class, in the Almoravid movement of
history; furthermore, some adoption of Islamic
practice before the Almoravids was recorded amongst
the Western Śamḥāda nomads. The Zwāya “Almo-
radiv tradition” is in part a creation of the colonial
age, an attempt by the French to woo the Zwāya letter-
ed fictions to promote their own interests at the expense of the troublesome Awdāl Hassan of the bldāl-al-siba,
conveniently ignoring the fact that the warrior Idaw
‘Īsā of Tagānīt openly and unashamedly alleged their
blood descent from the fighting aristocracy of Abū
Baḥr b. Umar al-Lamtūn and his progeny yet were
otherwise barely distinguishable from the other amirates of the Banū Ma’lik which had eventually
occupied every corner of the Tarāb al-bidān.
The Šufi orders were the principal channel whereby
Islam affected and moulded every aspect of Maurita-
ierian life: in the open desert, in the caravan towns, in
the villages, of the river bank and within the new
towns which were built by the French and, after
independence, by the Mauritians themselves. Only
the lowest social classes, where such survive, the
slave and servile population, lived, or live, a life where
animistic beliefs were dominant or survive in their
beliefs, though this does not mean that numerous
elements of animism and magic have not markedly
influenced the practice of Saharan Islam itself in the
past, even amongst the Zwāya, whose charms,
medical prescriptions, magic formulae and prophylac-
tics once had many of the characteristics of the Muslim “mixers” amongst all the populations which
have lived as neighbours of the negro peoples along
the historical borders between dār al-ʾIsldm and dār al-
ḥār in Africa.
Every Moor was, in theory, affiliated to one or ot-
er tarīka, although many of them were barely aware
of all the obligations which this imposed upon them.
The principal tarūk were and are the following:
1. The Kādiriyā (from which are derived the Bakkā-
ṭiyā, Fāḍīliyyā/Fāḍīliyya, ʿAyniyya, etc.). It
owes its establishment to the Kunta and the leader-
ship of Shaykh ʿAṣṣiya al-Kalābīr and his successors.
2. The Tīdjānīyyā which entered Mauritania at a
later date and to which belong the Idaa Aʿli and
Aghlāl of Tağānīt and the great majority of the
negroes of the river region, especially in Fuuta Tooro.
3. The Hamāwiyā, a recent off-shoot of the Tīd-
ānīyya which spread vigorously amongst the
Aghlāl of the Hawd and amongst certain fractions of
the Awlad Billa and the negro population in the region
of Niör (now in Mali).
Two tarūk, regarded by many as heretical to both
tē Kādiriyā and the Shāḥdālīyya, are:
4. The Ghuzīliyya which survive principally in
Tağānīt. The majority come from the Idaa Būsūt; they
are headed by the descendants of Shaykh al-Ghazwānī
and are centred at Bū-ʿMdeid. The ṭayyār are divided
between the Ḥl al-Mṣīd (Muslim of the mosque) and
the ṭayyīn (the provisioners).
5. The Ab al-Gazra. This is a recent and very little-
known sect linked to the first, which has the bulk of
its followers in the Aoddjāf (Oujeff).

(b) The history of the tarūk

The Mauritanian historian Muḥādīr b. Hāmīdīn has
summarised the history of the rise of these orders in
an article which was published in Nounscht in the
newspaper Mūrītānī in 1380/1960: 1- "As for Ṣūfīsm
amongst them, it is upon the path of al-Djunaq, and,
as for their [doctrinal] prop and their syllabus within it,
that is found in the books of al-Ghāzālī and al-
Suhrawardī and al-Shāfārī (d. 1565) and al-Zarrūk
(1442-93; Brockelmann, II, 253) and their likes. Such
books are read but are not studied in the
madrasāt. Ibn ʿAjāʾībī (d. 1131) in his work Ṣūfīyāt
[q.v.], also has a book on the essence of religious
knowledge (al-Murṣīd al-muṣīn). They also have
locally-written compositions on Ṣūfīsm which are in
common use and of wide benefit and which circulate
amongst the common people. These include the works
of Shaykh Muḥammad al-Yādālī, Shaykh ʿṢīdī al-
Muḥādīr al-Kantī and his son Shaykh Sayyīd
Muḥammad, Shaykh ʿṢīdīyā al-Kalābīr, ʿAbd b.
Muḥammad al-Ḥādīgī, Shaykh Ibn Muṭṭiliyya al-
Tandgāhī, Muḥammad Māwūdī b. ʿAbd al-
Yaʿkūbīn and Shaykh Muḥammad al-ʿAṣṣiya al-
Kalāmbi, and works by others.

1 The bulk of Mauritanians understand Ṣūfīsm as
al-Suṣṣ (... defined it; the laying bare of the heart before
God and the fear of Him, by performing the divine
precepts and in forsaking those things which are inter-
dicted. Next, it entails the doing of that which is
recommended, forsaking that which is reprehensible,
and, fulfillment of the purposes of the faith as far as
one is able, with endeavour to subdue the self (djihād
al-nafs), making use of prayers recited in private wor-
ship (āṣārād). This is either by taking them from the
content of books, such as the prayers (adabār) of
Muḥyī ʿl-Dīn Yaḥyā al-Nawāzī (631-76/1233-77)
and al-Ḥṣn al-bāḥṣān by al-Djazārī (d. 739/1338) or,
ext, by initiation of one of the ṣūfīs of the tarūk.

The ʿṢīdīyā was the most widespread tarīka
in the country until Shaykh ʿṢīdī al-Muḥādīr al-
Kantī appeared and many famous men came into promi-
nence by his help, amongst them Shaykh ʿṢīdīyā al-
Kabīr and Shaykh al-Kādir al-Iṣlahātī and others, and
the Kadīrīyya. The Tīdjānīyya appeared at the beginning of the 19th century,
and many people were drawn to it. The Kādiriyā formed
two branches, the first being the Kuntīyya ascribed to
Shaykh ʿṢīdī al-Muḥādīr al-Kuntī. The history of it,
and its chain of initiation (nisīḥ), has been commen-
tuated upon and exposed by his son Shaykh ʿṢīdī
Muḥammad. The second, the Fāḍīliyya, was ascribed
to Shaykh Muḥammad Fāḍī al-Kalāmbi. The history of it
has been commented upon and exposed by his son
Shaykh Muḥammad al-ʿAṣṣiya and by others.

2 As for the Tīdjānīyya, it formed two branches,
the Fāḍīliyya, ascribed to Shaykh Muḥammad al-Ḥāfız
al-Awālī, and its history has been commented upon
and exposed by al-Tījānī b. Bābā al-ʿAwaʾlī, and by
others; and the Hamāwiyā, ascribed to Shaykh Muḥammad al-Ḥāfīz
al-Mānī (1883 or 1886-1943).

3 As for the Ṣūfīyya, it formed two branches,
the Ghuzīliyya and the non-Ghuzīliyya. The Ghuz-
īliyya is ascribed to Shaykh Muḥammad al-Aḥqāf al-
Dāwūdī (d. ca. 1860) and ultimately to al-Dāwūfī.
A considerable number of people remain unbound by
any specific tarīka, and they also sometimes criticise
some of the Ṣūfīyya.

It will be observed from the above comments
of Muḥādīr b. Hāmīdīn that he does not deem the
Ghuzīliyya to be a heretical tarīka.

(c) The fight of the tarūk against the French.

The Mauritanian tarūk took an important part both
in resisting and in coming to a modus vivendi with
French colonial policy. The most active Ṣūfī-inspired
resistance movements were the Hamāwiyā and the
Mayāsīya (a small tarīka founded by Muḥammad al-
Kādir wuld Mayāba, who favoured ḥiṣnīn from
Mauritania if a djihād proved to be impossible), and
the resistance of Shaykh Muḥammad al-ʿAṣṣiya al-
Kalkāmbi [q.v.], who was principally based at Smārā in
the Sākīya al-Hamāzī but whose formal bases were in
the Mauritanian Aoddjāf. The hostility to the French,
as to other Christians, was of long standing; it arose
partly out of a war of European penetration and sup-
pression of Muslim belief and partly out of a positive
and aggressive belief in the total infidelity of their
European foes. By the turn of the century, the French
were convinced that the gum traffic on the Senegal
river was threatened and that the Moors also
threatened the French territories to the south of that
river. Xavier Copolani saw that some peaceful pro-
gress of France’s interests might be possible through
Shaykh ʿṢīdīyā Bābā in Boutillim, who was himself
convinced that the French would gain the upper hand
and that through cooperating with them the
Kādiriyā might gain and increase its following and
influence at the expense of its competitors. Copol-
ani’s occupation of the Trārza and Brākna owed
much to Shaykh ʿṢīdīyā’s support and cooperation.
However, the most significant threat to further expan-
sion came from Shaykh Muḥammad al-ʿAṣṣiya and ʿṢīdī
wuld Mawālī Ṣayn, who laid siege to the fort at
Tījākta (Tiijka) in 1905. During this and other
attacks planned by Shaykh Muḥammad al-ʿAṣṣiya, Copol-
ani was assassinated on 12 May by a mukaddām of
the Ghuzīliyya. The northern resistance in the Aoddjāf
became a veritable djihād, with active support coming
from the Sultan of Morocco. However, this did not
prevent the French from advancing and in 1909 the
Aoddjāf was pacified. Only in the extreme north did
Shaykh Muḥammad al-ʿAṣṣiya continue his resistance until his death in 1910.
The attitude of the French to Islam in Mauritania fluctuated between a general sympathy and a limited backing for certain marabouts amongst the alleged ‘Berber’ Zwāyā (a view discernable in the writing of Paul Marty and in some of those who were interpreters and aides of the French administration, for example Ismaël Hamet in his *Chroniques de la Mauritanie Sénégaloise* and other writings), and in an obsession with the threat of a pan-Germanic and pan-Islamic alliance, in which Machiavellian *éminence grise*, Shaykh Mā` al-`Aynayn, had a particularly important rôle to play. Over a period, some foreign Arabic papers were banned from internal circulation, the *Zawiya* were closely watched, mail was sometimes censured and Arabic higher education undoubtedly suffered. Differences between the Kādiriyah and the Tijāniyyah were exploited wherever possible. In the view of D.C. O’Brien, Islam became “a traditional subject of French paranoia” (*Towards an Islamic Policy* in *French West Africa* (1884–1914), in *ÎAL*, viii [1967], 309). Where the French allowed and at times encouraged madrasas to be built, it was principally to facilitate tribal control by them and to simplify their constant observance. The encouragement of certain marabouts to visit their flocks in adjacent Afrique Noire was in part shrewd policy, in part cosmetic. It was aimed at impressing a far wider Muslim public. Some of the men of the turkīyeh of the Zwayā deserted the French, amongst them, Shaykh Hamallah wuld Muhammad wuld Sayyidnā `Umar of Tishit (see C. Hames, *Cheikh Hamallah, ou qu’est-ce qu’une conférence islamique (tariqa) ?, in* Archives de Sciences Sociales des Religions, no. 55/1 [1983], 67-83). Repeatedly deported or under surveillance, he died in obscure circumstances in January 1943 and a number of his followers, as well as two of his sons, were executed.

In those years which followed the World War I, the death of Shaykh Mā` al-`Aynayn and the desecration of his zawiya at Smā`ara did not mean that his sons retired from the struggle nor that the northerly Moorish tribes of the *bilad al-siba*, the Rgaybat in particular, refrained from raiding both French and Spaniard alike. Harking back to the Gazula and to the Lamtuna in the days of the Almoravids (Wace, Levction and Hopkins, *Corpus*, 240) Ibn Baṭṭūta, when he stayed in Walata, whatever reservations he may have harboured about some of the ethics of its Mauritanian people, was determined to concede that “these are Muslims who observe the prayer and memorise the Koran” (*ibid.*, 285).

Mukhtar b. Hāmidun, *op. cit.*, has outlined the history of Kur'ānic recitation and study in more recent times:

"As for the rendition of the Kur`ān amongst them, it is by the manner of the reading (harf) of Nāffī`. The *riste`a* of Warḥ is more widespread amongst them than the *riste`a* of Kāllūn, save amongst the *madugawe`ūdūn* amongst them, where both the *riste`ā* are on a par. If it be said that the proportion of those who know the Kur`ān in the Zwāya social class attains 70%, this would not seem far-fetched on account of the intensity of their concern for the Kur`ān, likewise the proportion of the *madugawe`ūdūn* amongst the reciters. A company of them, beyond reckoning, from the *imāms* amongst the reciters, have attained a renown in the recitation of Nāffī`, or in the seven or the ten readings, men who were skilled in Kur`ānic tajwīd, in mastering it and in writing it down and in its transmission by a continuous chain of i`jāzā. Amongst such men were al-Fa`ghaʾ Abī `Allah al-Daymānī, Sayyid Abī `Allah al-Tawājāwī, Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Hājīdī, al-Tālib Abī `Allah al-Dajānī, Sayyid al-Mukhtar ibn Idrīshī, Lamrībīʾ Abī `Allah al-Turkūzī, and others.

Beginning at the time he can talk properly and speak clearly, a boy begins to memorise the Kur`ān.
Then he writes it and the recites it correctly according to the rules laid down. The most renewed of the texts which they use is the poem al-Durar al-ladunniyya by 'Abd al-Rahman b. Muhammad b. Barri (d. 730/1339; see Brockelmann, II, 248), the ode of al-Shawghawi, the Mukaddima of Ibn al-Djazari and the ode of al-Shabitib (d. 590/1194 [see EL s.v.]). All of these have been commented upon by a number of people and have been imitated by others, in works in verse or in prose, lengthy or concise, in Arabic or in Hassaniyya. Every Kur'anic qidra in Mauritanian is traced back to 'Abd al-Rahman b. al-Kadi. However, they disagree over the pronunciation of some of the letters, such as the softened hamza. Amongst them are some who pronounce it as a pure ka'. As for the qaim, there are some who pronounce it hard, approaching the sound of the daal, whilst others pronounce the qaim in an open and free manner approaching the sound of the za'y. In ancient times they used to pronounce it in the latter manner, and they did so until the beginning to the 12th/18th century. The first of them who recited with the hardened qaim was Sawayid 'Abd Allah al-Tanwadjibi (d. 1145/1732-3). He adopted it from Sawayid Ahmad al-Habib, the 'pole' (kutub) of Sidjiimasa. On account of that, the people used to call it 'the qaim of Tanwadjibi', and the other one 'the qaim of Massuma', because the 'ulama' of the Massuma and the Tanwadjibi supported it. Ibn Sawayid al-Amin al-Djakanli put pen to paper amongst them in his refutation of Sawayid 'Abd Allah. Amongst those who also supported the free and openly-pronounced qaim at that time was the fakih Min Nahma al-Daymam. In regard to this he said, amongst his verses:

A tribe, whose habitation was the Hidjaz, have corrupted the qaim. They are a rabble from amongst the negroes. The openly-pronounced qaim was favoured by Muhammad al-Yadali al-Daymam and by others. Those who then recited with the hardened qaim increased in number during the last two centuries. One of them said, in regard to it:

We recited the Book of God with the qaim first of all, but the substitution of one qaim for another is preferable to continuous dissection and debate between us.

Wars with the pen have continued up to the present day. All the participants agree that the 'qaim of Tanwadjibi' is hard and that 'the qaim of Massuma' is both open and depressed, and that both qaim are voiced. The dispute is now only about the degree of hardness of 'the qaim of Tanwadjibi' and the openness and the depression of 'the qaim of Massuma'. In a similar way, they differ in regard to the pronunciation of the za'y and the ka'?

(e) Arabic and Islamic scholarship in Mauritania.

(i) In the gebla. The dune and gum forest country of south-west Mauritania, the gebla (Trarza and Brakna and, by extension, parts of Gorgol), throughout Mauritania's history has been an important tribal meeting point, attracting the influx of groups from the Saharan regions to the north, drawn towards the coast by trade, to the river Senegal and its fertile pastures and to the salt mines in the region of Awtill. The Arabic and Islamic studies of the Moorish and non-Moorish scholars of the gebla have been influenced by the following factors: the survival of the Zenaga language and the use of it in religious works by Zawaya scholars, contact with Europeans at an early date in Awtill, the openness and the geographical position of the Senegal river, intercourse between scholars along a different axis from that in the north, between the Adrar and Timbuctoo, via Tagant and al-Hawd, and the growth of Hassaniyya in the art form of azawad amongst the Hassaniyya princes of the gebla at the same time as this was taking place in Tagant region.

Scholarship was very strong amongst such tribes as the Awlad Daymam and the Tandaqha. Four scholars and poets from the former tribe, where Zenaga is still spoken and written in Arabic script, have been especially studied and selected. They are: Shaykh Muhammad Sa'id b. al-Muqhtarah al-Yadali (1206-1284/1891-1962), the author of a number of important historical works about the history and life of the southern Zwaiya, prior to, and following the "War of Shurbubba", of works of tasrih and sirah, and of Arabic grammar (al-Yadali was nicknamed al-Nabawi and,according to Muqhtarah b. Hamidun, "Muhammad Sa'id al-Yadali was the first who brought Arabic grammar to the gebla"), and he practised the extensive use and even abuse of babd in his verse. He was the leading figure amongst a group of such poets, including Bu Fumwayn, Alumna al-Arabi and al-Dib al-Hasani. Al-Yadali's pupil Wadl b. Khailun (Wadl b. 'Abd al-Rahman, d. between 1212/1798 and 1214/1799-1800), was also important for a commentary on al-Shair and for his studies of the Zwaiya Imamate of Nashir al-Din, though especially of the hagiographical archives of the Awlad Daymam and their genealogies. His two great religious poems are his Senega and Arabic, al-Makzak and al-Mazrig, are his most original compositions and are probably unique survivors in all Mauritanian literature (on both al-Yadali and Wadl, see Norris, Shi'i folk literature, Oxford 1968, 123-54; idem, Zindga Islam during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in SOAS, xxxii [1969], 496-526; and idem, The Arab conquest of the Western Sahara, London 1986, 61-3). The Arabic works studied in the gebla and catalogued in al-Makzak are listed in Appendix I of Norris, Shi'a scholars of Mauritania, in Willis, ed., Studies in West African Islamic history, i, London 1979, 158-9. The life and poetry of al-Yadali may be read in al-Waisi, 223-36. Another outstanding scholar of al-Shair and grammarian of the Awlad Daymam was Mahand Baba b. Isma'il al-Wasit, 223-36. Another is preferable to continuous dissension and debate between us.
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Muhammad Fal b. Muttaliyya al-Tandaghi, (al-Wasit, 343-5). Awfa was skilled in Mauritanian medicine and surgery. He wrote in Hassaniyya, and also wrote lengthy works in Classical Arabic on the science of medicine, Ummahāt al-tibb, Kawā' ID al-tibb, al-Madgana' (on the treatment of bones), a treatise on the reciprocal rights of doctor and patient in medical treatment, and his ārgāza of 1,182 verses on medicine called al-Umda (Norris, Mauritanian medicine, in The Maghreb Review, ix/5-6 [1989], 119-27, and al-Wasit, 520-3). It was at Būtīlimt (Boutilimt) that Mauritanian scholarship in the ġebra attained one of its glories in the shape of the example, the life and teaching of Shaykh Sidiyya al-Kabir and his successors, and through the foundation of its al-Maṭhād al-İslāmī, which was to become one of the most famous Islamic centres of learning in the whole of West Africa, drawing students from Senegale, Mali, Niger and beyond, as well as from within Mauritania itself. It is interesting that the Awlād Ābiyyār (from which came not only Shaykh Sidiyya al-Kabir, and his grandson Shaykh Sidiyya Bābā, but also ex-President al-Moktar oll Daddah) were originally a tribe of the ārāb, "warior", caste but became Zwaya "of the sun" (Ziyā'āt al-Shami). Of special importance were the studies which Shaykh Sidiyya al-Kabir (1190-1284/1773-1869) and his son Shaykh Sidiyya Sidi al-Muhārūt al-Kunt (1142-1236/1729-30 to 1811) in Azawād, thus linking the scholarship of the ġebra with that of the eastern marches of Mauritania (Stewart, op. cit., 34-53). But Sūfīsm and fiqh apart, the family of Shaykh Sidiyya were also noteworthy poets. They are given an honoured place in al-Wasit (240-77). Despite the conservatism of his verse, Mohamed El Moktar oll Daddah (loc. cit., 47), dubious Sidi Muhammad b. al-Shaykh Sidiyya (1247-80/1832-69) an "independent", and he deems his verse to have been "original in its accent". Likewise a mystic, his poetry was noteworthy even during the lifetime of his father (Stewart, 148-50).

It should be mentioned that there is little influence of the Sira Ḥilāliyya in folk tales of the Banū Maṭkīl in Mauritania other than a few fragments recorded amongst the Awlād Daffar. Adventures that are akin to the exploits of Abū Zayd al-Hilālī are not however attributed to him. The Hilālīs are locally described as heathens with supernatural powers. The raids and miracles of 'Ukba b. Nāfi' characterise the Kunta of Mali, who claim descent from him. In Mauritania, amongst the Kunta as well amongst the Shāṃāsīd and other Zwaya groups, the personality who approaches nearest to that of the hero of a ġeste is Abū Bakr b. ʿUmar al-Lamtūni, who, accompanied by his Yemnites and by his eventually martyred kāfīr councillor the Imām al-Ḥadhrāmī, breaks the power of the negroes and the infidel monsters of the Ādārā and Ṭagānīt and their armies of ferocious dogs. In the context of the narrative there is much borrowing of stories in the tales of the Arīm al-ʿArāb [q. v.] and from the early Islamic Yemnite cycles of ʿUbayd b. Shāyāra al-Dhurūmi and Wāḥib b. Munāḥib (Norris, Saharan myth and saga, 126-59).
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Ahmad left Wadan in 1245/1829 and returned to it in 1250/1834. He completed his Rihla in 1253/1838.

A Tishit tradition maintains that the founder of the Shinkiti (known as Bila Shuraf) was Sidi Ahmad b. Ibrahim b. Sidi Ahmad b. Ishaq, who remarks (578) that no knowledge had survived in the town about Shinkiti (who was like-minded and a poet). He died in 1243/1828.

Most curious of all the town’s scholars was the almost forgotten Sidi Ahmad b. Ibrahim b. Sidi Ahmad b. Ishaq, who in the 11th/17th century allegedly appeared in a blaze of light in a Shinkiti date grove. He passed on knowledge and initiated Shinkiti scholars, such as Muhammad b. al-A’maa’ and the grandfather of Ibn Razga, in many branches of learning. This youth allegedly vanished into the Atlantic on a skin rug, having claimed to be a Shari‘i from Fez. This tale was repeated by the let-tered (see the Author), 578-9. It would seem to suggest that no knowledge had survived in the town about scholarly work prior to the 11th/17th century and that the sources of learning there owed much to the Shari‘i of Fez who had settled there as they had done elsewhere in the Sahara (e.g. the Adrar-n-Tigirt in Mali) in the earlier medieval period.

(iii) In Tiğit and Wâdân. Tiğit (Tichit), the most famous and among the most ancient of caravan centres of eastern Tagant (Tagant), lay on the route joining the Adrar, the salt mine of Idjâl and Wâdân with Walâta and Mali. Trans-Saharan routes to the north linked it with the Maghrib. Its population consists of indigenous former Azayr-speakers who have kinsmen in Mısina (Ke-Macina) and who are of Negro blood, though of free status; Sanhâdja Shura, who ultimately claim descent from ˚Ali b. Tâlib, and Awlad Billa of the Awlad Hassan, who exerted a dominant influence and influence on that quarter and did much to stimulate the interest of Mauritanian scholars in the Leiden edition of the Shurafidân’s Kitab An-Nabat al-Maghâli. It was founded in the 8th/14th century at the earliest.

The Pilgrimage of Ahmad, the only history of the town written in Mauritania called Kitab al-Wasit, which was attributed to Ahmad b. Sidi Muhammad b. Habbut, who was like-minded and a poet. He died in 1331/1913. The shrines of eastern Tagant (Tagant), lay on the route joining the Adrar, the salt mine of Idjâl and Wâdân with Walâta and Mali. Trans-Saharan routes to the north linked it with the Maghrib. Its population consists of indigenous former Azayr-speakers who have kinsmen in Mısina (Ke-Macina) and who are of Negro blood, though of free status; Sanhâdja Shura, who ultimately claim descent from ˚Ali b. Tâlib, and Awlad Billa of the Awlad Hassan, who exerted a dominant influence and influence on that quarter and did much to stimulate the interest of Mauritanian scholars in the Leiden edition of the Shurafidân’s Kitab An-Nabat al-Maghâli. It was founded in the 8th/14th century at the earliest.

The Pilgrimage of Ahmad, the only history of the town written in Mauritania called Kitab al-Wasit, which was attributed to Ahmad b. Sidi Muhammad b. Habbut, who was like-minded and a poet. He died in 1331/1913. The shrines of eastern Tagant (Tagant), lay on the route joining the Adrar, the salt mine of Idjâl and Wâdân with Walâta and Mali. Trans-Saharan routes to the north linked it with the Maghrib. Its population consists of indigenous former Azayr-speakers who have kinsmen in Mısina (Ke-Macina) and who are of Negro blood, though of free status; Sanhâdja Shura, who ultimately claim descent from ˚Ali b. Tâlib, and Awlad Billa of the Awlad Hassan, who exerted a dominant influence and influence on that quarter and did much to stimulate the interest of Mauritanian scholars in the Leiden edition of the Shurafidân’s Kitab An-Nabat al-Maghâli. It was founded in the 8th/14th century at the earliest.

The Pilgrimage of Ahmad, the only history of the town written in Mauritania called Kitab al-Wasit, which was attributed to Ahmad b. Sidi Muhammad b. Habbut, who was like-minded and a poet. He died in 1331/1913. The shrines of eastern Tagant (Tagant), lay on the route joining the Adrar, the salt mine of Idjâl and Wâdân with Walâta and Mali. Trans-Saharan routes to the north linked it with the Maghrib. Its population consists of indigenous former Azayr-speakers who have kinsmen in Mısina (Ke-Macina) and who are of Negro blood, though of free status; Sanhâdja Shura, who ultimately claim descent from ˚Ali b. Tâlib, and Awlad Billa of the Awlad Hassan, who exerted a dominant influence and influence on that quarter and did much to stimulate the interest of Mauritanian scholars in the Leiden edition of the Shurafidân’s Kitab An-Nabat al-Maghâli. It was founded in the 8th/14th century at the earliest.

The Pilgrimage of Ahmad, the only history of the town written in Mauritania called Kitab al-Wasit, which was attributed to Ahmad b. Sidi Muhammad b. Habbut, who was like-minded and a poet. He died in 1331/1913. The shrines of eastern Tagant (Tagant), lay on the route joining the Adrar, the salt mine of Idjâl and Wâdân with Walâta and Mali. Trans-Saharan routes to the north linked it with the Maghrib. Its population consists of indigenous former Azayr-speakers who have kinsmen in Mısina (Ke-Macina) and who are of Negro blood, though of free status; Sanhâdja Shura, who ultimately claim descent from ˚Ali b. Tâlib, and Awlad Billa of the Awlad Hassan, who exerted a dominant influence and influence on that quarter and did much to stimulate the interest of Mauritanian scholars in the Leiden edition of the Shurafidân’s Kitab An-Nabat al-Maghâli. It was founded in the 8th/14th century at the earliest.
town was the Sharif ʿAbd al-Muʾmin b. Ṣāliḥ, who came from Aghmāt in Morocco and who, like the reputed founder of Wādīn al-Ḥadīdī, Ṭumānī, was a pupil of the Kāfīdī Abu Ḥaqqīya b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Sabtī (476-544/1083-1149). The date of foundation given in the so-called Tīshīt chronicles, 548/1153-4, cannot be corroborated from any mediaeval Arab geographer. A much later date in the 8th/14th century, currently cited in Mauritanian, casts doubts on the foundation of the town in the early middle ages. The Sharif ʿAbd al-Muʾmin lies buried in the precincts of the principal mosque (see Oswald, Der Hausendistädtchen der Westsahara, 414-59), and according to de Laisiges (Breve Estudio, 63-4) those who claim descent from him may have come as late as the 12th/18th century.

Tīshīt has always been noted for its scholars and for its libraries, and it receives mention in the writings of the Mauritanian historian Mūqabtīr b. Ḥāmidūn, more especially for contributions made to fiqh and to the study of Arabic grammar. Two scholars contributed some forty additional disputed issues (masāʾiʿ), Ṣāḥīb ʿAbd Allāh Muhammad Abūbadddīl al-Zaydī tīshītī (1065-1123/1654-1711) and the Sharīf Ṭumālī Sīvī (ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṣāliḥ al-Bābdīl), who studied with Muḥammad al-Mustūmī (see Oswald, op. cit., 453-5), who lived early in the 11th/17th century.

Three grammarians are mentioned: Ṣāḥīb Sīdī Muḥammad al-Nashī, of Awdaghust, and the ʿAbd al-Mūsa b. Zaydī tīshītī (d. 1117/1705-6, see Oswald, 492, 62) and his son Sīdī Ahmad (1110-71/1680 to 1757-8) (see ibid., 497 (110)), and ʿAbū Bakr al-Tufayl al-Mustūmī, who died in 1116/1704-5 (see ibid., 516-17).

Wālata (Berber Islaatan, French Oulata), formerly Birūnī, is the most easterly of Mauritanian towns within the eastern Ḥāwār (Hodh). It was one of the role of Saharan caravan towns, competing with Tīmūrbūto over the eastern border and with Agades and Ḥadādīm. Local tradition dates its first cultural esser after the empire of Ḥiāna fell to the Soussous. Ṣāvykh Ismāʾīl founded the town, the population of which was predominantly Sonīkē, and it absorbed elements from the earlier city of Awdaghūs. Over a period, the Ṣāḥānda Ṣassītī branch of the Almoravids assumed the role of the kadi of the region, as they were to do in the Saharan towns of Tākkaḍā and Agades further east. When Ibn Baṭṭūta visited the town in 753/1352, coming from Siqīlmās, he was well-received by the Massūfī scholars there. The kāfīr of Wālata was Muḥammad b. Ḥāmidūn, whose brother Yāḥyā b. Ṣāliḥ was a fīkhī. The architecture, the dhūr of its merchants' houses display Islamic influences from as far away as al-Andalus, Fez, Tīlīmān, Ḥadādīm and Wālata. When Ṣūrīn Ālī occupied Tīmūrbūto in 1469 and began his harassment of Ṣāḥānda Ṣassītī scholars, the forebears of Ahmad Bābā (866-929/1462-1525) and the Muḥkātar al-Nābawī b. And-Āḥ-l-Muḥammād, together with ʿUmar Aḥtī and his sons, fled to Wālata which gained from this influx, despite a threat to its independence from Sonīkē Ālī. The main asylum for these scholars may have been the township of Tāzākhīt, today a ruined suburb of Wālata. This town gave its name to some noted scholars, amongst them Muḥammad b. Ḥāmidūn, ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad Aḥtī (Oswald, op. cit., 485 (7)). Other scholars of the Massūfī were buried there and the cemetery has been frequently visited by the devout, despite the destruction of the township of Tāzākhīt by the Ḥassānī Awlād Yūnīs.

In more recent centuries, Wālata became the nucleus of disparate Zwāya and Ḥassānī groups, the early Kunta, including Sīdī Ahmad al-Bakkātī (d. ca. 921/1515) who is buried there but whose historicity is not confirmed outside Kunta records, the Mahāḏībī (Lemḥāḏā) Ṣāyarītī from Baghādā, other ʿAšāraʾ of Wālata who claim to have come from Tuwāt, Aḥghāl from Tagūnīt (who may be related to the Aḥghāl of Shinkīf) of Tīmūrbūto, and possibly the Kel Aḥghāl of Ṣimplūn the Den Kēnēr Tuareg of Niger, the Iḍyilībī from the Wād Nūn in Morocco and the Tāzājāntī. The chronicle of Wālata does not trace the town's history further back than the 10th/16th century.

Wālata was famous for its scholars, many of whom received a mention in the noteworthy biographical dictionary written by Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Bāk r al-Sīdīkī b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. al-Ṭālībī ʿAlī b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Banānī al-Bārīfī al-Wālātī, known as ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Ṭālībī Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Bāk r al-Sīdīkī, who died on 22 Dhuʾl-Hiḍdīja 1219/24 March 1805. His book Fāth al-ṭūrīk fī maʿrifat aʿyūn ʿalāmāt al-Tahrīr, written in 1214/1799-1800, has been edited and published by Muḥammad ʿIbrāhīm al-Kattānī and Muḥammad Ḥadīdī (Zīwrī) al-Ṭālībī al-Wālātī (1851). The chief scholars of Wālata must include Tālīb ʿAlī al-Wālī b. ʿAbd Allāh Muhammad b. Ṣāḥīb al-Kaṭtānī and Muhammad b. ʿAbd Bāk r b. al-Ḥaḍīmī (d. 1098/1687) ibid., 490 (49)) and the grammarian Anbāwāy ʿUmar b. al-Īmām Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh who lived in the early 8th/14th century.

(iv) In Western Ḥāwār (Ṭīrī al-Ḵābīyya). This bleak desert region which, in the past, once knew more fertile periods of climate, is located along the southern and eastern border of the former Spanish Sahara and Mauritanian. Until Mauritanian withdrew from the Western Saharan conflict it formed the greater part of its territory which was allocated to it by the partition. This region enjoyed a reputation for Islamic scholarship and for the presence of small desert "universities" (maḥādir). Its leading poets and men of letters are highly esteemed as Mauritanians, although for the Ṣāḥārwī these outstanding men, together with ʿAbd Allāh al-Qāmī al-Aynayn, represent the national scholarly legacy of the Ṣāḥārwī people. Both Saharan peoples take a joint pride in their achievement. The Aḥī Bārīkālā, to whom many of them belonged, were the most powerful subtribe of the Tīdāyūkūb in Ṣīrīr. They dug the bulk of its wells and they formed part of that group of Zwāya tribes, many of which were centred in the Mauritanian gebla, which were deemed to be branches of the Tāshūmsa Zwāya. Pastoral activities, more especially camel-breeding, enabled scholars to devote their time to study and to writing.

Representative of this scholarship were:

The Aḥī Muḥammad Sālim, who were noted for their expertise in fiqh and whose members acted as judges and jurists in all parts of the Western Sahara. Some of this family claim descent from ʿIbrāhīm al-ʿUmawī, kāfīr of the army of the Almoravid ʿAbd Bāk r b. ʿUmar.

The neo-Djahīlī poets of the late 12th/18th and early 13th/19th centuries who were expert in the Rūmī Ḥadīth and the Ḥādīth of the six pre-Islamic poets. Several of these came from the Tīdāyūkūb tribe. The most famous of them was probably Muḥammad wūl Ṭūlīb al-Yaʾkūbī (al-
Wasit, 94-190), the so-called "al-Nabigha of Shinkit", who was praised by Wuld Haddar as the "pole of... help of a long and flexible stick of titdrek (leptadenia spartum) or mrekba (panicum turgidum). The education of Sha Bakr b. Wa... and especially those in the last kurgan with the shorter Meccan suras... and grammar. The girls began their studies towards... their literacy in Arabic and their... in view of the innumerable times the hubus, zakat... and grammar, citing as one of the mash that it was the... and reprehensible relationship between the sexes, together with the non-wearing of the hidjab by Moorish women. In Mauritania, this book is regarded by some as one of the four who were unaroused in their eruption, sc. Ibn Raza, Ibn al-Mukhtar b. al-Djalak, and Muhammad b. Buna al-Djalak. Although the author of al-Wasit is of the opinion that al-Mukhtar b. Buna al-Djalak was a worthier candidate. Limjdaydari was deeply attached to Tiris and longed for it when he visited the East, including Egypt. Amongst his pupils was the Sufi Sayyid Ahmad b. Idris al-Fasī. (v) The learning and scholarship of Moorish women. Mauritanian women, like their Tuareg sisters, have played an important rôle in Saharan society, though in their own case their literacy in Arabic and their profound grasp of Islamic belief, including Ṣūfism, have made them teachers, governesses and administrators and so enabled them to play a significant part in the shaping of Mauritanian history. In the 9th/11th and the 6th/12th centuries the Şanhāja, more especially the Lamtūn, women took an active part in Almoravid politics. They also fought as equals beside their menfolk. When the Almohads attacked Marrakech in 541/1147, they fought fiercely until noon on the day when it was captured and the attackers only secured its citadel after Fannū, the daughter of the Almoravid ʿUmar b. Yītnān, had been overcome. She had fought, clad as a man, and the Almohads marvelled at the ferocity of her fighting up to the very end of her life. When Ibn Battūta visited Walāṭa he was shocked to observe what he regarded as the lack of modesty of the unveiled Şanhāja women. He upbraided his friend Abū Muhammad Yandakān al-Muṣsīfī when he saw the latter’s wife entertaining a “companion” in the courtyard of his house. Abū Muhammad replied, ‘The association of women with men is agreeable to us and a part of good conduct, to which no suspicion attaches. They are not like the women of your country’ (Levtzion and Hopkins, Corpus, 285-6).

Mauritanian traditions recount that at Tinjīgī, an important settlement around the 8th/14th century of the Lamtūn Taḍjākānt, the Muwattaʾ of Mālik b. Anās [q.v.] was taught in the madhār to pupils who included 500 girls, and that amongst the Mīlidhīna a ‘Zawīya, an unrecorded, state only in an abbreviated form of muddāḥt al-limān, the Muddawwana of Sahhūn [q. v.] was likewise studied. The Zawīya tradition of girls’ education would seem to date back to a period prior to the settlement of the Awlād Ḥasan, amongst whom concern for female education was by no means unknown. Moorish girls were taught from a syllabus which included the Kurān, the Sūra of the Prophet, selected passages of fīkḥ and Classical Arabic poetry and grammar. The girls began their studies towards the end of the Kurān with the shorter Meccan sīrās and especially those in the last khāṣ. As studies progressed, so the early sīrās were memorised, a process called sīla. The full recitation of the Kurān in chapter sequence is termed ʿalla. The study of Sūra was based upon the following works: Kurān al-ḥaṣiṣ, attributed to a scholar named al-Lamtūn, al-Ghassāwī; and poems and commentaries attributed to Abū al- Badawi al-Maḍjdīsī (al-Wasit, 350-1). In fīkḥ, the syllabus included the commentary by ʿAllī al-Ṣidjīmānī (d. 1057/1647) on al-Muddawwana fi ḥabīdāt bi Abū Zayd ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Sayyidī al-ʾAlkhdārī [q.v.] and on the writings of Ibn ʿAshīr and on the Risāla by Ibn Abī Zayd. Arabic poetry was less often studied by young women, and the poets were carefully selected. Girls were normally taught by a woman teacher, and much attention was paid to the help of a long and flexible stick of tiṭār (lepomis armatus) or merkba (panicum turgidum). The education of
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Bibliography: A complete bibliography of
Mauritania may be obtained from the following publications: (a) Actes de l'Veme Congrés de l'Institut des Hautes Études Marocaines = Hesperis, xi, Paris 1930; (b) D.T.B. Blaudin, Essai de bibliographie du Sahara et des régions avoisinantes, Arts et métiers graphiques, Paris 1960; (c) Ch. Toupet, Orientation bibliographique sur la Mauritanie, in BIFAN, xxvi/3-4 (1962), 594-619; Mohamed Ben-Madani, Sediq Beg Amr al-Idayaydjiyya, who published an ode in the Idablahsan, who composed an ode in honour of Shaykh Sidiyya al-Kablr (1773-1868); Aïtcha bint Sayyid al-Mukhtar b. Sayyid al-Àmin, the wife of Shaykh Sidi al-Mukhtar al-Kunti, to whom were attributed miracles, pious deeds, frequent recitation of Sûfi prayers and constant support of her husband's many activities. The Shaykh's son Sidi Muhammad, who is the biographer of his father, Kithat al-Tawâif wa l-tala'id (see kunti), had originally planned a short biography of her, hence his allusion to the miracles of both shaykhs in his full title (karâma al-Shaykhayn). This was never completed. Those few references to her many virtues early in his book, where he outlines his plan, form a fitting tribute to his ideal of Mauritanian Muslim womanhood.
Mauritanie — Murra


Mediaeval cities and archaeological sites:
R. Mauny, Tableau géographique de l’Ouest Africain au Moyen Age, Méms. IFAN, no. 61, Dakar 1961 (by far the most comprehensive publication, covering the early and mediaeval sites in Mauritania, including Koubi Saleh (Ghana?), Tegdaoust (Awadhjat) and Azougui (Azugji, Azukk, etc., the Lamtuna "capital"). More recent excavations undertaken at Tegdaoust have appeared in J. Deviese, Tegdaoust. J. Recherches sur Awadhjat, Paris 1970. On the relation between Azougui, the Almoravid town, and the Imâm al-Hadrarni in Mauritanian history and legend, Portuguese commerce in the Adrar and the "War of Shurubbâ", see Abdel Wedoud Ould Cheikh and B. Saison, Vit(e) et mort(s) de l’Imâm al-Hadrarni, Autore de la postérité Saharienne du mouvement almoricide (IP-17e siècle), in Nouv. éd. Maurit., i, 2 (1958). (All these publications provide a picture of the present article is gratifying for much of the information which appears in this article, parts of which are also in the original article by F. de la Chapelle in El art.)

AMIRIYANY, Abug Ayuby Sulaymân b. Mâshch (the Missa stemming from Muriyân in Ahwáz, see Yakut, Mu^djam, Beirut v, 201), secretary to the former the author of the present article. Various stories are given in the sources about how he came to enjoy al-Mansur’s confidence: that in the time of the last Umayyad caliph Marwan b. Muham-Ad, that he was a secretary in Irak under Hisham’s time and acting informally as vizier without ever being granted the title officially. He may have been known by his mother’s name, Salul (Ibn Hazm, 330; Yakut, Muqallam al-sulûn, ii, 728). (7) The B. Murra b. Abd Allah b. Hammam [q.v.] (al-Wazir al-Maghribi, Abad al-khadâwi, Riyâd 1980, 135; al-Kalkashandi, Kâlal’d al-djumân, Cairo 1963, 115). There seems to be a confusion regarding the genealogy of this poet (see Madjallat al-’Arab, i (1966-7), 37, 48, 1154); however, these B. Murras were better known by their mother’s name, Salûl (Ibn Hazm, 291, 402; Ibn al-Kalbî, Damwarat al-nasab, Beirut 1986, 91); in the case of the B. Murra of the tribe of Djuhayna, they are said to have occupied one of Medina’s "forresses" (al-Qâmi, al-Kalkashandi, Nihâyât al-arab, Cairo 1959, 418; al-Nuwâyrî, Nihâyât al-arab, Cairo 1955, ii, 330; Yakût, Muqû'am al-sulûn, ii, 728). (8) Several groups called Murra were included in the Shâybân, a branch of the Bakr b. Wâlîi, whose homeland was basically in Irak. The most important of these groups seems to have been the B. Murra b. Ham- mâm. Some of them held important positions as governors and generals during the late Umayyad and early ’Abbâsid periods, whereas others joined the Khâridjî opposition. They are usually mentioned, however, as "Shâybânî" rather than as "Murrii" (Ibn Hazm, 324-7; Ibn al-Kalbî, 497-519; W. Caskel, Qamarat an-nasab, Das genealogische Werk des Hilâm ibn Muhammad al-Kalbi, Leiden 1966, ii, 23-4; al-Wazir al-Maghribî, 120; al-Nuwâyrî, Nikûh, ii, 348; al-Tabarî, ii, 147, 975, 1653-4). (C.E. Bosworth)

MURRA, Banû, an Arab tribal term.

The Arab genealogical works record the name Murra in the genealogies of many tribes, but apparently the name does not always denote functioning tribal groups. In the Kurayhî, e.g., Murra is merely a link in the genealogical chain, and the name of Murra (see Ibn Hazm, Qamarat an-nasab al-’Arab, Cairo 1962, 14 ff.). It is also difficult to deter- mine whether a given (ancient) Murra was a tribe, a clan or a lineage. As effective tribal groups may be considered the following (among others): (1) The B. Murra b. ’Ubayd, of the Tamîm confederacy. In the 2nd/8th century, they lived in Kûfa (Ibn Hazm, 217; Ibn Kathir, al-Isâs wa ’l-niyâh, Cairo 1932, v, 517). (2) The B. Murra b. Sa’îsâ, clan of the poet ’Abd Allâh b. Hammâm [q.e.] (al-Wazir al-Maghribi, Abad al-khadâwi, Riyâd 1980, 135; al-Kalkashandi, Kâlal’d al-djumân, Cairo 1963, 115).

It is unclear whether Abu Ayyub was ever a vizier without ever being granted the title officially. See Bibliography: Ya’kûbî, Ta’rîh, ii, 468; Tabari, iii, 370, 372; Dzhahjariyâr, al-Wurâda wa ’l-kutâb, Baghdad 1357/1930, 65-70, 74, 76-88; Mas’ûdi, Murâqî, vi, 105-6, 286; Ibn al-Mubîr, v, 186 ff.; Ibn Kahlîkîn, ed. T. ’Abîsâ, ii, 410-14, tr. de Slane, i, 595-6; Ibn al-Tiktakî, Faghî, ed. Derenbourg, 236-9; Sourdel, Vizara ’sâbûdih, i, 78-87; H. Kennedy, The early Abbasid caliphate, London 1981, 103, 203.)

By far the most important Murra groups are the ancient B. Murra b. ’Awf, and the contemporary A’ Murra of Sa’ûdî Arabia.

The B. Murra b. ’Awf was a North Arabian tribe or clan, part of the larger tribal groups (from the narrower to the broader) Dhu’aynî, Qahtânî, Ya’lînî, Ma’dîn. In pre-Islamic times their territories lay to the north and east of Medina (Hamad al-Djasir, in Madjallat al-’Arab, iv [1969-70], 126, 610; al-
Mawṣūl, al-Īsāf fi sharh Ǧahāfāl al-kašfi al-Bayḍawī wa ʿl-Kashšaf, Edin. Univ. Lib. Or. 2, fol. 149b). According to another story, it was ʿUmar who suggested that they fought against several other tribes (al-Mawṣiḥ, ʿAgāḥi, ed. al-Shinkit, Cairo, ii, 118 ult.; al-Iṣḥāḥ, ed. al-Ḥakim, ii, 134; al-Baghḍādī, Kāzīʿāt al-ṣaḥāb, Būlāk 1299, iv, 217; Ibn al-Āṯīr, al-Kāmil, Beirut 1965, i, 642; al-Nuwayrī, Niḥayat, xv, 364). The most famous conflict in which they were involved in pre-Islamic times was the war of Dāḥis waʿl-Ghabra (q.v.). These conflicts may account for the B. Murra's hostile attitude towards the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) and his followers, especially the Fāzara. The same issue apparently caused division among the B. Murra themselves. For this or other reasons, al-Nābihīa's clan aroused the hostility of other Murra clans, who went as far as to contract an alliance against it. There were other internal conflicts as well, such as the one between the two poets ʿAbbāb b. al-Ṭabari and ʿAlī ibn Ṣidqiyah. Their leader al-Ḥarith was appointed as his successor one of his fellow-tribemen, ʿUmāra b. Ḫūraym. ʿUṭmān, son of this ʿUmāra, served as governor of Armenia, ʿAḍharbaydān and ʿUṣfīd under the caliphs al-Ḥādhī and Ḥārūn. ʿUṭmān b. Ḫāyān was governor of Medina for al-Walīd b. ʿAbd al-ʿĀlib, and his son Ṣiyāḥ b. ʿAbd al-ʿĀlib held the same position under al-ʿĀlib. ʿUṭmān b. Ḫāyān and ʿAmr b. Ḫubairī were important generals. Al-ʿAbbās b. Saʿd (or Saʿd), related to the Murra although not one of them, was in charge of the ʿUṭrāt (q.v.) under the ʿIrākī governor ʿUṣāf b. ʿUmar (120/637-38). Ḫābiṣ b. Murra was a commander in the army of Marwān II, and after the latter had been killed he continued the flight against the ʿAbbāsids, until eventually he came to terms with the ʿAbbāsids b. ʿUthmān b. Ḫāliq, ʿAlī ibn Ṣalāḥ (ʿAlī ibn ʿUmar). In addition, several Marwānīs were married to daughters of the Murra notable and poet ʿAlī ibn ʿUṭmān (Ibn Ḫazm, 253-4; Ibn al-Ḵalīb, 415, 418, 420, 424; Ibn al-ʿAṣwāḥ, Ǧaḥiṣ, vi, 513, 520; Ibn Ḫāṭīb, Bidāy, ix, 305, 312; al-Mawṣiḥ, ʿĪsāf, Or. 2, fol. 616a, Or. 3, fol. 359a; al-Ṭabarī, ii, 1282, 1564a, iii, 56). It was perhaps such close relations with the ruling elite which gave rise to the claim that the B. Murra indeed originated in the Kuraysh. As tradition would have it, however, the claim preceded the Umayyad period. Verses of poetry are attributed to the Ǧaḥāfī warrior al-Ḥārīth b. Ẓālim, in which he claimed Ǧurāshī descent after he had been ousted by his own clan, on account of the incessant troubles which he was giving them. Stories were told about Murra's grandmother, or about his father, explaining how they came to leave the Kuraysh and settle with the Ǧaḥāfat, thereby causing a shift in the genealogy of their offspring Murra. When the delegation of the B. Murra came to Muḥammad, they sought to curry favour with him by mentioning that they belonged to his own tribe, the Kuraysh. This claim, however, was universally recognised. According to some reports, Ḫumayr b. ʿUmar decreed that they did not belong to the Kuraysh. Ḫumayr b. ʿUmar was an expert on kuṣūf (q.v.), the art of identifying genealogical relations. According to another story, it was ʿUmār who suggested that they

The B. Murra seem not to have been a large and complex group, yet they dispersed during the Arab conquests, and probably later on as well. Groups of them were found in the various provinces, from Khurâsân in the east, through Syria and Egypt, to Elvira and Seville in Spain. Some of these may have been just splinter groups (Ibn Hazm, 292-5; al-Tâbâri, ii, 425, iii, 625). A part of them remained in the ancient territories in Arabia, where they continued to follow the traditions of their pre-Islamic nomadic life. Together with other Bedouin tribes, they pestered the Hâşimî town-dwellers, so that the caliph al-Wâhîbî sent punitive expeditions against them in the years 231/846 and 232/847 (Ibid., iii, 1339, 1342, 1362; Ibn al-Athîr, Kâmîl, vii, 19, 29). The B. Murra b. Awf are apparently lost. The genealogists of the later Middle Ages do not know anything about them, except that which they found in the earlier books. The dispersed groups of the B. Murra were either assimilated by other tribal groups, or assumed new names, or both.

The modern Âl Murra is a powerful tribe of nomadic pastoralists, which belongs to the elite of the pure, ancient Bedouin tribes in contemporary Sa'ûdî Arabia. Their dialect, unintelligible to many, is considered to be the purest Arabic, and they master ancient Bedouin skills such as hunting and tracking down animals and people. With the progress of life in Sa'ûdî Arabia, however, hunting became curtailed, and the Âl Murra's services in tracking down criminals became redundant (D.P. Cole, Nomads of the north, Cairo 1975, C.35).

The original home of the Âl Murra was in Nadjîrân, from which they started to expand around the middle of the 18th century. Today, their territory extends from Nadjîrân northeastward across the Empty Quarter, and in the eastern part they reach northward to the oasis of al-Hasâ. Occasionally, they exceed their own territory and wander as far north as Kuwayt and to the oasis of al-Hasa. They do not inhabit them. Only about a third of the tribe frequents these oases twice a year, once in order to pollinate the dates, the other in order to harvest them (Cole, 30; K.S. Twitchell, Saudi Arabia, Princeton 1958, 35, 75). These oases in fact represent an abortive attempt on the part of the Sa'ûdî government to sedentarise the Âl Murra. In the beginning of the 20th century, King 'Abd al-'Azîz created the organisation of the Ikhwân [s.v.], whose purpose was to spread the Wahhâbi doctrine and to bring the Bedouins back to the original and true form of Islam. Within this project, settlements were established for the Bedouins [see Al-Hijâr], but the Âl Murra found it impossible to abandon their nomadic way of life. However, the royal attempt at sedentarising them does not reflect a conflict between the Arab tribes and the ruling house. On the contrary, the tribe is allied with the Âl Sa'ûd, and has given it its ardent support. Although in the past there were confrontations between Murrîs and the Âl Sa'ûd, the founder of the modern state of Sa'ûdî Arabia, 'Abd al-'Azîz b. Sa'ûd, found among the Âl Murra refuge in times of trouble, and aid in times of struggle. The alliance is cemented by the matrimonial ties which exist between the royal house and noble families of the tribe.

The Âl Murra were not unaffected by both the changes which occurred in Arabia with the founding of the modern state, and the discovery of oil. Many of them became incorporated in the national guard, so that they receive salaries from the state. Many others engage in wage-labour, which involves settlement, and the B. Murra are now a mix of both. On the other hand, traditional means of subsistence beside camel raising, such as hunting and raiding, became unlawful. Yet on the whole, the Âl Murra are still a tribe of nomadic pastoralists. Their social structure and their way of life, at least until the late sixties, remained unchanged.


(ELLA LANDAU-TASSERON)

MURSAL (A.), a technical term in the science of hadīth [q. v.]. The oldest definition of this term, when applied to a hadīth [q.v.], was that of Ibn al-Mundūl. This definition was soon abandoned for a more specific definition: a mursal is an inmād in which the Successor and the Prophet the name of the Companion is lacking. In the course of time, the older definition gave rise to the technical term munkāṣī (lit. "cut up"; its opposite is mutṣāṣī). Mediaeval Islamic hadīth experts got rid of the confusion by concluding that not every munkāṣī is mursal, but every mursal is munkāṣī. A closely related technical term for an inmād which stops at the Companion, thus without mention of the Prophet, is called maṣkūf; another term for an inmād which is "cut off" at the level of the Successor, thus without mention of either the Prophet or a Companion, is called munkāṣī; finally, although it has the appearance of a contradiction in terms, with a tradition qualified as mursal al-ṣahīd al-ṣahīd, it is possible that a Successor of the Successor also has a historical role in the development of a hadīth which he/she could not possibly have been present, such as Abī Ḥādiṣ's account of the first revelation Muhammad allegedly received, cf. Nawawi's commentary on Muslim's Sahih, ed. Cairo 1349, 30.) A text in which mursal still has its original meaning (later reserved for munkāṣī) is the introduction which Muslim b. al-Haddājīdī, d. 261/875 (261/875), added to his Sahih (ed. M.F. Abū al-Bakr, i, 30, tr. G.H.A. Juynboll in JAFI, v, 1984, 296). In the Risāla of Abī al-Shāfī`ī (d. 204/820) there is a passage (461-71) in which both terms are still used indiscriminately, although mursal gradually seems to be acquiring its own (later) definition. At first there was still difference of opinion on whether or not certain mursalāt or mursalī traditions of certain major Successors constituted an argument (ḥudūd) in a legal argument. It was finally al-Shāfī`ī who settled the matter: they do not, unless substantiated by a Prophetic tradition of more or less the same purport supported by an interrupted (mutṣāṣī) and sound inmād. The most extensive account of this dispute is given in Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, Mukaddima [sc. fi `ulum al-hadīth], edited together with the Maḥāsin al-isṭiṣalāt of `Umar b. Ṣaλāḥ al-Bu`llīnī by A. Abū al-Kāhin al-Murtadā (d. 604/1208), and Ḥāfīz al-Sirāfī, Tadbir al-ra`iṣī, ed. A. Abū al-Latīf, i, 195-207. The historical origins of mursal traditions may be reconstructed as follows: During the 1st/7th century, a number of legal experts in the different centres of Islamic learning gave their opinions on legal issues about which the public had sought their advice. These experts, many of whom later became famous, agreed on certain points, and these opinions acquired a certain fame. Thus we find in Medina Sa`īd b. al-Musayyab (d. 94/713 [see FUKHĀS AL-MA`ĀDINA, in Suppl.]), in Mecca Abījābār, Abī Rabīḥ (d. 114/732), in Damascus Makhlūl (d. 112-8/730-6), in Baṣra Ḥasan al-Ṣa`rī (d. 110/728 [q. v.]) and in Kūfah as-Sa`bū illnesses (d. 103-10/721-8), to name only one for each main centre. (For a survey of other early fukahā, see FIKH.) In the course of the 2nd/8th century, these legal opinions were partly "raised to the level" (Arabic: naf) of Prophetic traditions by the addition of a name of a Companion who was reported to have heard the Prophet decide thus in the matter, and partly entirely reworded and provided with fictitious inmāds (Arabic: wad) also going back to the Prophet, this in order to meet the growing demand for precedents which might "establish" the antiquity, or even the "Prophetic provenance", of a legal decision. In this way a large number of these mursalī, thus doctored to look like what later became known as genuine Prophetic hadīth, found its way into collections which were later canonised, and from the point of view of Muslim scholarship became authenticated as Prophetic sunna. Western students of hadīth, on the other hand, are inclined to see these mursulī as the oldest relic of 1st/7th century legal thinking in Islam, a phenomenon of basically post-Prophetic origin, in the formation of which Muhammad's example or inspiration may at most have played a role transmitted through living memory. However, because of the wholesale naf and wad mentioned above, a standardisation which effectively obliterated the traces of their true origins, the route taken by each of these mursalī individually must be considered as no longer traceable, except perhaps in the case of a few isolated instances.


(G.H.A. JUYNBOLL)

MURSHID (A.), literally, "one who gives right guidance, ru`ūd, irshād, in Sūfī mystical parlance, the spiritual director and initiator into the order (tarība) of the novice or murid [q. v.] who is following the Sūfī path; synonyms are baba, pir and shaykh and in Sūfī parlance, the preceding or succeeding Guide is regarded as the mursul. The historical origins of mursal traditions may be

(G.H.A. JUYNBOLL)
A special use of the term within the Persian world, in the compound form murshid-i kāmil "perfect spiritual director", occurred amongst the Safawids [q.v.] who ruled during the 16th-17th centuries in Persia. From our first knowledge of the Safawiyah Šūfi order in 8th/14th century Āḏhar- bāyḏān, it seems that its šayḵūṯ, from their base at the Ardabil [q.v.] shrine of the founder, assumed this title of murshid-i kāmil, demanding complete obedience from all their adherents. This requirement continued to be exacted by the Safawī šāhs when they had also become temporal monarchs, pāḏaḵšāns [q.v.]. In Persia as a whole, with resultant stresses within the state and tensions amongst the loyalties of their servants. See کریم and also R.M. Savory, The emergence of the modern Persian state under the Safawīs, in Iran-Shāris, Jnl. of Iranian Studies, Tehran University, il/2 (1971), 21-4, repr. in Studies on the history of Safawī Iran, Variorum Reprints, London 1987, no. VIII; idem, Iran under the Safawīs, Cambridge 1980, index.

Bibliography: See also that for Murshid. (Ed.)

**MURSHID KULI KHAN**, commander and official of Mughal India (d. 1068/1658). He was a Turk by birth and first in the employment of ‘Ali Mardān Khān, the Persian governor of Kandahār. He came to India along with ‘Ali Mardān Khān when the latter surrendered Kandahār to the Mughals (1047/1638). He was appointed diwān of the Pandžībān in 1049/1648 and of Multān in 1051/1641. His later offices were: Mir ʿaṭīq (1052/1645), Fāqīdār of the foot-hills of Kangra (1055/1645) and Ḥākīṯa bēgī (1058/1648). When Awrangzīb was appointed Viceroy of the Deccan in 1062/1652, he was appointed diwān of Balaghat and was promoted to the rank of 1500/1000. In 1066/1656 he was given the additional charge of Painghāṭ, thus holding the charge of the whole of Mughal Deccan with the rank of 1500/1000.

Murshid Khān made significant changes in the revenue administration of the Deccan. He appointed new village headmen (mukaddāms). He established the system of “differential” crop-sharing and took half of the produce from the dry lands, one-third from the land irrigated by wells and one-fourth from those under superior crops. The old system of assessing the revenue on the basis of plough-counts was still retained in certain areas, but over the larger area the system of measurement was introduced. For this purpose, Murshid Khān determined the raʿī (standard output per unit of area) for each crop, and having in view the prices fixed the dastār or cash rate (later to be known as the ḏ芜a of Murshid Khān). He also advanced loans (takdīr) to the cultivators for the purchase of seed and cattle.

When Awrangzīb marched northwards to contest the throne with Dārā Shukōh [q.v.], Murshid Khān accompanied him as his Mir ʿaṭīq, but was killed at the battle of Dharomat in 1068/1658.


**MURSHIDABĀD**, a district of India, in the Presidency Division of the State of West Bengal, area 24,641 km² (1971), population 2,940,204 (1971), of whom 1,503,427 were males and 1,436,777 were females. Of the total population, 56.34% were Muslims and 43.6% Hindus. Murshidabād is one of the few districts in India where Muslims form a majority of the population, the only others being Malappuram District of Kerala State and six districts of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. In the decade 1961-71, the Muslim population grew by 28.5%, and the Hindu population by 26.6%. In the rural areas of the district, Muslims form 59.3% of the total rural population, but in urban areas only 24.2% of the total urban population, a reversal of the more usual pattern in India, where the overall figures (1971) give Muslims as 16.2% of the urban population, and only 10% of the rural. At the partition of India in 1947, Murshidabād was initially allocated to East Pakistan on account of its Muslim majority population, but when the details of the Radcliffe Award were published it was re-allocated to India. Apart from a small community of Shīʿīs in Lalbagh sub-division, the Muslims of the rest of the district are Sunni. Of these ‘Shaykh’ has become the common designation for all who cannot claim to be Sayyids, Pathāns, or Mughals.

The history of Murshidabād is part of the general history of Bengal [see BANGALĀ] until the early 18th century, when it came to prominence in connection with the establishment of a new administration by Murshid Kuli Khān (to be distinguished from the Murshid Kuli Khān of the previous article). Until this time, the town of Murshidabād had been known as Makhsūṣabād, and had not attracted many Muslim settlers, even in the period of Mughal rule, partly because it was regarded as unhealthy on account of its low-lying position in the Bengal delta. From the beginning of the 17th century, however, it began to be important as a centre of commerce, particularly in silk, and attracted the attention of English, French and Dutch trading agents. Murshid Kuli Khān, a Brahman by birth, had been sold as a boy to Ḥāḏīḏī Shāfī ‘Īṣāhānī, who brought him up as his son, under the name of Muḥammad Hāḏī. Educated in Persia, he was subsequently given high office by the Mughal emperor Awrangzīb, and became diwān of Bengal, and in 1702 was given the title of Murshid Kuli Khān. The revenue of the province until then had been insufficient even to pay the salaries of the military and civil establishment, and he therefore set up a new and more efficient system of revenue, choosing as his contractors new men of the official and trading class and thus creating a new (and eventually landed) aristocracy in Bengal. The change of name of his capital from Makhsūṣabād to Murshidabād appears to have been made in 1705. The English East India Company set up a factory in the district, at Cossim-bazar, in 1659. In its dealings with foreign trading companies is to be seen a large part of Murshid Kuli Khān’s success in increasing the revenue; he was also in personal life a man of puritan character, sleeping little, observing the stated times of prayer, and engaging himself “in copying the Kurʾān and administering justice” (Karim, 238). Himself a Shīʿī, he was the first of a succession of Shīʿī sāḥibāns of Bengal, including those who were nominal only, after the Battle of Plassey in 1757. From Murshidabād, Shīʿīs migrated and formed colonies in other parts of Bengal.
a town in the south-east of Spain, 43 m/140 feet above sea level in the centre of very fertile country poorly endowed by nature, had been noticed already by the Arab geographers who give more or less long accounts of it. Abu 'l-Fida', for example, says that, it was like Seville for the number of its groves and parks (munzahahat), among which he mentions the famous al-Rushaka.

MURSIYA, MURCIA, a town in the south-east of Spain, has over a million inhabitants, with an area of 11,317 km². Its port, 40 miles to the south on the Mediterranean coast, is Cartagena, the Ksar'djanna [q. v.] or Kar-tajannat al-Khulad', the year 210/825, but according to Umayyad Abd al-Rahman II al-Hakam about 247/862, the land of Tudmir and with it, of course, Murcia agree in saying that it was a comparatively poor country which bore the name of Tudmir [q. v.]. This name which is connected with the name of Theodemir, a Visigothic chief of the region at the time of the Muslim conquest, was also applied to the town of Murcia itself, from the time when it supplanted Orihuela [see uŕyula] as the chief town of the region. Indeed, almost all the Arab authors who speak of Murcia agree in saying that it was a comparatively poor country which bore the name of Tudmir [q. v.].

Mucridabad has a number of important Islamic foundations; see for these, Catherine B. Asher, in G. Michell (ed.), The Islamic heritage of Bengal, UNESCO, Protection of the cultural heritage, 1, Paris 1984, 87-100, 206-12. (T.O. LING)

MURSHIDABAD — MURSIYA

Kartddjanna [q. v.]

Abu '1-Fida...

Ibn Abi Abl Ashklula. For details of the obscure history of this period, see the monograph by Caspar Remiro AlT b. Yusuf, Abu Ishak al-Marwani, ed. and tr. Dozy and de Goeje, 194-236; Yakut, Mu'am, ed. Wustenfeld, iv, 497; Ibn Abi al-Mun'im al-Himyar, al-Rawd al-miHir.


history of the country, in particular, to ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ [q.v.] and the foundation of his mosque.

Since Vattier's work deserves rescue from oblivion, the same subject of a facsimile edition accompanied by a copious and instructive commentary at the hands of G. Wiet (Paris 1953). An interested reader can find in the introduction some information on the author (who lived, at the earliest, in the 7th/13th century), his possible sources and the connections which should be made with other works of the same type. See al-ʿĀṣa Ṣadūq, al-Murtadd (Paris, 1907).

MURTADA B. MURTAAAA (AL-)MURTADA B. AL-CAFIF — MURTADD 635

1. In the Kurʾān, the apostate is threatened with punishment in the next world only, the “wrath of God” will fall upon him according to a sura of the latest Meccan period (XVI, 108-9) and severe punishment (ʿdāḥib) “except he did it under compulsion and his heart is steadfast in belief”. Similarly, it is written in the Medinan sūra III, 80 ff. “... This is the punishment for them, that the curse of Allāh, the Angels and of men is upon them for all time (82); the hands of G. Wiet (Paris 1953). An interested reader can find in the introduction some information on the author (who lived, at the earliest, in the 7th/13th century), his possible sources and the connections which should be made with other works of the same type. See al-ʿĀṣa Ṣadūq, al-Murtadd (Paris, 1907).

On the question whether the apostate should be given an opportunity to repent, traditions differ. According to one tradition of Abū Burda (d. 104/722), Muʿāṣir b. Djabal refused to sit down until an apostate brought before him had been slain “in accordance with the decision of God and of his apostle” (al-Bukhārī, Maqālah, bāb 60; Iṣṭiḥāb at-murtaddīn, bāb 2; Abū Bakr, bāb 1, Muslim, Ḥumāma, tr. 15; Abū Dāwūd, Ḥudūd, bāb 1; Ibn Hanbal, v, 231). In the same tradition in Abū Dāwūd, however, it is added that they had tried in vain for 20 nights to convert the apostate. The caliph ʿUmar is also represented as disapproving of this proceeding with the words: “Did you then not shut him up for three days and give him a round loaf (muḍāʾ) daily and try to induce him to repent? Perhaps he would have repented and returned to obedience to God. O God! I was not there, I did not order it and I do not approve; see, it was thus reported to me” (Mālik, Akhṭaya, tr. 15). There are also traditions according to which God does not accept the repentance of an apostate (Ibn Hanbal, v, 2) and others according to which even the Prophet forgave apostates (al-ṇaṣr, bāb 13).

3. a. In Fīkh, there is unanimity that the male apostate must be put to death, but only if he is grown up (bālīgh) and composes mens (ṣākīl) and has not acted under compulsion (muṣbāh). A woman, on the other hand, is imprisoned, according to Ḥanafi and Shafiʿi teaching, until she again adopts Islam, while according to the Ḥanafīs, Ibn Hanbal (al-Tirmidhī, Ḥudūd, bāb 25), the Mālikis and Shafiʿis (cf. ibn, 131, where al-Shafiʿi vigorously attacks Abū Yusuf who is not mentioned by name) she also is put to death. Although this punishment is not properly hadd (cf. thereon, al-ṣhaṭīfī, Umm, vii, 330. ll. 20-2) it is regarded as such by some jurists, as it is a question of a hadd (Allāh (cf. e.g. al-Saratḥī, Siyār, iv, 162); therefore the execution of the punishment lies with the ummah; in the case of a slave, however, the slave must carry it out, as with any other hadd punishment. Execution should be by the sword. According to the above traditions, apostates must sometimes have been tortured to death. The caliph ʿUmar II had them tied to a post and a lance thrust into their hearts (Abū Yusuf, Ḥisāba, 112). Al-Badḡīrī expressly forbids any form of torture, like burning, drowning, strangling, impaling or flaying; according to him, Sultan Baybars II (708-9/1308-9) was the first to introduce torture (Snouck Hurgronje, Verspr. Geschriften, ii, 198). Lane (Manners and customs, ch. iii, near the end) records the case of a woman who had apostatised and was led through the streets of Cairo on an ass, then strangled in a boat in the middle of the Nile and thrown into the river. (The throwing of a corpse into the Nile was already usual in Cairo in the Fatimid period; cf. Mez, Renaissance des Islam, 29.) In quite recent times, followers of the Kādiyānī or Ahmadiyya [q.v.] sect in Afghanistan were stoned to death (OM, v [1925], 338). In the former Turkish territory and Egypt, as well as in Muslim lands under European rule, since the middle of the 19th century, under European influence, the execution of an apostate on a kādī’s sentence has been abolished, but we still have imprisonment and deportation (cf. Ibn Ḥanbal, iii, 217). An interesting drive according to a variant the reference is to Zindiks or Laktima (d. 106/724) and Anas b. Malik (d. 91/710) according to a variant the reference is to Zindiks or Laktima (d. 106/724) and Anas b. Malik (d. 91/710).
poison or otherwise. Occasionally modern Islamic writers (such as those of the Ahmadiyya movement) endeavor to prove that Islam knows of no death penalty for apostasy; the Indian apostate Muhammad Murtadd is still a great stress on the fact there is not only an indication of the death penalty in the Qur'an (Zwemer, The law of apostasy in Islam, 17, 37-8, London 1924; OM, v [1925], 262).

One should here call attention to an agreement which is probably not accidental. Since in Islam, in addition to apostasy, unchastity and unnatural vice are punished by death, even by stoning, according to both Shafi'i and Maliki, as well as blaspheming God or a prophet, and magic, we find in Islam all crimes punished by death which in the Mishna (Sanhedrin, vii, 4) are threatened with stoning.

b. Whether attempts at conversion must be made is a question of Usul Al-Fiqh. A number of jurists of the 1st-2nd/7th-8th centuries deny this (as do the Zahiris) or like 'Ata (d. 115/733) make a distinction between the apostate born in Islam and one converted to Islam; the former is to be put to death at once (so also the Shi'is). Others insist on three attempts at conversion (relying on sura IV, 136; cf. al-Tabari, Tafsir, v, 193-4) or have him in the first place imprisoned for three days (cf. above, 2). According to others again, one should await the cycle of the five times of prayer and allow the apostate to forget at each refusal that he has refused at each is the death punishment to be enforced. If, however, he repents and professes Islam once more, he is released (cf. thereon, al-Shafi'i, Umm, i, 228; Abû Yusuf, Khurajî, 109). In later times, istitiba was always applied.

c. Apart from the fact that apostasy deprives the murtadd of burial with Muslim rites, it has certain civil consequences. The property of the one who commits apostasy (ridda, shifaa) returns penitent, he is given back what remains (cf. Umm, i, 231, where al-Shafi'i opposes the contrary Hanafi view). Others, especially later Shafi'i, regard the rights of ownership of the apostate as suspended (maqaf) and regard him as one who is under guardianship (mabhuj), only if the fugitive apostate dies, if the dâr al-bar the murtadd is faży according to al-Shafi'i and the Malikis; if the fugitive murtadd returns penitent, he is given back what remains (cf. Umm, i, 231, where al-Shafi'i opposes the contrary Hanafi view). One can support this view. The law of apostasy in Islam, v [1925], 262).
After Islam, murū'a extended its meaning thanks to the now pre-dominating moral focus. Broadly speaking, with the Rightly-guided Caliphs it means chastity, good nature and observance of Qur'anic laws. With the Umayyads, it implies politics, diplomacy, work, dignity and compassion (on the last meaning, cf. the Diyân of Baghšār b. Burd, Cairo n.d., 70). With the early 'Abbāsids it implies merit (al-fadl: Kalâla wa-Dinma, Beirut 1899, 266) and is contrasted with abjectness (according to al-Asma'ī; cf. al-Ādab wa-l-ḥakīmah, Cairo 1351, 70), while with the moralists it is identified with al-adab in the meaning of good conduct. Sāliḥ b. Ǧanāḥ (cf. al-Mukhtasār [1930], 649) wrote a work on ethics entitled al-Ādab wa-l-'murū'a, published in Rāšīd al-ḥalalqā'ī, ed. Kurz Āli, Cairo 1913 (these two words are already associated in 'Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Kātib, quoted in the Mukaddima of Ibn Khaldūn, Beirut 1900, 248, 1. 10; cf. also Mirāt, 12, I, 12-13; 25, II, 4-6 below); but what is upsetting is that Sāliḥ b. Ǧanāḥ said that "murū'a in its origin means firm resolve (al-bazm); success (al-ṣafar) is its fruit" (MMAT, iv/1, 32). In time, among the lexicographers, murū'a means urbanity (al-insānīyya: al-Diyāwārī, 398/1007-8, op. cit.), distinction (al-sarw: Ibn Sīda, d. 458/1066, Muhājīs, iii, 17; meaning borrowed from Abū Zayd [al-ʿAnṣāri] and ideal manhood (al-nūhrīyya; al-Ǧāfariyya: Siḡārī, d. 650/1252, quoted in TA, 1, 117, 13), the moralists, murū'a was to find a place in Muslim ethics (al-Bustī, d. 534/965, op. cit., 208), to be raised to an ethical notion covering a number of qualities, especially those of kings and lords (al-Thaḥālībī, d. 429/1038, Mirāt, 2) and in proportion as Muslim speculation developed, it was to occupy a place in the first rank in the theory of morals, including definite moral elements as well as abstract (al-Mawardi, d. 450/1058, op. cit.). Continuing in this way in the path of ethical significance and becoming more and more abstract, murū'a finally came to mean virtue in the lexicographers (al-Fayyūmī, d. 770/1368-9, al-Mīṣībān al-munir, Cairo 1912, 878) and the moralists (al-Diūrūjūdī, d. 816/1413-14, Taʿṣīfī, Leipzig 1845, 223). On the other hand, in the legists it indicates the fact of abstaining from any act capable of offending religion although not constituting an illicit act (Fagnan, Additions, Algiers 1923, 163). In Muslim Spain, assuming the forms maruwa and marāwa (with the adjective marawi = variant of the classical mara: Kāmūs, Bombay 1298, 18), this meaning became more and more abstract and developed further in the spoken language of to-day, it means in Egypt nobility of soul and liberality (classical meanings); whence the Turkish adjective form used in Egyptian Arabic muru'at (obliging). It becomes maruwa (mīriwa) in Egypti and maruwa (mīruwa) in Syria, and means in effect energy, as in the expression "so-and-so has not the m. to accomplish such a thing." (cf. in the classical language, al-Thaḥālībī, Akāsin kalim al-nātīt, Syntagma dictorum, ed. Valeton, Leiden 1844, 28)

Murū'a has further been developed in Sūfism. It was regarded as one of the "branches" of futuwwa (al-Ƙuḥayri, Risāla, Cairo 1330, 103, II, 2, 3 below). In any case, there is no doubt that its meaning here is on the moral plane (we find bracketed together murū'a and futuwwa: Mirāt, 15, I, 1, 2 below; 23, 1, 4; 24, 1, 6; 25, 1, 2, 6; 26, 1, 12; al-Muwaṣṣāhā, 30, I, 13; Fleisch, Alī's Hundert Sprüche, Leipzig 1837, 7, I, 1, 8; 15, 11, 25, 1, 13; 29, 1, 1; Alhwardt, Berlin catalogue, v, 30-1, nos. 17, 32; al-Iṣbahānī, op. cit., juxtaposes them). However, murū'a is fundamentally distinguished from...
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futuwwa, and it has gone a long way outside Sufism,
both as a word and as an ethical idea (cf. against this,
Tueschen, Die islamischen Futuwwabünde, in ZDMG [1933], 11, 27).

This being the case, it seems difficult to agree with
Goldziher (Muh. Stud., i, 1-40, esp. 13) who connects the
idea of murîa with that of virtus (cf. before him,
de Goeje, Divinò polite... al-`Anjârî, Leiden 1875, p.
Ixxvii, referring to a very doubtful text) among the
pre-Islamic Arabs. In his view murîa (opposed to the
dīn of Islam) is the moral principle, from the fact that
it presupposes certain obligations viz. liberality, the
protection of the gâr, observance of the law of the
vendetta and fidelity to one’s pledged word. This
thesis presents two disputable points. The first is
philological: if we survey the semantic evolution of the
word murîa, it must be granted that on the one hand
the word is only identified with virtue at a late date,
and on the other, in the pre-Islamic period it was not
yet an absolutely abstract term capable of being taken
as a symbol. The second point is connected with the
method; if one starts from an idea one has formed
about virtue, one cannot see all the aspects of a moral
system, the essence of which we do not understand
because it is quite foreign to us. It is therefore better
not to isolate a moral phenomenon from the
atmosphere of ideas and facts in which it has
developed. In grouping these facts and ideas and
observing them, one is led to substitute the term
`murîda [q.v.] for murîa when seeking for a moral principle of
the pre-Islamic Arabs (cf. B. Fares, L’honneur chez les
Arabes avant l’Islam, Paris 1932, 32-3). (B. Fares)

Bibliography: In addition to the references given in
the article, see Ch. Pellat, Hauela maftûn ‘al-
murîa’-‘indâ kudâmâ ‘al-‘Arab, in al-Karmil, iv (1983), 1-17, who debates the opinions of Goldziher
and B. Fares and shows how the notion of murîa’s
complexity in the Djâhilîya as well as in Islam.

(Ed.)

MURZUK, a town in the urban district
(baladiyya) of the same name in southern Libya and
in the province of Fezzan or Fazzan [q.v.]. The
town is situated in lat. 23° 35’ 55” N. and long. 14° 7’ 5"
E. The district includes the sub-districts of Agar
‘Arab, Garamantes, Murzuq, Traghân, Umm al
Arâniî and Zuwayla.

In antiquity, Murzuk was within the territory of the
Garamantes, whose centre Garama was 60 miles/100
km northeast of Murzuk (see C.M. Daniels, The
has always been on the important trans-Saharan
caravan route linking Bornu and Kânen [q.v.] with the
Mediterranean coast. In recent times, Murzuq
was under the control, in fact very nominal, of the
Karamâlî [q.v.] amis of Tripoli until ca. 1830 (see J.
Wright, Libya, a modern history, London 1983, 16). It
was the capital of the Fazzan region and headquarters
of the Ottoman Turkish forces in southwestern Libya
until the Italian invasion of 1912, but insecurity
prevailed and trans-Saharan trade declined. In the
early years of Italian occupation, the population of
Murzuk was estimated at 800 (Touring Club Italiano,
Guida d’Italia. Possedimenti e colonie, Milan 1929, 384)
though British estimates in 1920 set the total at
approximately 3,500 to 7,000 (Admiralty, Handbook of
Libya, London 1920, 205). The foundation of the
original town is thought to date to the work of Sidi
al-Muntajir al-Muhammad in 710/1310, at which time
the stone and mud fort, casbah and town wall were
built. Water supply was available for the town and
the palm gardens from shallow aquifers led by the Wâdi
Huîra. The Turkish fort, barracks and a mosque were
located in the north west corner of the walled town.
The sisâ with a daily market, and main mosque with a
notable truncated conical minaret, were set on the
main thoroughfare of the town on a south-east to
north-west axis between Bâb al-Kabîr, the principal of
three town gates, and the fort. Among European
travellers to visit Murzuk were Heinrich Barth in
1831, Vice-Consul Warrington in 1855, Gerard
Rohlfs in 1865 and Gustav Nachtigal in 1869. In the
Italian period and after Libyan independence in 1951,
Murzuq was described as a small regional settlement.

Muzak was given baladiyya status in the 1970s, acting
as administrative, security and educational centre for
much of southern Libya as far as the Chad and Niger
borders. The town population was reported at 6,290
in 1981, by which time the residential area, which
included 1007 houses, had spread considerably
beyond the walled town. The population of the urban
district was 42,294 at the census of 1988. Modern
farms were established on newly-reclaimed land to the
east of palmeries and irrigated gardens. Finds of oil
were reported in 1980 for the Murzuk region, but
the extent of the field is not known.
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MUSÁ, the name in Arabic for the Biblical prophet
Moses.

1. In the Kur‘ân. Here, Mûsá is considered as the
precursor of the, model for, and the annunciator of
Muhammad (VII, 156). The two prophets share the
same belief (XLIII, 11). Mûsá is also conceived in
Muhammad’s image. Charges are brought against
him similar to those made against Muhammad and he
is said to want to pervert people from the faith of their
fathers (X, 79); he practises magic (XXVIII, 18).
Mûsá and Muhammad seem rather to be sent to the stub-
born Pharaoh [see FIRAUN] than to the believing
Israelites. Revelation is granted him: tawrât, kîthâb,
fûrán, suhuf [I, 50; XXI, 49; LIII, 37; LXXVII, 19],
ilumination, instruction and guidance. The
picture of him is made up of Biblical, Haggadic and new
elements. Mûsá is exposed, watched by his sister,
refuses the milk of other nurses and is suckled by his
own mother. Coming to the assistance of a hard-
pressed Israelite, he kills an Egyptian but repents of
his crime to which Satan had tempted him. He is
pursued and escapes to Madyan [see MADYAN SHU‘AYB].
At a well there he waters the flocks of the two
daughters of a gaylîd. One of them invites him home
modestly. He receives her as his wife at the price of
8-10 years service. This preliminary history is told in
surâ XXIII, 1 - 26; the mission itself is often
mentioned.

Mûsá receives from the burning bush in the holy
valley of Tuwaun (XX, 12; LXXIX, 16) a message,
a voice which orders him to take off his shoes, the
message to Pharaoh, the signs of his mission, the rod,
the snake and the hand that becomes white. His
speech is difficult to understand (XLIII, 52); Hûrûn
accompanies him as wa‘zûr (XX, 30; XXV, 37).
Pharaoh at times plcures Mûsá; at other times
knowing he had been brought up by them (XXXVI, 17). Pharaoh
assembles his magicians but their rods are devoured

Bibliography, (in addition to references in the
article) J.A. Allan, K.S. McLachlan and E.T. Penrose,
Libya, London 1973; Nachtigal, Sahara and
1974; M.A. El-Dawâfi, Charsî, Khâfar et la Libye, 1908 -
1884, Tripoli 1977; Secretariat of Planning,
National atlas, Tripoli 1978; K. Folan, Tripoli
during the reign of Yusuf Pasha Qaramani, Ile-Ile 1979;
Finnmap, Sabha region—existing conditions, Helsinki
1981; M. Morsy, North Africa 1900-1900, London
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by Mūsā’s. The magicians profess their belief in God and are mutilated in punishment (VII, 106-123; XXVI, 59-78; XXVI, 36-51). Pharaoh wishes prayers to be offered to him as God and orders Hāmān [q.v.] to build him a tower so that he can reach the God of Mūsā (XXVIII, 38; XL, 38). Mūsā performs nine miracles (XVII, 103; XX, 79-98; XXVIII, 12). These are: 1. the rod and snake; 2. white hand; 3. deluge; 4. locusts; 5. lice; 6. frogs; 7. blood; 8. darkness; 9. separation of the waters of the sea (cf. e.g. al-Tabari, i, 45).

Mūsā spends 30 and 10 nights with God (VII, 138). He brings instruction and admonition on the tablets. In his absence, al-Sāmiri makes the lowering golden calf (VII, 146; XX, 79-98). Mūsā breaks the tablets. He desires to see God. God crumbles the hill to dust (VII, 139). Israel fears war and has to wander 40 years in the wilderness (V, 24-9). Mūsā’s enemies, Kārīn [q.v.] (Korah), Pharaoh and Hāmān, perish (XXIX, 38).

Some details differ from the Biblical story. Instead of Pharaoh’s daughter, it is his wife who rescues the infant; instead of seven shepherds Mūsā assists two. Instead of ten plagues, the Kur’ān speaks of nine miracles. Mūsā strikes twelve springs out of the rock, one for each tribe (II, 57, a memory of the twelve springs of Elim, Exodus xv. 27). The divergence is greater when Mūsā made musāra for Pharaoh.

There are two features: Mūsā repents of having slain the Egyptians. Mūsā sees the burning bush at night and desires to take a brand from its fire for his house (XX, 10; XXVIII, 29). Pharaoh’s magicians die for their belief in God.

The following seems to originate in Haggada: God forbids the infant to be suckled by an Egyptian mother (XXVIII, 11). In the Haggada Moses is offered to all Egyptian suckling mothers; but the mouth that is to speak with God cannot imbibe anything impure (Sīta, 12b). That God tilts the mountain over Israel (II, 60, 87; VII, 170) is explained from the Haggada: Israel hesitated to accept the Pentateuch and God tilted Sinai over them: Torah or death (Sabbath, 80a; Aboda Zara, 27d). The turning of the sabbath breakers into apes (II, 61; IV, 50; V, 65; VII, 166) recalls the Hagaddah of which the cowards of the tower of babel become apes (Sanhedrin, 109a). Kārīn is represented as an exceedingly rich man, the keys of whose treasure is to be offered for himself as to a god, has a tower built and shoots a arrow against heaven; the arrow comes back blood-stained and Pharaoh boasts he has slain God (al-Tabari, i, 469). From the story of Jacob and Laban come the following: Mūsā serves 8-10 years for his wife (XXVIII, 27). His father-in-law offers him the spotted lambs born in his flock and the ewes for the watering troughs bear spotted lambs (al-Ṭahlībi, 112). There are frequent references to a pious Egyptian woman who is martyred by Pharaoh with her seven children, the youngest of whom is still at its mother’s breast (in al-Ṭahlībi, 118, 139); this is of course modelled on the martyr mother of the Maccaabe.

There are many fanciful embellishments, e.g. the miracle of the snakes, the plagues and the scenes on the Red Sea: Moses’s rod in particular plays a great part. It came from Paradise; Adam, Hābīl, Shīṭā, Idrīs, Nūḥ, Hūd, Sāliḥ, Ibrāhīm, Ismā‘īl, Ishaq and Ya‘qūb had previously used it (al-Kisā‘ī, 208). In al-Ṭabari (i, 460-1), an angel brought the rod. Mūsā obtained it from his wife; his father-in-law quarrels with him about its ownership and an angel decides in favour of Mūsā. It is a miraculous rod and al-Ṭahlībi (111-16) in particular relates the wonders it performs. It shines in the darkness; it gives water in a drought, and placed in the ground it becomes a tree bearing fruit; it produces milk and honey and fragrant scent; against an enemy it becomes a double dragon. It pierces mountains and rocks; it leads over rivers and sea; it is also a shepherd’s staff and keeps beasts of prey from the herds of Moses. When Mūsā was asleep on one of these rocks with the dragon, on another occasion seven of Pharaoh’s assassins.

The varied Biblical, Haggadic, legendary and fairy tale features in the Islamic legend of Mūsā are thus blended into a very full picture and in al-Ṭahlībi form a regular romance.
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(John Fuller)
second meaning. Several Kur’ān passages speak of a
direct conversation between Allāh and Moses, notably
IV, 162: kālama lldhu Musa taklim
where the use
of the cognate infinite, li `takākid, shows that this
‘conversation’ should be taken literally and not as a
metaphor (LA, xv, 429; al-Āshʿarī, Ibāna, Ḥaydarsād 1321, 27). These passages always
emphasise God’s speech to Moses, and that may be
the reason for al-Azhari’s interpretation. The Form
III kālāna is not found in the official text of the
Kur’ān, but sura II, 254, contains a variant, kālamā
Allāh6, which could be, according to al-Baydāwī, i, 130,
the origin of the official title; but, in this passage,
there is no question of Moses. See also the epithet
nadīf applied to Moses (Kur’ān, XIX, 53) and
assimilated by al-Baydāwī, i, 583, to manāgī.

Bibliography: See Goldzaher, Die Richtungen der
islamischen Koranauslegung, 174; Dozy, Supplément, ii, 486.

D.B. Macdonald7

MŪṢĀ, BANū, three brothers (in order of
seniority) Muhammad, Ahmad and al-Hasan, who
were among the most important figures in the
intellectual life of Baghdaḏ in the 9th/10th
century. We do not know their dates of birth, but
Muhammad died in 259/873 and could hardly then
have been less than 70 years old because the youngest
brother al-Hasan was already a brilliant geometer in
his youth (cf. q.v.). Their father, Mūsā b. Shakir, was said to have been
in his youth a resourceful highwayman who made the
roads in Khurāsān unsafe. By all accounts, however,
he became a noted astronomer and a close companion
of al-Ma’mūn when the latter was residing at Marw
in Khurāsān before he became caliph. When Mūṣā
died, al-Ma’mūn became the guardian of his sons,
who were given a good education in Baghdaḏ, becom-
ing skilled in geometry, mechanics, music,
mathematics and astronomy.

Under the successors of al-Ma’mūn, the brothers
became rich and influential. They devoted much of
their wealth and energy to the quest for the works of
their predecessors, especially in Greek and Syriac,
and sent missions to the lands of the Byzantine
Empire to seek out manuscripts and bring them to
Baghdaḏ. Muhammad is said to have made a journey
to Byzantium in person. The brothers acted as spon-
sors to a group of scientists and translators, to whom
they used to pay about 500 dinār a month. The most
outstanding of these scholars were Ḥabīb b. Kurrā
and Hunayn ibn Iṣḥāq [q.v.], who rendered numerous
works, many of which would otherwise have been lost,
from Greek and Syriac into Arabic. Muhammad was
on friendly terms with this group of scholars, particu-
larly with Hunayn, who translated and composed
books at the request of his patron. The brothers there-
fore played a leading rōle in the transmission of Greek
works to Arabic, and in the foundation of the long
and important contribution of the Islamic world to the
sciences.

The Banū Mūṣā, particularly Mūhammad, were
employed by the caliphs on various undertakings, and
became involved in the turbulent political life of
Baghdaḏ. Mūhammad and Aḥmad, for example,
were among a group of twenty men responsible for the
construction of the new town of al-Di‘afarīyya for the
caliph al-Mutawakkil [q.v.] and are mentioned as
having directed the excavation of canals. It seems,
however, that they subcontracted the actual construc-
tional work to others. They appear to have been of an
envious and sordid character, and are said, for exam-
ple, they became enemies of the famous philosopher
Abū Yūsuf al-Kindī [q.v.] and caused him to lose the
favour of al-Mutawakkil, who ordered him to be
beaten and allowed the brothers to confiscate his
library. In his last years, Mūḥammad was deeply
involved in palace politics, in the period during which
Turkish commanders were assuming effective control
of the state. After the death of the caliph al-Muṭaṣařīr
[q.v.], Mūḥammad successfully campaigned for the
nomination of al-Muṣtaḥfa [q.v.] in preference to
Aḥmad b. al-Muṭaṣaḏīn, because the latter was a friend
of al-Kindī. When Baghdaḏ was besieged by the army
of the caliph’s brother Abū Aḥmad, Mūḥammad was
sent by al-Muṣtaḥfa’s commander, Mūḥammad b.
‘Abd Allāh b. Tāḥīr, to estimate the strength of the
enemy forces, and he was one of a delegation sent by
the Tāḥīrid to Abū Aḥmad’s army to ascertain the
terms for al-Muṣtaḥfa’s abdication.

These reports are interesting for the information
which they give us about Mūḥammad’s standing in
the courtly circles, but his political activities were not
of the first importance, since it was of little moment
who occupied the caliphal throne when the real power
lay elsewhere. In any case, the rōles of the brothers as
patrons of scholars, and their own scientific
achievements, are of much greater significance than
their entrepreneurial or political activities. A list of
their works, taken from Arabic sources, will be found
in The book of ingenious devices, an annotated translation
of the Banu Mūṣā’s Kitāb al-Hiyal, by D.R. Hill, Dordrecht
1979, 5-6. Twenty works are known to us by
name, including books on mathematics, astronomy
and mechanics, but only three of these are known to
have survived. The Latin text of a translation by
Gerard of Cremona of a mathematical work was pub-
Deutschen Akad. der Naturf., xlix [1883]). A work on a
musical automaton was published in Machrie (1906),
444-58 and in German translation by E. Wiedemann,
in Centenario... Amari, Palermo 1909, 169-80; the
attrition of this work to the Banū Mūṣā is, however,
doubtful.

The best known and most important of the brothers’
works, which was largely the work of Ahmad, is their
Kitāb al-Ḫīyāl (see Eng. tr. given above). They were ten to
the caliph Aḥmad Y. al-Hassan, Baghdad 1981). The work comprises descriptions of some 100
small machines, including alternating fountains,
self-filling and self-trimming lamps and a clamshell grab.
About 80 of the devices, however, are trick vessels of
various kinds that exhibit an astonishing mastery of
automatic controls. The inspiration for Aḥmad’s work
is undoubtedly to be found in the machine treatises of
the Hellenistic writers, particularly the Pneumatics of
Philo of Byzantium (mid-3rd century BC) and the
Pneumatics of Hero of Alexandria (fl. ca. 60 AD). The
Kitāb al-Ḫīyāl, although some of the devices in it come
directly from Philo or Hero, in general goes well
beyond its Greek predecessors, particularly in the use
of small pressure variations and conical valves and
other components in automatic controls. Indeed, the
work of the Banū Mūṣā in the variety and ingenuity
of their control systems was unsurpassed until quite
recent times. There may have been some didactic
intention in their writing, but most of their construc-
tions are quite trivial to our eyes. Nevertheless, many
of the ideas, techniques and components that they
used were to be of considerable importance in the
development of machine technology. In the present
state of research, we cannot establish how their ideas
were transmitted to Europe. Diffusion may not have
occurred until hundreds of years after the time of the
Saracens, during the Middle Ages in the Islamic world,
including al-Andalus, it seems probable that some at
least of the Banū Mūsā's ideas entered northern Europe.


Mūsā b. Abī 'l-Ḥafīẓ, a chief (or the Mīknās [see al-Mutk], a prominent Berber tribe of the [Q. V.]

In the last years of the 3rd/early years of the 4th century, Fās was politically as well as physically divided between the Kayrawānī and Andalusian banks of the city and plagued with civil war. It was in this context that in 292/905 the Idrīsīd Yahyā b. al-Kāsim, dubbed al-Mikdād (Yahyā III of the dynasty), was succeeded by his rival and kinsman Yahyā (IV) b. Idrīs b. 'Umar, at whose general’s sickness he had met his death. Far from ending Fās’s troubles, the advent of Yahyā IV marked the start of a reign that was to be marred and then ended by foes from an unexpected quarter. In Irfikiyā, at the last end of the Maghrib, the Syrian Fāṭimid 'Ubayd Allāh had dislodged the Aghlabīs [Q. V.] and, styling himself al-Mahdī [see al-Mu'addī 'Ubayd Allāh], assumed the office of caliph (297/910). Only a year or two thereafter he had, as the first step in an eastern policy designed to secure for him universal recognition as caliph, attempted to conquer Egypt—a venture ending in defeat and a hasty return to Irfikiyā. Doubtless seeing consolidation of his position in the West as a precondition of success in his eastern policy, he then focused attention on the western Maghrib and set in train a western military offensive under the command of his kādī Masālah b. Ḥabūs al-Miknāsī. At the chronology and details of operations the Arabic sources are at variance, and the inconsistencies they contain are to some extent reflected in the most readily accessible European-language accounts of events. The version that follows therefore should not be regarded as definitive.

In 305/917–18 Masālah’s military target was Fās. In the approaches to the city, Yahyā (IV), who had gone out to do battle with him, was worsted and took refuge behind the city walls. A siege followed that ended only after he had come to terms with Masālah and agreed to recognise, in a written declaration, the sovereignty of al-Mahdī. In return for vassalage he was to be allowed to retain his authority over Fās and its immediate territories. Everything beyond, however, was to be subject to Masālah’s cousin, Mūsā b. Abī 'l-Āfiya, lord of Tasūl (Toul) and Tāzā (Taza) and chiefman of the Mīknāsī, tribal masters of the Malwiyya (Moulouya) valley.

Mūsā, realising the incompatibility of Yahyā’s continuing presence in Fās with his own plans for total control of the western Maghrib, resolved to have him removed. Accordingly, when Masālah b. Ḥabūs next appeared on the scene in 307/919–20, Mūsā contrived to convince his cousin of the necessity to rid the Idrīsīd, taking the road to Fās, Masālah succeeded in seizing and deposing Yahyā, who was then banished by Mūsā to Aṣāyla (Arzila). Thereafter, Fās remained under Fāṭimid control until 313/925, when the courageous and enterprising Idrīsīd al-Hāsān b. Muhammad b. al-Kāsim, known as al-Hadjdjam (some sources: Hadj-Jam, an area dangerously close to al-Andalus. In 314/927 'Abd al-Rahmān had taken his first step in a policy of defensive expansion by occupying Malīla (Melilla) and, by 316/928–9, he had opened negotiations with the Idrīsīds. By way of retaliation Mūsā had attacked and utterly crushed the Umayyād’s Rīfān vassal, al-Mu'ayyad, the Sīlahīh ruler of Nakūr [Q. V.], a small principality situated between Tīwān (Tetuān) and Malīla. In 319/931 'Abd al-Rahmān III, now an impressive potentate who had, at the end of 316/early 929, proclaimed himself amīr al-mu'āmmalin [Q. V., q. v.], took possession of Saṭib and transformed it into a North African bulwark against any possible Fāṭimid invasion of Spain. With the Umayyād seizure and fortification of Saṭib came Mūsā’s realisation—possibly prompted by a visit from Umayyād emissaries—that 'Abd al-Rahmān was now in a commanding position and well able to bring him to heel, should he feel so inclined. Mūsā therefore suddenly abandoned his allegiance to the Fāṭimids and with it his position as the official representative of their authority in the West. His allegiance he forthwith transferred to Cordova.

When the news of Mūsā’s defection eventually reached 'Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī in Irfikyi, he duly arranged for Humayd (some sources: Hamid) b. Yaṣīl, nephew and successor of Masālah b. Ḥabūs, who had died in battle in 313/924, to launch an offensive against Mūsā (320/933). Worsted in the plain of Maṣūn (Msoon), a little to the east of Tāzā, Mūsā fled, abandoning Fās to the Fāṭimid general. Once Fāṭimid forces had left the region, Mūsā again affirmed his recognition of the Umayyād Caliph’s sovereignty in the western Maghrib.

In 322/934 'Ubayd Allāh died and was succeeded
by al-Kā'im bi-amr Allāh [q.v.]. Encouraged by the news of the former's death, Mūsā b. Abī 'l-Āfiya enlisted the aid of one Ahmad al-Qaddamī and succeeded him in his position (325/935). His triumph was short-lived: within a few months, al-Kā'im's forces were beneath the walls of Fās, led by a fātā named Maysūr, and Mūsā was obliged to flee as the Fāsiūns themselves came to terms with the enemy and agreed to recognize al-Kā'im. The victory of the latter's troops marked the end of Mūsā's political career.

The precise date, place, and manner of his death are matters which our sources make hard to determine. One account (in Raʾūd al-kiṭārāt) has it that, as soon as Maysūr had finished with Fās, he pursued the fleeing Mūsā, who fought a series of losing battles, in which the Idrīsīds—now re-established in the Rif and north-western Morocco with new loyalties—played a prominent part; that after a life of wandering through the desert and such territories as remained under his control from Adjarsīf, i.e. Garsīf (q.v.), he died in the mid-9th century; that after a life of wandering through the desert and such territories as remained under his control from Adjarsīf, i.e. Garsīf (q.v.), he died in the mid-9th century; that after a life of wandering through the desert and such territories as remained under his control from Adjarsīf, i.e. Garsīf (q.v.), he died in the mid-9th century.

Over the years, the date of his death has been variously placed: 328/939-40 or 341/952-3; that, as ruler, he was succeeded by his son Ibrahim (d. 350/961), who was in turn succeeded by his son 'Abd Allāh (d. 360/971), the 'dynasty' disappearing with the death of the latter's son Muḥammad in 363/973-4 or, according to one chronicler, a few days before. The date of his death was either 328/939-40 or 341/952-3; that, as ruler, he was succeeded by his son Ibrahim (d. 350/961), who was in turn succeeded by his son 'Abd Allāh (d. 360/971), the 'dynasty' disappearing with the death of the latter's son Muḥammad in 363/973-4 or, according to one chronicler, a few days before.

Mūsā's death caused no momentous events in Granada. His Classical Arabic was of a high standard. He apparently had an important administrative function in Granada because he bore the title sāhib al-qiṣra ("head of the police" or "captain of the guard"); this title, however, is not considered perhaps as purely honorific. Among his pupils during his time in Granada we find Yehudah al-Lewi (d. 1141), whom he encouraged in composing poetry.

In 1090 Granada fell into the hands of the Almoravīds [see AL-MURAṬĪN, 4.], who were intrinsically the death of the Jewish community. Most of the members of the Ibn Ezra family left the city. Moses ibn Ezra, however, seems to have remained in Granada for a while; perhaps he did not have the necessary funds to flee. Finally, he succeeded in escaping to Christian Spain (Castile). He did not return to his native city and considered himself in exile for the rest of his life, although his family and friends invited him to return there. We know little about the conflicts which he had with his family; he had some disagreements, it seems, with his brother Yosef and with his own children.

He wandered around, dependent on the gifts of munificent patrons. Some of his patrons are mentioned in the Arabic dedications of his poetry, like Ibn Mūdžāhīr (Abraham b. Meʾir, who served at the court of the 'Abbāsīd king al-Muʿtamīd [q. v.]), to whom his Shamsa b. Razāyā ("The Book of the Necklace") is devoted, and who was crowned in Arabic as šāhīd ("Book of the flowers of the meadows"), contains a collection of Hebrew poems, each rhyming on ṭadžīnūs tāmm, i.e. words identical in sound, but different in meaning. Moses ibn Ezra's other poetry bears witness to his many letters to colleagues in Muslim Spain, which compensated for the loneliness of the poet in Northern Spain. He lived in towns like Saragossa, of whose inhabitants' low intellectual status other contemporaries also complained, such as the Arabic poet Ibn ʾAmārā [q. v.] and the Hebrew poet and philosopher Solomon ibn Gabirol (d. 1058 or 1070).

Moses ibn Ezra's two important Judeo-Arabic works are the Kitāb al-Muḥādara wa l-mudhdkara ("Book of Discussing and Memorising") and the Makāla bi l-Hadīkāt fi maʾal al-muṣaffā wa l-tākāhā ("The Book of the Garden on Figurative and Literarī Language"), the Muḥādara is a treatise on rhetoric, dealing mainly with the question of how contemporary Hebrew Andalusian poets should compose their poems according to the laws of the poetics of the Arabs. This book must have been written in old age, when he was in exile; a possible suggested date is ca. 1135. The book is divided into eight chapters, being apparently answers to a friend who posed him eight questions about the nature of the poetry of the Hebrews and the Arabs. The book is unique in the sense that it is the only Judeo-Arabic treatise about poetic. The book is mainly of interest from two points of view: it contains a chapter (no. 5) with a historical survey of contemporary Hebrew Andalusian literature, and chapter no. 6 (covering about half of the book) deals, amongst other subjects, with twenty-three traditional Arabic figures of speech, quoting examples from the Kurʾān, Arabic poetry, Hebrew Scripture and contemporary Hebrew Andalusian poetry. In his presentation of the figures of speech, Moses ibn Ezra was above all influenced by al-Ḥāṭimī's [q. v. in Suppl.] Hīyāt al-muḥādara, and to a lesser extent, by Ibn Rāghīb's [q. v.] Kitāb al-Unma.

The Hadīkāt deals, amongst other subjects (such as the position of man in the universe, the unknowability of God, and the intellect), following a copious
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orientation), with the metaphorical interpretation of
the anthropomorphic passages ... See also, in
addition to the general histories of North Africa and
Muslim Spain, Fournel, Les Berbers, Paris 1857-75;

earlier ("It follows from the absolute unity of God
that the Divine Essence cannot be comprehended by
the human mind, but only described by metaphor")

Book contains some references to Arabic poetry.
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Discussion and Commemoration (Poetica Hebraica).
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Maghrib his freedman Tarik [q.v.]. The latter in

92/710-11 invaded Spain, and Musa, anxious about

and at the same time jealousy of the progress made by

his lieutenant, himself crossed in the following year,

leaving his son 'Abd Allâh as governor of Ifnkiya.
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(Shadthuna [q.v.]), Carmona, Seville and Merida, he

was on his way to Toledo when Tarik came to meet

him and was bitterly reproached by his master. Musa

b. Nusayr then continued his march and completely

subjugated the north of Spain from Saragossa to

Navarre. In 95/713-14 he left Spain with immense

booty, having given his son 'Abd al-`Azîz as governor;
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when Sulayman assumed power in 96/715, he at once
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Musa b. Nusayr’s stay in Syria before his death in

98/716-17, the Arab historians give a number of
details which are obviously of quite a legendary
character.
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Musa and his troops thereupon entered on a career
of successful conquest which ended in the consolida-

tion of Muslim power in Ifnkiya and in the conquest of

the rest of North Africa and Muslim Spain, and Musa

was the most essential details. Assisted by his sons

'Abd Allâh and Marwân he sent successful expedi-

tions against Zaghwan and Sadjuma (?) and reduced

and disappeared in those parts of the eastern

limits of the Muslim power in Ifnkiya and in the conquest
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chronicles, in RT, xxix (1957), xxxii—xxxiv (1938),

xxvii—xxvii (1939) and lit (1942). Amongst the prin-
cipal historians whose works are accessible, one
may cite: Ibn `Abd al-Hakam, Futakh Misr, ed. Tor-
rey, New Haven 1922, ed.- partial tr. Gateau,
 Algiers, 2nd ed. 1948 (cf. R. Brunschvig, "Ibn
`Abdalhakam et la conquete de I'Afrique du Nord, in AIEO
Aiger, xi [1942—1947]); Ibn al-Kutiyya, Ifthath al-andalus,
ed. Ribera, Madrid 1926; Aifikhir madamou, ed.- tr.
Laurent e Acantara, Madrid 1867; Ibn `Idgari,
Bayn al-majlifi, i—ii, ed. G. S. Colin and E. Lévi-
Provençal, Leiden 1948-51; Ibn al-Athir, Kamil;
Lévi-Provençal, Nas_s asadid on s'ath al-arab li l-
Maghrîb, in Sahifat al-Mu'had Misr, ii (1373/1954),
21—8. There are biographical notices
devoted to Musa b. Nusayr in Ibn Khallîkîn,
Wafayat, ed. I. `Abbasî, v, 319—29, no. 748; Ibn
al-Farâdi, Ta[9]h_ 'alamâ' al-andalus, no. 1453; Dabbi,
Bughyat al-mulâmis, no. 1334; Ibn al-Abbar, al-
Huila al-`iyânîh, ed. Mu'nis, Cairo 1964. See also, in
addition to the general histories of North Africa and
Muslim Spain, Fournel, Les Berbers, Paris 1957-75;
Saavedra, Estudio sobre la invagination de los árabes en España, Madrid 1892; H. Mu‘nis, Fatatur ‘andalus, Cairo 1959.

(E. Lévy-Provençal)

MUSA b. UKBA AL-ARASI (after 55-141/675-758), early Medinaan scholar and historian, especially interested in the Prophet’s expeditions or maghāţ [q.v.]. A manuscript of al-Zuhayr b. al-Awwâm’s and a pupil of al-Zuhri [q.v.], he taught in the Prophet’s mosque in Medina, showing in his work the characteristic, increasing emphasis of the Medinaan school on ismâ‘l and also displaying a concern in giving dates for the events which he describes. His Kitab al-Maghâţ, transmitted by his pupil al-Thabrânî b. Ibrâhîm b. ‘Ukbâ, has not survived as a complete work, although one fragment survives and it was cited by later writers such as Ibn ‘Isâkh, al-Wâkidî and al-Tabarî.


MUSA ČELEBI (?-1413); Ottoman prince, son—probably the youngest—of Bayezid I [q.v.]. At the battle of Ankara in 1402, he fought in the rear of the contingent commanded by his father (Nizam al-Dîn al-Shâmî, Zafar-nâmê, ed. F. Tauer, Prague 1937, 255) and seems to have fallen into Timur’s captivity at the same time as Bayezid (cf. the Relazione of Gerardo Sagredo, dated 12 October 1402, in M.M. Alexandria-Derscu, La Campagne de Timur en Anatolie, repr. London 1977, 130). Nizâm al-Dîn Şâhîmi (op. cit., 60) asserts that Timûr’s men found him and brought him into Timûr’s presence after the battle. He appears to have remained in Timûr’s custody until his father’s death in 1403, when Timûr released him and sent him with his father’s coffin to Ya‘kûb, the lord of Germîyân [q.v.]. Ya‘kûb released him into the custody of his brother Mehemmed (I) [q.v.] in Bursa, but only after Mehemmed had defeated and expelled their third brother, Išâ (Anonymous chronicle, Bodleian Library, Oxford, 65. Marshall 313; quoted serbatim by Neghri, ed. F.R. Unat and M.A. Kâymen, Kitâb-ı Chânâmâmî, i, Ankara 1949, 419; ii, Ankara 1957, 423-31). Despite several conflicting traditions to the contrary (e.g., Enwerî, Diisûrâmâmê, ed. M.H. YÎnanç, Istanbul 1928, 91; orûc b. ‘Adîl, Tavârîhî-î ‘Al-Ôgîmân, F. Babinger, Hanover, 37, 105) it is probable that between 1403 and 1405, Mehemmed remained in the custody of his brother Mehemmed. In this year, Mehemmed released him, evidently as a political instrument in his war against his brother Sûleymân Čelebi [q.v.].

In 1409, Sûleymân Čelebi ruled in Rumelia and in Ottoman Anatolia as far east as Ankara (see E.A. Zachariadou, Sûleymân Čelebi in Rumîli and the Ottoman chronicles, in Isl., lx [1983], 268-90). As presented in the Anonymous chronicle (Bodleian, Marshall 313, serbatim in Neghri, ii, 473-9), Mehemmed requested Mehemmed to release him, so that he could seize Rumelia from Sûleymân Čelebi and rule there as Mehemmed’s vassal. Before his departure, he visited Mehemmed, the lord of Kârâmân [q.v.], and Isfendiyâr-oghîl Mûbâriz al-Dîn, the lord of Sinop, presumably to seek their co-operation in an alliance against Sûleymân Čelebi. From Sinop, he travelled to Wallachia. Here he concluded a marriage alliance with the voyvoda Mircea—a also an enemy of Sûleymân Čelebi—and, with the assistance of Wallachian troops, invaded Sûleymân’s territory (Neghri, loc. cit.). His success was immediate. At this time, Sûleymân Čelebi was in Anatolia. The fortresses in Rumelia acknowledged Müsâ’s overlordship; he occupied Edirne (q.v.) (P. Schreiner, Die Byzantinischen Klenkchroniken, i, Vienna 1975, Chronicle no. 96, p. 636) and, by May 1410, Gallipoli (Gelibolu [q.v.]). With this fortress in his possession, he was able to prevent Sûleymân’s crossing the Straits (St. Stanoevitch, Die Biographie Stefan Lazarevic’s von Konstantin dem Philosophen als Geschichtsquelle, in Archiv für Slavische Philologie, xviii [1876], 442). However, with assistance from the Byzantine Emperor Manuel, Ibrâhîm b. Shâmî al-Kurhânî, who was able to cross the Bosphorus and, on 15 June 1410, to defeat Müsâ at Konmition (Hasköy) (Schreiner, loc. cit.). Müsâ fled to his temporary ally Stephen Lazarevîç, the Despot of Serbia (M. Braun, ed., Lebensbeschreibung des Despoten Stefan Lazarevic’s von Konstantin dem Philosophen, Wiesbaden 1956, 33). Müsâ soon returned to Rumelia, and the civil war continued into the autumn of 1410. A Ragusan report of August 1410 comments that Sûleymân Čelebi was the most successful of the warring princes (Stanoevitch, op. cit., 444-5). Nevertheless, Müsâ emerged victorious. In February 1411, he advanced from Yambol to Edirne and, according to both Greek and Turkish traditions, attacked Sûleymân when he was drunk. As his own troops began to desert him for Müsâ, Sûleymân Čelebi fled. In 17 February 1411, M. Butschke’s agents captured and killed him (Schreiner, loc. cit.; Neghri, ii, 484-7).

The death of his brother left Mûsâ as sole ruler in Rumelia. However, immediately on his accession, Stephen Lazarevîç allowed his men to pillage Mûsâ’s territory, and the Byzantine emperor sought to prolong the Ottoman civil war by releasing from custody Sûleymân Čelebi’s son Orghan (Stanoevitch, op. cit., 447). It was this act of provocation that led Müsâ, in the autumn of 1411, to lay siege to Constantinople. This operation was unsuccessful, not so much, it would appear, as a result of a Greek victory over his naval force (Laonicus Chalcocondyles, Historiarum libri decem, ed. I. Bekker, Bonn 1843, 176-7), as through the desertion of several lords of Rumelia. Müsâ’s vassal, George Branîckîvîc, the nephew of Stephen Lazarevîç, fled to the Byzantine emperor Manuel; the Ottoman lords Mîkhâilîghî [q.v.] Mehemmed and Djandarlî [q.v.] Ibrâhîm fled to Mûsâ’s brother in Anatolia (Braun, op. cit., 44-5).

The Anonymous chronicle (serbatim in Neghri, op. cit., ii, 488-9) reports that Djandarlî Ibrâhîm informed Mehemmed that the lords of Rumelia wished to overthrow Mûsâ, who had aroused their hatred by killing some of their number and confiscating their property. These desertions seem to have emboldened Mehemmed to attack his brother. In the spring of 1412, he crossed the Bosphorus with the help of Manuel, and attacked Mûsâ at Inceâig (Neghri, ii, 490-5). Mûsâ was victorious, but after the battle, two more of his lords, Pasha Yîgit and Mîkhâilîghî Yusuf, deserted him, fled to Stephen Lazarevîç, and plundered Mûsâ’s realms with Serbian troops. In the autumn of 1412, Mehemmed again crossed the Bosphorus with Manuel’s help to attack Mûsâ, but again turned back, as bad weather and swollen rivers blocked his passage (Braun, op. cit., 46-8).

On Mehemmed’s withdrawal to Anatolia, Mûsâ attacked his ally, Stephen Lazarevîç. He set out from Sofia at the beginning of January 1413, seized Vranja in the Morava valley and laid siege to Novo Brdo (ibid., 49-50). A Ragusan report of 8 March 1413, describes this siege, but not where it was fought elsewhere (St. Stanoevitch, op. cit., 448). In Serbia, he
apparently conquered Sokolac, Lipovac, Bolvac, Srvjilj, Stalac and Koprion (Braun, op. cit., 50). The probable reason for Mūsā’s ending this successful campaign was the news that Ogašan, the son of Sulejman Celebi, had landed in Thessaloniki, presumably released again by the Byzantine emperor. Mūsā departed from Serbia to Albania (ibid., 50), and it was probably at this time that he formed an alliance, by marriage to his daughter, with the despot of Ioannina, Carlo Tocco (G. Schirò, Cronaca dei Tocci di Csfalonia di Anonimo, Rome 1975, 360). From Albania he marched to Thessaloniki, destroyed the fortified monastery of Chortiates on the Kassandra peninsula (Braun, op. cit., 50). From here he returned to Edirne.

In the meantime, Stephen Lazarević had sent an envoy to Mehmed, urging him to attack Mūsā from the east, while he attacked from the west with Serbian, Hungarian and Bosnian troops (ibid., 50). Mehmed evidently agreed and announced a campaign against Mūsā, presumably in the spring or early summer of 1413. With an army which included troops from his father-in-law, the lord of Duleghad (Neshri, ii, 533), he crossed the sea of Marmara in ships provided by Manuel. At Vize he received word from Ewrenos (g.v.) that his son Barak, Paşa Yigit, and Sinan Bey of Trikkala would desert Mūsā and join him at Pirot. From Vize he marched to Pirot and on to the Morava valley (Neghri, ii, 513-21), where he concluded a treaty with Stephen Lazarević (Braun, op. cit., 53), and received soldiers from Ewrenos and John VII Palaeologus, the governor of Thessaloniki. Near Kosovo he received a further Serbian contingent, and troops under the command of Mūsā’s erstwhile ally, Hamza Bey, the brother of Djineyed of Ayoč (g.v.). Despite desertions, when Mūsā encountered Mehmed’s army on 3 July 1413 (ruled 136-58/754-756; Braun, op. cit., 53-4).

Three years after Mūsā’s death, Shaykh Badr al-Dīn (g.v.), whom he had appointed as kādi’eskīr (g.v.), led a rebellion against Mehmed I in Rumelia, apparently hoping to win support from Mūsā’s former ally before he became Hamza Bey had dispossessed following the defeat of his brother.

Bibliography: The most reliable narrative sources for Mūsā Celebi appear to be the account of the Ottoman civil war in the Turkish Anonymous chronicle, copied verbatim by Neghri; Constantine the Philosopher’s Serbian Life of Stephen Lazarevic; and the Greek Short chronicle listing events of the Ottoman civil war (references given in article). All these appear to be the work of contemporaries or near-contemporaries. Coins and documents from the time of Mūsā are extremely scarce. For coins, see A.C. Schaendlinger, Osmanische Numismatik, Brunswick 1973, 89, 156. For documents, see P. Wittek, Zu einigen fruhmoslimischen Urkunden (II), (III), repr. in Wittek, La formation de l’Empire ottoman, ed. V. L. Ménage, London 1982; E.A. Zachariadou, Early Ottoman documents of the Pre-doroms Monastery (Serres), in Südostforschungen, xxii (1969), 3. Modern studies of Mūsā Celebi are N. Filipović, Princ Mūsa i izaj Bedredin, Sarajevo 1971, and the relevant chapters in E. Werner, Die Geburt einer Grossmacht — Die Osmanen, Weimar 1985. Modern studies strongly reflect the theory that Mūsā Celebi and his kādi’eskīr Badr al-Dīn were social and religious egalitarians. For a narrative of Mūsā Celebi’s reign, see C. Imber, The Ottoman Empire, 1300-1491, Istanbul 1990, 67-73. (C. Imber)

Mūsā al-Haḍī [see al-Haḍī].
Mūsā al-KāziMi ("who restrains himself" or "who keeps silent"), the seventh Imam of the Twelver Shi’ites. He is known as Abu ‘l-Hassan al-Awwal (or al-Mādi), Abū Ibrāhim, Abū ‘Ali, and al-Abd al-Sālih. He was born at al-Abwā’ (between Mecca and Medina) or in Medina on 7 Safar 128/8 Nov. 745. Other dates given are Dhu ‘l-Hijja 127/Sept. 745 and 129/747-48. His mother Ḥamdā (or Humayda) bint Sā’īd al-Barbariyya (or al-Andalusīyya) was an amm wa’lad bought from a Berber slave-dealer; she is often referred to as al-Maṣaṭīfī, "the purified".

Little is known of al-KāziMi’s early life; in the story of the Zaydi al-Nāṣir al-Uṭrīsh (d. 304/917) he is said to have taken part in the revolt of Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allāh against the ʿAṣḥābis in 143/756 (cf. W. Madelung, Der Imam al-Qāsim ibn Ibrāhim, Berlin 1965, 160; see also Abu ʿl-Farāḍī al-Isfahānī, Maṭāṭī al-ṭulbiyyīn, 277). He first came into prominence at the death in 148/765 of his father Dja’far al-Sādīk (g.v.). This event led to splits in the ShiʿFi community over the succession. Al-Sādīk’s son and designated successor Ismā‘īl predeceased his father, while a second son, Abū Allāh, died shortly after his father, leaving no male offspring. These two sons nevertheless both had their followers: the proto-Imāmīyya and the Faḍhiyya respectively. There also arose a group called the ʿalīyya and the ʿilīyya (compare ʿalīyya), which, like the imāmāte should go to another son, Muhammad, and a further group, the Naʾsāisyya, who affirmed that Dja’far had not died and would reappear as the Mahdī. According to Twelver belief, in contrast, al-KāziMi had already as a boy been designated by his father as the future Imām. Al-KāziMi’s imāmāte was supported by some leading ʿalīyya, including ʿAbd al-Hakam b. al-Hakam (g.v.); others withheld their recognition for a time.

When the ʿAbbāsids caliph Abū Dja’far al-Maṣūr (ruled 136-58/754-757; g.v.) received news of al-Sādīk’s death, he reportedly sent spies to Medina to discover the identity of the appointed legatee and have him killed. Al-Sādīk is said to have anticipated this move, and to have let it be known shortly before his death that he appointed five legates, including al-Maṣūr (in first place) and Mūsā al-KāziMi; thus the caliph’s plan was foiled.

Al-KāziMi adhered to a quieterist policy. He devoted himself to prayer and contemplation and, like his father before him, spread the ShiʿI doctrine among his disciples. Yet this did not spare him from harassment by the ʿAbbāsids. Al-Maṣūr’s son and successor al-Mahdī (ruled 158-69/775-85) brought al-KāziMi to Baghdad as a prisoner. There the Imām is said to have been placed in charge of the prefect of police, al-Musayyab b. Zuhayr al-Dabbī (d. 175/791-2 or 176/792-3), who became a follower of his. If this report is true, then al-KāziMi’s arrest could not have taken place during al-Musayyab’s governorship of Khurasan, which lasted between 163/779-80 and 166/782-3 (cf. al-Tabarī, iii, 500-1, 517). According to a less reliable account, 166/782-3 is the date of al-Musayyab’s appointment as governor; see al-Kaṭīb al-Baghdādī, xiii, 137). Al-KāziMi’s detention seems to have been brief; his release reportedly followed a dream in which ‘Alī b. Abī ʿĀlib appeared before al-Mahdī and berated him for arresting al-KāziMi. Al-Mahdī made al-KāziMi promise that he would not rebel against him or any of his children; he then gave the Imam the bai’a and sent him back to Medina (cf. al-Tabarī, iii, 533).

According to some reports, al-KāziMi was again in danger after the collapse in 169/786 of the revolt of al-
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Husayn b. CAH Sahib Fakhkh [q.v.]. Although al-Kazim had refused to support this revolt and had warned al-Husayn that he would be killed, the caliph al-Hadi (ruled 169-70/785-6) accused him of instigating the uprising and planned to have him killed. He was, however, dissuaded from this intention by the kādī Abū Yusuf Ya‘kūb b. Ibrāhīm [q.v.] and died soon after. Al-Kazim is said to have composed the prayer known as al-Djawshan (“coat of mail”) in gratitude for his deliverance (see Ibn Tawīs, Muḥād al-dawwāb, Tehran 1322, 217 ff.).

In a similar story, a respected Sunn! scholar from Baghdad describes how, shortly before al-Kazim’s death, al-Sindl Tawus, Abu Yusuf Ya‘tion by the kādī in gratitude for his deliverance (see Ibn Tawīs, Muḥād al-dawwāb, Tehran 1322, 217 ff.).

When news of al-Kazim’s relatively comfortable situation was communicated to al-Raḥīd (who was at al-Rakka at the time), the angry caliph sent al-Faḍl a written order to kill al-Kazim. One account has it that al-Faḍl refused and was given one hundred lashes, while al-Kazim was transferred to the prefect of police al-Sindl b. Șāhak (grandfather of the poet Kughaḍjīn [q.v.]). Al-Faḍl’s father Yâyha b. Khālid hastened to al-Rakka and, in an attempt to placate al-Raḥīd, promised that he would do whatever the caliph wished. Al-Raḥīd repeated his order to have al-Kazim killed; Yâyha returned to Baghdād and conveyed the message to al-Sindl, who brought about al-Kazim’s death by serving him poisoned fresh dates (rubāb). In another account it is al-Faḍl who is depicted as having al-Kazim poisoned. According to a third report, it is his brother Muhammad who was warned by the ahdāf of his danger and was transferred to death. Finally, it should be noted that al-Tabarl, iii, 649, mentions al-Kazim’s death without comment, thus implying that he died of natural causes. This is indeed the view of most Sunni authors, and it is also favoured by some modern scholars (e.g. F. Omar, art. HĀRŪN AL-RĀHĪD; A. Cloet, Haroun al-Raḥîd et le temps de Mâle et Une Nuit, Paris 1896, 51). The dates most commonly given for the Imam’s death are 6, 24 or 25 Radjab 183/13, 31 Aug. or 1 Sept. 799; other dates are 181/797-8, Radjab 182/Aug.-Sept. 798, Radjab 184/July-Aug. 800, 186/802 and 188/804. He died at a prison (or mosque) near the Kūfā gate known as al-Musayyab (after al-Musayyab b. Zuhayr).

The manner of al-Kasim’s death as described in Twelver sources presented Twelver theologians with a problem: for if the Imam, who is supposedly omniscient, knew in advance the time and manner of his death and did nothing to prevent it, did he not thereby assist in bringing about his own demise (mu‘in ‘ala nafṣī)? One answer, ascribed to al-Kāzim’s son, the eighth Imam ‘Alī al-Ridā [q.v.], is that al-Kāzim indeed knew of his impending death and made all the necessary provisions, but that at the crucial moment God made him forget this information (lit. “threw forgetfulness over his heart”, al-kād kalbihi ‘l-nisydri). According to another tradition, al-Faḍl b. Yâyha al-%Barmakī brought al-Kazim poisoned fruit on three successive days, but the Imam would not touch it. When the food was brought in on the fourth day, the Imam called out, “My Lord, you know that if I had eaten it before today I would have assisted in my own destruction”. He then ate the fruit and became sick. The next day a physician was sent to examine him; al-Kazim first ignored him, but at the physician’s insistence he finally showed him the palm of his hand, which had turned green from the effects of the poison. The physician then told the ‘Abbāsids that al-Kazim was well aware that he had been poisoned; al-Kazim died shortly thereafter (Ibn Bībawāyh, Ḥusayn, 186-8; idem Amāli, 130-1). The implication is that the Imam knew the exact date of his death and took the poison in accordance with his knowledge that he was about to die. A respected Sunni scholar from Baghdād describes how, shortly before al-Kasim’s death, al-Sindl...
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assembled eighty leaders of the community and brought them to al-Kazim in order, as he said, to give them to ruminate that the Imam had been maltreated. Al-Kazim acknowledged that he had been accorded comfortable living conditions, but then added: “I have been given poison in seven (or nine) dates; tomorrow I shall turn green (from the effects of the poison) and the day after tomorrow I shall die”.

“At that”, the Sunni scholars reports, “I saw al-Sinâdi b. Shāhak, shake and tremble like a palm-leaf” (al-Kulmî, al-Kāfî, i, 256-9; Ibn Bâbawâyh, Ūyân, i, 79).

A different version has it that the Imam was not at liberty to do as he pleased, and was forced to eat the poisoned dates (Ibn Bâbawâyh, Ūyân, i, 70-2).

According to some Shi'i accounts, al-Kazim’s death was a direct result of the sinful behavioural of his community: as al-Kazim explains, God was angry with the Shi'a and told the Imam to choose between sacrificing himself to save his followers and having the Shi's killed; he chose to protect the Shi'a at the price of his own life (al-Kulmî, al-Kāfî, i, 260). Al-Madjiî (q.v.) (Mīrât al-`ukbî, Tehran 1404/1984 ff., iii, 126-7) explains God’s anger with the Shi'a as stemming from their lack of loyalty and obedience to the Imám, coupled with their abandonment of takîyya (q.v.) (self-protection through dissimulation). This abandonment of takîyya, together with the Shi'a’s failure to become genuinely known, which in turn led to his arrest.

After al-Kazim’s death, al-Sinâdi (or rašâdî) assembled representatives of the Ḥashimīs, Tûbis and other notables of Bagdâd, uncovered the Imâm’s face and had them acknowledge that he had neither died or had merely gone into concealment and would reappear. He was buried in the cemetery of the Arab aristocracy in north-west Bagdâd (mâkâhir al-Šâhîrâs or makâhir Kuraysh) at the Bâb al-Tîbn (“the straw gate”), in the area which became known as al-Kazimiyya (cf. Le Strange, Bagdâd, 160-5). At first, a curtain or a wall was set up to avoid the eyes of the people, but the curtain was not low enough and was withdrawn (ghayba) so that some men would claim that he had died (al-Tusi, K. al-Maqâlî, 38; cf. E. Kohlberg, From Imámîyya to Ihnâ`sharîyya, in BSOAS, xxiv [1976], 531-2).

The Wakîfî split may have been occasioned by financial, and not just religious, considerations. Al-Kazim had agents (kwâlif; wukalâ') in various places, and after his death some of them are said to have refused to hand over to al-Riđâ the monies entrusted to them, arguing that Musa was the last Imam. One of them was the Kûfani Musâr b. Yûnûs Buzurg; others were 'Ali b. Abî Hâmzâ al-Bâta`îni, who is said to have been entrusted with 30,000 dinâr; Ziyâd b. Mârwan al-Kandi, who kept 70,000 dinâr; and al-Kazim’s agent in Egypt, Uṯmân b. 'Isâ al-`Amîrî al-Ru`aštî (Ruwâstî), in addition to a great deal of monies had five (or six) female slaves (gawârî), bought with the Imam’s money. According to some reports, Uṯmân later repented, freed the slaves and returned the money; other accounts indicate that he refused to hand back the money, but freed the slaves and married them off (al-Kishâhî, Ridjâl, 499-500; Ibn Bâbawâyh, Ūyân, i, 92; al-Nâdîjâshî, Ridjâl, Kumm 1407, 300, no. 817).

Al-Kazim’s death led to the creation of a particular Shi‘a branch. Those Shi‘a who denied that he had died, claiming that he had gone into concealment and would return as Mahdî, were called by their opponents al-wâkîs, “those who stop”, because they ended the line of Imâms with him and disputed the transfer of the imâmât to his son. They were also known pejoratively as al-mamûs (short for kîsh mamûs, “rain-drenched dogs”, referring either to their lowly state or to their smell, which, like that of wet dogs, was supposedly more offensive than that of a cadaver). Many Wâkîs, mostly Kûfans, defended the occultation (ghayba) of the seventh Imâm in special works, such as the one by Iyâs b. al-Râdî (in which Dja’far al-Sâdîk (referring perhaps to the two occasions on which al-Kazim was to be taken away from Medina) predicts that his son will disappear twice (inna li-Abî `l-Hassan ghaybatayn), so that some men will claim that he has died (al-Taṣîf, K. al-Qâhîbî, 38; cf. E. Kohlberg, From Imâmîyya to Ihnâ`sharîyya, in BSOAS, xxiv [1976], 531-2).
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return as Mahdi; Baṣṣūr is said to have claimed that he himself was Imam (or ... this poet owes his escape from obscurity to the use of his verses by such eminent musicians as Maqbad [q.v.].

GAS, cfar, AlI b. Dja
cations addressed to him by his brother (d. 354/965) is extant (GAS, i, 191). Among Twelver Musnad Musd al-Kdzim of Abu al-Kdfi, Tuhaf al-^ukul, i, 13-20, Ibn Shu'ba, Tuhaf al-^ukul, 283-97 respectively.

Al-Kazim’s descendants, known as Musawis, are said to account for some 70% of all sayyids in present-day Persia (Amr Tāhiri, The spirit of Allah, London 1985, 26-7).

Bibliography (in addition to references given in the article): Ps.-Nāṣib (Qafar b. Harb), Uyûl al-nihāl, ed. J. van Ess as Mas'ul al-imāma, in Frühe ma'āṣiratische Histoiregraph, Beirut 1971, 46-8. Ya'kūb, Ta'rīkh, Beirut 1379/1960, ii, 383, 414-5; Himyari, Kur al-imād, Najaf 1369/1958, 167-98; al-Saffār al-Kummi, Bāṣir al-tanādīq, Kerb 1400, 43-4; 103, 126, 138, 250-2; 254-5, 263-6, 269-276; 381-389, 411; 428-434; 427-434; Nabhakhti, Fīrāq al-^arab, ed. H. Ritter, Istanbul 1937, 51-78; 62-73, 77, 80-2, 91-3; Sa'd b. 'Abd Allāh al-Kummi, Makādat al-^arab, Dealings with Sa'd b. Khalid b. Zayd b. Harb, and praised Musaab b. al-Zubayr and Hamza b. Abd Allah and esteemed; when he wanted something, he readily purchased the item in question; he had a predilection for buying gold and silver; he treated his guests very generously; he had a predilection for buying gold and silver; he treated his guests very generously; he had a predilection for buying gold and silver; he treated his guests very generously.

Although resident in Medina, Musa Shahawat often visited Damascos, being highly esteemed by the Umayyad caliphs; however, from a political-religious point of view, although he sided with the Zuba'yids and praised Mus'ab b. al-Zubayr and Hamza b. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Zubayr, he does not seem to have had any particularly decisive opinions. In any case, his surviving epigrams show no evidence that his foreign origin inspired Shu'ubī sentiments in him. He took the opportunity to address laudatory verses to Fāṭima bint al-Hasan, while the fact that he had dealings with Sa'd b. Khālid b. 'Abd Allāh al-^Uṯmānī—of whom he was rather critical—and of Sa'id b. Khālid b. 'Abd Allāh b. Asīd—who helped him in purchasing a slave—have produced conflicting opinions among those writers who have discussed his work. It is probable that his output was not particularly abundant; all that remain are a few fragments of compositions written to meet specific circumstances—eulogies and epigrams—and this poet owes his escape from obscurity to the use of his verses by such eminent musicians as Maqbad [q.v.].
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MUṢA B. ABD ALLĀH b. MUṢA b. Thābit b. ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr b. al-Awāmī b. al-Zubayr, Ābu ʿAbd Allāh, genealogist who owes his fame to his works, the Kitāb al-Nasab al-kabīr, considered to be lost, and the Kitāb Nasab Kuraysh, edited by E. Levi-Provencal, Cairo 1953.

This Kurayshite was born in Medina, probably in 156/773, a descendant of the Companion al-Zubayr b. al-ʿAwāmī b. al-Zubayr, Ābu ʿAbd Allāh, genealogist who...[q.v.]. Handsome, chivalrous, generous to the utmost degree, he had already attracted attention by his elegant character, and particularly from his attitude to his mother, who is depicted as a model in memory of the old privilege of the Quraysh.
degree of prodigality, he resembled his older brother and the Zubayrid family only in his courage and outbursts of severity in repression.

He began his military career at the outset of the caliphate of Marwan b. al-Hakam, with an ill-conceived expedition in Palestine. His name has gone down in history chiefly owing to his campaign, in his capacity as governor of Irak, against al-Mukhtar b. Abi 'Ubayd [q. e.], who was occupying Kufa and constraining him to exercise his authority only in the region of Basra. It was in fact to put an end to the disturbance created by this Shi'ite rebel that his brother 'Abd Allâh had in 67/686 entrusted him with responsibility for the Irak province. On his arrival in Basra, he pronounced a threatening khutba which led to the expectation of an energetic action; alluding to the surnames given to his predecessors, Babbâ and Kubâ', he stated that he claimed for himself that of "butcher" (qazzâr). Nevertheless, he was soon to display his concern for those under his administration by ordering the construction, in order to limit the spreading of the Batîha [q. e.], of a dike to which he gave his name, while he appropriated for himself the lands thus gained from the marshes ('Abd al-Malik was later to concede them to his followers).

It was shortly after his arrival in Basra that he began his struggle against al-Mukhtar, whose supporters he defeated at al-Madhar [see MAYSAN] then at al-Madhar [q. v.], which took place about the middle of Djumâda I 72/October 691. 'Abd al-Malik offered Musabbihi his life for the last time in the government of Irak, but in vain. Thrown from his horse, the Zubayrid received the coup-de-grâce from an avenging Baktr, 'Ubayd Allâh b. al-Hurr al-Musabbihi, of a family originally from Harrân in the Djamâra, was born at Fustat Misr on Sunday, 10 Radjab 366/4 March 977 and died in the region of Basra. The following year, a Syrian army commanded by the same Khalîd came to camp at Dju'farat Nafi'/Dju'fart Khalîd, hence the name Dju'fiyya given to these troops; Musabbihi raised an army with difficulty and gained only a semi-victory over his adversary. Furthermore, he could not for long resist the population, who were showing themselves more and more hostile, while the Umayyad pressure increased. Nevertheless, the troops massed at Baghumaya avoided engaging in hostilities, and it was only when Musab bihi moved towards Dayr al-Djahlalî [q. e.] that events came to a head. Besides, his position was critical, the Basrans having refused to follow him. The best troops of the province were far away with al-Muhallab, engaged in an interiminable campaign against the Khârijis. The troops around the Zubayrid displayed only moderate enthusiasm. His officers, tired of his iron hand, were prepared to betray him and entered into negotiations with 'Abd al-Malik. The Marwânî was not stingy in his promises. He also tried to negotiate with Musabbihi, who, learning of the perfidy of his followers, rejected all offers and decided to die like a brave man. Among his followers Ibrâhîm b. al-Aghtar [q. e.] alone fought vigorously in the battle; the others folded their arms during the fighting or went over to the Syrian ranks. 'Abd al-Malik offered Musabbihi his life for the last time with the government of Irak, but in vain. Thrown from his horse, the Zubayrid received the coup-de-grâce from an avenging Baktr, 'Ubayd Allâh b. al-Hurr al-Musabbihi, of a family originally from Harrân in the Djamâra, was born at Fustat Misr on Sunday, 10 Radjab 366/4 March 977 and died in the region of Basra. The following year, a Syrian army commanded by the same Khalîd came to camp at Dju'farat Nafi'/Dju'fart Khalîd, hence the name Dju'fiyya given to these troops; Musabbihi raised an army with difficulty and gained only a semi-victory over his adversary. Furthermore, he could not for long resist the population, who were showing themselves more and more hostile, while the Umayyad pressure increased. Nevertheless, the troops massed at Baghumaya avoided engaging in hostilities, and it was only when Musabbihi moved towards Dayr al-Djahlalî [q. e.] that events came to a head. Besides, his position was critical, the Basrans having refused to follow him. The best troops of the province were far away with al-Muhallab, engaged in an interiminable campaign against the Khârijis. The troops around the Zubayrid displayed only moderate enthusiasm. His officers, tired of his iron hand, were prepared to betray him and entered into negotiations with 'Abd al-Malik. The Marwânî was not stingy in his promises. He also tried to negotiate with Musabbihi, who, learning of the perfidy of his followers, rejected all offers and decided to die like a brave man. Among his followers Ibrâhîm b. al-Aghtar [q. e.] alone fought vigorously in the battle; the others folded their arms during the fighting or went over to the Syrian ranks. 'Abd al-Malik offered Musabbihi his life for the last time with the government of Irak, but in vain. Thrown from his horse, the Zubayrid received the coup-de-grâce from an avenging Baktr, 'Ubayd Allâh b. al-Hurr al-Musabbihi, of a family originally from Harrân in the Djamâra, was born at Fustat Misr on Sunday, 10 Radjab 366/4 March 977 and died in the region of Basra. The following year, a Syrian army commanded by the same Khalîd came to camp at Dju'farat Nafi'/Dju'fart Khalîd, hence the name Dju'fiyya given to these troops; Musabbihi raised an army with difficulty and gained only a semi-victory over his adversary. Furthermore, he could not for long resist the population, who were showing themselves more and more hostile, while the Umayyad pressure increased. Nevertheless, the troops massed at Baghumaya avoided engaging in hostilities, and it was only when Musabbihi moved towards Dayr al-Djahlalî [q. e.] that events came to a head. Besides, his position was critical, the Basrans having refused to follow him. The best troops of the province were far away with al-Muhallab, engaged in an interiminable campaign against the Khârijis. The troops around the Zubayrid displayed only moderate enthusiasm. His officers, tired of his iron hand, were prepared to

It was shortly after his arrival in Basra that he began his struggle against al-Mukhtar, whose supporters he defeated at al-Madhar [see MAYSAN] then at al-Madhar [q. v.], which took place about the middle of Djumâda I 72/October 691. 'Abd al-Malik offered Musabbihi his life for the last time in the government of Irak, but in vain. Thrown from his horse, the Zubayrid received the coup-de-grâce from an avenging Baktr, 'Ubayd Allâh b. al-Hurr al-Musabbihi, of a family originally from Harrân in the Djamâra, was born at Fustat Misr on Sunday, 10 Radjab 366/4 March 977 and died in the region of Basra. The following year, a Syrian army commanded by the same Khalîd came to camp at Dju'farat Nafi'/Dju'fart Khalîd, hence the name Dju'fiyya given to these troops; Musabbihi raised an army with difficulty and gained only a semi-victory over his adversary. Furthermore, he could not for long resist the population, who were showing themselves more and more hostile, while the Umayyad pressure increased. Nevertheless, the troops massed at Baghumaya avoided engaging in hostilities, and it was only when Musabbihi moved towards Dayr al-Djahlalî [q. e.] that events came to a head. Besides, his position was critical, the Basrans having refused to follow him. The best troops of the province were far away with al-Muhallab, engaged in an interiminable campaign against the Khârijis. The troops around the Zubayrid displayed only moderate enthusiasm. His officers, tired of his iron hand, were prepared to

This privilege did not prevent his brother 'Abd Allâh from receiving the news of his death with the utmost indifference and even of his reproaching him for being too fond of women, by way of a funerary oration. He was also able to reproach him for rudeness and being inclined to insults which he uttered against his adversaries, whose weak points and more or less falsified genealogies he made efforts to acquaint himself with in order to better the combat them.

Bibliography: Djâbiz, Bayân, i, 318, ii, 95; idem, Hayâwân, ii, 195; Ibn Kutayba, Ma'arif, index; Tabari, index; Aghârî, index; Balâd-qurî, Ansâb al-ashrâf, iv, v, index, xi; 5-4, 8, 10, 16-19, 23-4; Mawdûdî, Murâdî, index; Ibn al-Aghârî, Kâmil, iv, 123-4, 137, 139; H.D. van Gelder, Muhâbr dar intêsâm eftefe, Leiden 1888, 125 ff.; Ch. Pellat, Mîritu, index; see also the Bibl. of the art. al-Muṣâ'Urb t. Abi 'Ubayd. (H. Lammens-[Ch. Pellat])

MUṢĀBAṢA [see maydân]

AL-MUSABBÎHAT (A.) "those which give praise" is the name given to a group of Karâ'î̈n sûras from the middle Medinan period, LVII, LXI, LXII, LXIV, so-called because they begin with the phrase sâbâha ya yasubhâhu lî 'l-îlahî. The designation seems to be old; cf. Muslim, Za'kât, trad. 119. See further, Nödecke-Schwally, G. des q, i, 186, 245, ii, 45; and kur'ân, 7, towards the end. (Ed.) AL-MUSABBÎHÎ, Fâtimî historian (366-420/977-1030).

AL-Amir al-Mukhtar 'izz al-Mulk Abu 'Abd Allâh or Abu 'Abd Allâh Abu Muhammad b. Abi 'l-Kâsim 'Ubayd Allâh b. Ahmad b. Isma'îl b. 'Abd al-Azîz al-Harrâni al-Musabbihi al-Kâbitî, of a family originally from Harrân in the Djamâra, was born at Fustât Migr on Sunday, 10 Radjab 366/4 March 977 and died in the same town in Rabî' II 420/April-May 1030. Contrary to the conventions of the Fâtimî period, a time when professional soldiers were Berbers, Turks, negroes, Slavs, Sicilians, Persians, Daylamis, or Arabs descended from a great tribal family, al-Musabbihi, although a Sunnî citizen of Fustât, entered military service, wa-kâna 2âlî ziyy al-adnâf. The post of governor of Kays and of Bahnaâs which he held at the outset and the military title of amir given to him by his biographers seem to confirm the fact. Later, he was appointed head of the division al-râthî (or al-tâthî which should not be confused with the division al-râthî which was concerned with military pay),
equivalent to the post of general secretary of the central administration. However, he lived until his death in Fustat Misr, a short distance from the Nile and the Mosque of ‘Amr. Returning from his daily work in the city of Cairo, every evening he encountered in this venerable mosque the friends of his father (who died at Miṣr Fustat in 400/1009-10), and his own friends, men of traditional Islamic culture, often of Syrian origin. A devout Sunnī, he nevertheless loyally served the Fātimid régime and was particularly attached to the personality and subsequently to the memory of the Imam al-Hākim, who had been the only member of this dynasty to mingle on familiar terms, at the outset of his reign, with the inhabitants of Fustat. Al-Musabbihī is known as a prolific and versatile writer who addressed, in the tradition of al-Djahiz, the most diverse of subjects: practical psychology, sexology, cookery, grammar and law. Ibn Khallīkān and Ibn Sa‘īd al-Andalusī provide a detailed list of his works and specify the number of pages, exceeding a thousand in some cases, thirteen thousand for the history of Egypt, approximately forty thousand in total. Almost all of these works disappeared at a very early stage, and the authors who mention them know only their titles and length. Apart from a few brief quotations from his history dispersed among later compilations, the only specimen of his writing which has survived is the last chapter of the manuscript preserved in the Escorial in Spain, an ancient but not autographical manuscript, the fortieth chapter of his history of Egypt, recording events of a few months of the year 414/1023-4 and the greater part of the year 415/1024-5. This manuscript also contains poems and letters by various authors with whom al-Musabbihī was acquainted. This provides an insight into the contemporary literary composition, in elegant prose and poetry, of Egypt and ‘Irāq at the beginning of the 5th/11th century. The dedications and commentaries on authors also contain details of interest to the historian, particularly with regard to the conversion to Islam of the Jacobite bishop of Takrit, Abū Musallam Mushqarāh b. ‘Ubayd Allāh, in 407/1016-17, a bishop who conducted a correspondence with the men of the present. A single manuscript, al-Ma‘arrī for al-Maghribī, see Nassar, pages 106-7.

The first page of this manuscript contains a note written by al-Makrizī declaring that he has read it and has found it useful. It may be noted that the two aforementioned years are dealt with in greater detail in the latter’s Itṭiḥād al-hunafā‘ī wa-tawdī‘iha wa-ghardī‘ibuhd wa-md bihd min al-bikdī wa ‘l-khulafā‘ī wa ‘l-kuddū wa ‘l-a‘imma wa ‘l-khulafā‘, 1-345/956-7 and 368-395/1004-5. See also Th. Bianquis, Damas et la Syrie sous la domination fatimide, Damascus 1989, ii, 393-4.

The complete title which he gave to the history of Egypt, Aḥḥār Mīrs wa-fudā‘a‘īna wa-‘a‘dī‘īna wa-‘l-a‘dī‘īna wa-‘l-tawdī‘iha wa-‘l-khulafā‘ī wa-‘l-kuddū wa-‘l-a‘imma wa-‘l-khulafā‘, shows that he was passionately attached to this land, a passion shared by an earlier historian, Ibn Zūlāk, author of the Fadīl Mīrs, and later to be demonstrated by al-Makrizī with his Khitat. Al-Musabbihī writes the history of the present. He records events of the day and then, at the end of the year, puts together the obituaries of people whom he considers important and who have died during the preceding twelve months. The same death is thus sometimes reported twice; in the second version, time having alleviated the shock caused by the news of the death, judgment of the deceased person may have been modified. He records the various aspects of life in Fustat: road accidents, thefts, misdemeanours and crimes, public punishments, hippopotami wallowing in the Nile. He is regularly obliged to consult record of the low-level police authorities in Fustat and those of the higher police authorities based at al-Katā’i. He is also aware of proceedings in the administrative centre of Cairo, where he is present every morning. He records all the political gossip of an age in which power is extremely violent. In military commanders and civil administrators resort to all sorts of weapons, including the use of informers and the dissemination of forged documents, in order to discredit their opponents in the eyes of the Imam al-Zahir, a credulous youth mainly preoccupied with recreation. Al-Musabbihī describes in detail the spectacular ceremonies of homage to the Imam which took place at the Palace. Curiously, he describes with equal attention to detail both those at which he is present and those which he misses on account of illness. Al-Musabbihī regards with considerable suspicion the entourage of Sitt al-Mulk and, after the death of the latter, the cabal of courtiers which gathered around the young al-Zahir. He seems to regret the passing of the time of the caliph al-Hākim, who is particularly interested in news brought back from Syria by the postal service. This province, prosperous at the beginning of 414, was in 415 subjected to a very violent Bedouin invasion, and al-Musabbihī suggests that the mistrust of the central authorities towards the commander-in-chief, al-Duzbarī, was partially to blame for this. Al-Makrizī did not properly understand the text which he had before him, and he invented out of nothing a continuation of it. The second version of the manuscript which he produced under the year 415 in the Itṭiḥād and which contains errors and contradictions.

authority over the Sunni population of Fustat Misr by the apparatus of the Fātimid state, after a period in which al-Hākim had seemed willing to listen to public opinion, it is possible that ideological control was imposed on official historiography and that a certain number of texts, including the writings of al-Musabbihī, were spontaneously destroyed. For traces of al-Musabbihī (the years 345/956-7 and 368-415/978-1025) in later Egyptian historiography, see Cl. Cahen, Quelques chroniques anciennes relatives aux derniers Fatimides, in BIFAO, xxvii (1937). According to ayyūn Fuad Sayyid, Diamètres nouvellés sur quelques sources de l’histoire fatimide, in Annales Islamologiques, xiii (1977), al-Makrizī possessed the 34th chapter which is said to have dealt with the year 395/1004-5. See also Th. Bianquis, Damas et la Syrie sous la domination fatimide, Damascus 1989, ii, 393-4.

The complete title which he gave to the history of Egypt, Aḥḥār Mīrs wa-fudā‘a‘īna wa-‘a‘dī‘īna wa-‘l-a‘dī‘īna wa-‘l-tawdī‘iha wa-‘l-khulafā‘ī wa-‘l-kuddū wa-‘l-a‘imma wa-‘l-khulafā‘, showed that he was passionately attached to this land, a passion shared by an earlier historian, Ibn Zūlāk, author of the Fadīl Mīrs, and later to be demonstrated by al-Makrizī with his Khitat. Al-Musabbihī writes the history of the present. He records events of the day and then, at the end of the year, puts together the obituaries of people whom he considers important and who have died during the preceding twelve months. The same death is thus sometimes reported twice; in the second version, time having alleviated the shock caused by the news of the death, judgment of the deceased person may have been modified. He records the various aspects of life in Fustat: road accidents, thefts, misdemeanours and crimes, public punishments, hippopotami wallowing in the Nile. He is regularly obliged to consult record of the low-level police authorities in Fustat and those of the higher police authorities based at al-Katā’i.

He is also aware of proceedings in the administrative centre of Cairo, where he is present every morning. He records all the political gossip of an age in which power is extremely violent. In military commanders and civil administrators resort to all sorts of weapons, including the use of informers and the dissemination of forged documents, in order to discredit their opponents in the eyes of the Imam al-Zahir, a credulous youth mainly preoccupied with recreation. Al-Musabbihī describes in detail the spectacular ceremonies of homage to the Imam which took place at the Palace. Curiously, he describes with equal attention to detail both those at which he is present and those which he misses on account of illness. Al-Musabbihī regards with considerable suspicion the entourage of Sitt al-Mulk and, after the death of the latter, the cabal of courtiers which gathered around the young al-Zahir. He seems to regret the passing of the time of the caliph al-Hākim.

He is particularly interested in news brought back from Syria by the postal service. This province, prosperous at the beginning of 414, was in 415 subjected to a very violent Bedouin invasion, and al-Musabbihī suggests that the mistrust of the central authorities towards the commander-in-chief, al-Duzbarī, was partially to blame for this. Al-Makrizī did not properly understand the text which he had before him, and he invented out of nothing a continuation of it. The second version of the manuscript which he produced under the year 415 in the Itṭiḥād and which contains errors and contradictions.
A consummate historian, al-Musabbihi gives precise accounts of economic affairs. With the aid of his chronicle, it has been possible to sketch an analysis of the differential evolution of wholesale and retail prices at the time of a famine suffered at Fustat (Th. Biaquiss, Une crise frumentaire dans l'Egypte fatimide, in JESHO xxiii [1978], 67-101). Similarly, the precision of his description of state financial institutions facilitates a better understanding of the budget, expenses and receipts, of the Fātimid state (idem, Le fonctionnement financier des diwan s centraux dans l’Egypte fatimide, contribution to the Symposium marking the year 1400 of the hijra, Damascus 1980).

Bibliography: Editions in chronological order:


(Th. Biaquiss) AL-MUS‘ABĪ, ‘Abu ‘l-‘Ayyub Muḥammad b. Ḥātim, official and poet in both Arabic and Persian in Bukhāra during the Ṣan‘ānīds, flor. early 9th-10th century. Better-known in his time as a statesman than as a poet, he was a boon-companion, then chief-secretary (ṣamā‘i dī ‘isasān-risālat) and finally vizier in the reign of Ṣa‘īd b. Ahmad (301-31/914-43); but he fell from power, and opposing the appointment of the new vizier ‘Abd ‘Al-Dījānyānī [see Al-Dījānyānī in Suppl.] in ca. 326/938, was executed (Bayhaqi, Ta‘rīkh-i Bayhaqi, ed. Ghani and Fayyād, 107; Gardāzī, Zayn al-‘ādār, ed. Nazim, 32; Barthold, Turkistan 1, 245).

Al-Tha‘lībī (Yatima, iv, 15-16, ed. Cairo, iv, 97-8, tr. Rabier de Meynard, in JA, ser. 5, vol. i [1853], 196-7) gives specimens of his Arabic verses, whilst G. Lazard gives what survives of his Persian ones (Les premiers poètes persans (IXe-Xe siècles), Tehran-Paris 1342/1964, 1, 23, 75-4, 48-9); according to Lazard, the fact that Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī (read thus for Lazzard’s “al-Sījzjānī”) [p. e. r. appears to have dedicated to him a work on the Karamita [p. e. r. may indicate that al-Mus‘abī had Ismā‘īl’s sympathies, such trends of thought being known to have existed in Transoxania during Nasr b. Ahmad’s reign (cf. Barthold, op. cit., 342-4).

Bibliography: Given in the article, but for further references, see Lazard, op. cit., i, 23.

(C.E. Bosworth) MUṢĀDARA (A.).

1. In mathematics, muṣādārat are premises or postulates (Gk. ἀρχαὶ). See also Muṣādarāt, Muṣādarāt al-ulām, ed. van Vloten, 203; E. Wiedemann, Beiträge XIV, in SBPM Ed., xi (1908), 4 and n. 2 = Aufsätze zur Geschichte der Wissenschaftsgeschichte, Hildesheim 1970, i, 403.

2. In the administrative terminology of the mediaeval Islamic caliphate, muṣādarā is firstly “an agreement with someone over the payment of taxation due”, according to al-Khā‘rāzī, op. cit., 62 (the synonym of mufṣāra); cf. C.E. Bosworth, ‘Abd ‘Abdallāh al-Khā‘rāzī on the technical terms of the secretary’s art, in JESHO, xii (1969), 130.

The most-frequent found meaning for this term is, however, “the mulcting of an official (usually) ill-gotten gains or spoils of office”. The meaning here seems to stem from that above, via the idea of compelling an official to account for his financial gains, and then to forcible confiscation, often with violence and torture; or it may be, as Fleischer suggested, a much more abstract thing in itself (‘ṣamā‘i ḫidrāt), in which we find not only muṣādarā but also the terms muṣābala and mansūra with the same connotation of “seeking out, requiring an accounting, exacting, extorting money”. The practice of requiring officials to disgorge at least part of the spoils from their official duties dates back to Umayyad times, and was practised e.g. by al-Ma‘ṣūrī b. Yusuf [p. e. r. Lok. (N. 279-35) A. de Vogel, ‘The origin of a special organ of the administration for this purpose, given in the 3rd-4th/9th-10th centuries the name of dīwān al-muṣādarāt or dīwān al-muṣādarār in [see DĪWĀN. i] are ‘Abbāsid, and may lie in the special treasury the bayt māl al-muṣādarāt, which al-Manṣūr set up for keeping the illegally-obtained monies recovered from disfledged official agents, monies which were eventually restored to their original owners by al-Mahdī (al-Tabari, iii, 415-16, Eng. tr. H. Kennedy, Albany 1990, 119; Levī, Social structure, 307). From the end of al-Ma‘ṣūrī’s caliphate, the dīwān al-muṣādarā becomes definite shape, and the process of extracting money from dismissed official agents becomes general under al-Wāthīq; Sourdrel has suggested that the caliphate’s financial position worsened at this time through the expenses of the move to Sāmarrā and increased interference in the running of the administration by the Turkish military (Vicerat, i, 264). Al-Wāṣīqī’s vizier Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Malik b. al-Zayyāt distinguished himself by his relentless harrying of secretaries and officials, but was hoist with his own petard when the new caliph al-Mutawakkil subjected him to torture and death in Ibn al-Zayyāt’s own tannur, an iron cylinder with spikes inside it (cf. the Iron Maiden of Nuremburg) which he had used for the muṣādarā of his victims (see al-Mas‘ūdī, Mū‘ājji, vii, 913-4 = § 2782; Sourdel, i, 261-4, 268-9; art. Ibn al-zayyāt). Under al-
Mutawakkil also, we hear of Nadjah b. Salama, the secretary in charge of the diwdn al-tawki^ under al-Muktadir and his successors more and more parlous, the process of musdara, almost always accompanied by tortures, became the norm to which financial officials relinquishing their posts were subjected. In the time of al-Mu'tadid's vizier Muhammad b. 'Ubayd Allah al-Khâkânî, the director of the diwdn al-musddarin in his lifetime that the term is strictly used with their confiscated lands and property (Sourdel, i, 261-4). As the finances of the caliphate became in the 4th/10th century under al-Mu'tadid and his successors more and more parlous, the process of musdara, was less than 30, the minimum legal age for election as a Deputy, and he was therefore disbarred. In 1909-10 he visited

Albany, 1989, 157, and Sourdel, i, 280-1). Enormous sums were extracted by these means; thus Ahmad b. al-Khâjâj al-Djârdjârî, formerly secretary to the Turkish general Aghnas and later vizier to al-Muntajir, was made to disgorge a million dinars by Ibn al-Zayyât towards the end of al-Wâhîb's reign (Sourdel, i, 261-4). The practice was taken over by some at least of the succession states to the 'Abbâsid caliphate, e.g. by the Ghzawiwids [q. v.] in the East. At the fall in 416/1025 of Mahmud of Ghazna's vizier Ahmad b. Hasan Maymandi [q. v.], one of the latter's enemies was brought specially from Khorasan to act as musÎkârîdî [q. v.] "extractor of information, ferreter out of hidden wealth", and other high officials were roughly handled after dismissal. That suffered by Mahmud's former treasurer Ahmad Inâtilgîn is said to have been a contributory cause of his later rebellion as governor in Iran. In March 1967. His father came from a prominent family in the 9th/15th century, when the Ottoman treasury started regularly to seize certain types of property left behind, upon death, by eminent officials [see MUSHALLEFAT]. The scope of the practice expanded as the state started to consider all those who died while serving the state to be the sultan's slaves; it nevertheless often excluded the 'ulama'. Later, in the 11th/17th and 12th/18th centuries, any person who had prospered through a financial transaction with the Ottoman state came under the threat of confiscation. Confiscations and their release in cash increased especially during campaigns when a revenue crisis developed around the payment of soldier's salaries. The confiscation of the inheritances of the merchants or officials who were known to have cash stocks particularly escalated during these periods; to escape such confiscations, many invested their vast properties in 'ahkât, bequests, mortgages, and endowments. As confiscations disrupted Ottoman economic transactions, imperial decrees at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th centuries frequently assured that "the inheritance of those who did not have any accounts with the state would not be confiscated" (Buyurdu 1-2/12 in 1808). The practice of musâdara was abolished in the early 19th century by sultan Mahmûd II [q. v.]. Bibliography: Gâib-Bowen, i/2, 28-30; M. Zeki Pakalân, Osmanlı tarikâdî ve terimleri tâbiâti, Istanbul 1953, 624-6; Seyyid Muftârî Nûrî, Nâzî'î 'ü-l-aâlâ-vidî, Istanbul 1909, i, 148, ii, 102, iv, 99; Ahmed Lüftî, Târik-h-i Lüftî, Istanbul 1873, i, 144; M. d'Ohsson, Tableau général de l'Empire ottoman Paris 1788-1824, vii. I.H. Uzunçarşilî, Osmanlı devletinin sanayi teşkilâtı, Ankara 1984 edition, 78; TOEM, Istanbul 1911, xix, 79.

The practice of confiscation derived initially from the Islamic law that the master of a slave is his sole heir [see 4ABÎ]; by analogy, the Ottoman sultan was considered the exclusive inheritor of his slaves. The emergence of this practice can be traced back to the 9th/15th century, when the Ottoman treasury was less than 30, the minimum legal age for election as a Deputy, and he was therefore disbarred. In 1909-10 he visited

MUSADDAS [see MUSAMMAT].

MUSADDIK, MUHAMMAD (MOSADDEGH), Persian nationalist politician and Prime Minister in the period 1951 to 1953. Born in Tehran during 1882 (the precise date is uncertain), he died there on 5 March 1967. His father came from a prominent land-owning family, the âgháyáníns, and held various senior posts in the financial administration of the country. Musaddik's mother was a great-granddaughter of Fath 'Ali Shah, and one of her sisters was a wife of Mu'assaf al-Dîn Shâh. On his father's death in (7) 1894 the boy received the title Musaddik al-Sâlta, from which he later derived his family name when these became mandatory. After a traditional private education, he received his first administrative post at the age of 16 in the province of Khorâsân. Four years afterwards he married a granddaughter of Nâšîr al-Dîn Shâh, by whom he later had two sons and three daughters.

Musaddik's first entry into national politics was controversial. After the creation of the National Assembly in 1906, he stood for election to it as one of the candidates from Isfahân and was successful. When he attempted to take his seat, however, another representative from Musaddik threatened to obstruct the proceedings of the Assembly, claiming that the minimum legal age for election as a Deputy, and he was therefore disbarred. In 1909-10 he visited
Paris, where he studied for a short while before his already poor health forced him to return home. In 1911 he enrolled at the University of Neuchâtel and in 1914 he was awarded a doctorate for a thesis on Islamic law. On returning to Tehran that year, he taught at the School of Political Sciences, and wrote on several economic and legal issues including the sensitive one of foreign Capitulations. In 1916 he became a deputy Minister of Finance. By the end of the following year, he was again living in Switzerland, largely because of his poor health and the chaotic state of Persia at that time.

Like many of his fellow countrymen, both at home and abroad, Muşaddîk was strongly opposed to the terms of Britain's proposed new treaty with Persia in 1919; and he shared the view that it was an ill-disguised attempt to strengthen and perpetuate British influence in Tehran. In 1920 he accepted the offer of the post of Minister of Justice and returned by sea from Europe. It is an indication of the disorganisation then prevalent throughout Persia that, on reaching Shîrâz from Bûshahr, some of the city's notables prevailed upon him to accept the vacant post of Governor of Fârs, which he then held from the late autumn of 1920 to the early spring of 1921. When Sayyid Dâyâ' al-Dîn became Prime Minister in March 1921 he ordered the detention of Muşaddîk, who fled to Abadan. On returning to Tehran later in the year, he was appointed to the new position of Governor of Adharbaydžan. That post he held for less than five months. In June 1923 he became Minister of Foreign Affairs, but his relations with Riḍâ Khân were now far from harmonious and he resigned from the government in the following September. In February 1924 Muşaddîk entered Parliament for the first time, as a member for Tehran; and he appears to have preferred the relative freedom of debate which then prevailed to the restrictions and burdens of administrative office. Given his family background, it is perhaps not surprising that he opposed Riḍâ Khân's rise to power and on several later occasions he chose to side with the government in the following Shah's, even with that of the Kâdjârs. By 1930 the monarch could no longer tolerate Muşaddîk's criticisms and he was banished to his lands at Ahmadâbâd some 75 miles west of Tehran. After some years, the restrictions on him were relaxed and he visited Berlin for medical treatment. In 1940 he was again detained and sent into exile at Bîrdjand but was later permitted to return to Ahmadâbâd. Following the Anglo-Soviet invasion of August 1941, Riḍâ Shâh was forced to abdicate, and his son then declared an amnesty for political prisoners; Muşaddîk was one of its beneficiaries.

Muşaddîk's former opposition to the Pahlawi dynasty now stood him in good stead, and in the elections for the fourteenth Madjlîs in 1943 he won the greatest number of votes cast for any of the capital city's 30 Deputies. The allied occupation of Persia caused quite serious economic problems concerning inflation and the distribution of food. These, in turn, fuelled popular resentment against foreign powers. When, in 1943 and 1944, two international oil companies, followed by the Soviet government, made demands for the granting of new oil concessions in Iran there was widespread opposition inside and outside Parliament. Muşaddîk introduced a private member's bill in November 1944 which sought to prevent any future relinquishment of such concessions until the end of the war, when all foreign troops were supposed to leave Iran. It also sought to prohibit government ministers from discussing matters relating to foreign concessions without explicit parliamentary approval. On 2 December Muşaddîk's bill was passed by the Madjlîs.

Muşaddîk was re-elected to the fifteenth Madjlîs which opened in July 1947, and the government later sought its approval for a new oil agreement which had been negotiated with the USSR. The opposition to this was overwhelming, and the agreement was rejected. With Soviet participation in the oil industry now excluded, it was likely that attention would turn to British involvement. During the allied occupation, Muşaddîk had begun to formulate the principle of "negative equilibrium". This called for Iran to establish its future independence on the basis of strict neutrality, and all foreign influence and concessions were to be rejected. It was the view of many urban Iranians that, as the British government held the majority of shares in the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company (A.I.O.C.), the Company was in effect an agent of British influence in Iran. Relations between the Iranian government and A.I.O.C. were not therefore just a matter of economics; for Muşaddîk, as for many other Iranians, the political relationship was paramount.

Since 1947 the Company and the Persian government had been negotiating a new arrangement concerning royalty payments, and an agreement was initialled by the two parties in July 1949. It was to be debated in the National Diet the following month, the Madjlîs in December 1950. Muşaddîk, who was Chairman of that parliamentary committee, had by now begun to establish the National Front (Disbaya-yi Millî), a very loose association of many diverse political groups. It spoke out against the new agreement, as did the much more disciplined communist Tîdî party. The most important source of support for the growing anti-British sentiment was the opposition to the A.I.O.C. came, however, from an influential religious figure, Âyâtullâh Abu 'l-Kâsim Khâshî [q.v.]. As anti-British sentiment rose, the Shâh had appointed a senior officer, General 'Alî Razmârâ, as Prime Minister in June 1950, but he was assassinated by a supporter of Khâshî on 7 March 1951. During the following month, the Madjlîs passed legislation for the nationalisation of the oil industry and 29 April the Shâh appointed Muşaddîk as Prime Minister.

Muşaddîk, who had little personal knowledge of the oil industry, and who seems never to have visited Abâbâd, believed that the A.I.O.C. would rapidly capitulate. But the Company was by no means exclusively dependent on petroleum supplies from Persia. When the government in Tehran tried to put pressure on A.I.O.C., e.g, by revoking residence permits for its staff, the Company evacuated them in October 1951; but oil production was already at a virtual standstill. The Company's offer to submit the dispute to arbitration under the terms of the existing 1933 agreement was rejected by Muşaddîk. Repeated efforts by various British and American officials to reach a negotiated settlement also failed, as did an attempt by representatives of the International Bank, and in October 1952 the Iranian government severed diplomatic relations with Britain.

Muşaddîk's hopes that the United States government would put pressure on Britain to settle the dispute also proved ill-founded. In January 1952 US military aid for Persia was suspended for three months and in June 1953, after the failure of another joint US-British diplomatic approach, President Eisenhower declared that US aid to Iran kind would be provided for Persia unless the oil dispute with London was settled by negotiation or submitted to an international neutral body.

Meanwhile, domestic political and economic condi-
tions had begun to deteriorate. During 1952 Musaddik started to take extraordinary measures to preserve his weakening political position. In February 1952, the supporters of the sixteenth Madjlis were dismissed and the elections were held. When it was clear that support for Musaddik was waning, voting in many constituencies was halted and a truncated parliament convened with Musaddik remaining as Prime Minister. On 17 July, when the Shah refused his request to take over the Ministry of War too, Musaddik resigned and was replaced by Ahmad Kawam. Supporters of the National Front and the Tūda then fomented riots in several towns and cities, and on 22 July Musaddik was re-appointed as Prime Minister. A cowed and manipulated Madjlis voted on 3 August to give Musaddik full powers over economic, judicial, administrative and military matters for six months. (Those powers were renewed by the Madjlis in January 1953.) Army officers and legal officials known to be opposed to Musaddik were dismissed and sent into internal exile. In October 1952, the Senate was dissolved as it too was proving to be a source of political opposition. Musaddik, with the support of the Tūda party, then tried to restrict the political powers of the Shāh, and many of the Prime Minister’s former political allies—including influential figures such as Kāshānī, Husayn Makki and Muzaffar Bakāʻi—expressed public doubts about Musaddik’s avowed commitment to the principle of constitutional rule.

This pattern of events had been watched with growing alarm in Washington, where the United States government feared that Musaddik was now bent on establishing a dictatorship which might then seek closer relations with the USSR. By the summer of 1953, Musaddik knew that his domestic political base was much weaker and in July a highly dubious referendum was organised. It was then claimed that this showed massive popular support for Musaddik and for his dissolution of what remained of the seventeenth Madjlis.

Events came to a head on 16 August when the Shāh attempted to replace Musaddik as Prime Minister. Musaddik refused to yield and the Shāh, in a panic, fled abroad. Widespread rioting occurred between pro- and anti-royalist groups; the former were by now receiving active American support. On 20 August, the army, under General Fadl Allāh Zāhidī, succeeded in arresting Musaddik and the Shāh returned to Tehran. Musaddik was then placed on trial before a military court and charged with high treason. On 21 December he was found guilty and sentenced to three years’ solitary confinement. After that sentence had been served, he spent the rest of his life quietly at Ahmadābād.

Bibliography: The book by Farhad Diba cited below includes, in appendix IV, a list of books and articles by Musaddik, including his doctoral dissertation. Much of the literature about him, in European languages as well as in Persian, remains partisan and some is hagiographical. An objective biography has still to be written. Farhad Diba’s Messageh: a political biography, London 1986, is an admiring, but not always accurate portrayal. A volume of conference papers, Musaddiq, Iranian nationalism and oil, edited by J.A. Bill and W.R. Louis, London 1988, contains a wide range of material and views. Its bibliography of works in Persian and English is comprehensive, and rather than repeat the list of major works from which the reader is referred to pp. 341-9 of that book. While it was in the press, a few additional details of the 1953 coup appeared in a work by one of those associated with planning it, D.N. Wilber, Adventures in the Middle East: excursions and incursions, Princeton 1982. R.W. Ferrier’s History of the British Petroleum Company, vol. ii, Cambridge, forthcoming, will contain much detailed information on the negotiations between the A.I.O.C. and successive Iranian governments. E. Abrahamian, Iran between two revolutions, Princeton 1982, provides a detailed survey of the modern political history of Iran.
314/926 of the Sadjid [q.v.] Yusuf, Adharbaydjan became the scene of the struggle between the Khāndjī Kurī Daysam b. Ibrāhīm and Lāşkhārī b. Mardāl, a native of Gilân, whom the Ziyārid Wushmagird supported alternately. Lāshkhārī died in Armenia, and Daysam was betrayed by his vizier Abu ʿl-Kāsim ʿAlī b. ʿAlaʾfar who had come to an arrangement with Marzubān, for both were Bāṭīnīs, i.e. Ismāʿīlīs (Miskawiyah, ii, 32). Marzubān occupied Ardañīl and Tabriz, and finally Daysam surrendered to Marzubān and received from him a castle in Tārūm. Marzubān extended his rule as far as Darband. In 332/943-4 the Scandinavian adventurers (Rūs [q.v.]) came by the Caspian and the river Kur and took the capital of Arrān [q.v.], Bardāʿ [q.v.], in spite of the resistance of the subjects of Marzubān. At the same time, the Hamdānīs of Mawṣīl had conceived designs on Adharbaydjan, and Marzubān had to deal with a force under ʿAbd Allāh Husayn b. Sāʿīd b. Hamdān and the Khaṭṭān Kurī ʿAlaʾfar b. Shākīyā, which had reached Salmā [q.v.] but was soon recalled to Mawṣīl by Nāṣir al-Dawla. On the other hand, the Rūs, decimated by disease and harassed by the Muslims, beat a retreat (cf. the other hand, the Rus, decimated by disease and soon recalled to Mawsil by Nasir al-Dawla). On the invitation of king Kasrawī, Shahriyārīn, Dūrūm [district of Siunie], of Ahar and Warzakan (north-east of Tabriz), of Khīzān (north of Bākū?), as well as the Arslanids, Bagratids and the princes of Khaṭṭān (west of Bardāʿa).

Waḥsūdān and his nephews. Marzubān died in Ramaḏān 346/Dec. 957, and while bequeathing the power to his brother Waḥsūdān, forgot to cancel his first will by which his sons Dūṣṭān, Ibrāhīm and Nāṣir were to succeed him in succession.

The commanders of the fortresses would not surrender them to Waḥsūdān, who returned to Tārūm in disgust. Dūṣṭān b. Marzubān was recognised by his brothers, but was only interested in his harem. Marzubān’s old general Dūṣṭān b. ʿAlī converted the seat of power to Adharbaydjan. He later wandered in Georgia and in the hope that he would be able to organise his forces. Daysam, who had time to take Ardābīl, was defeated by Dūṣṭān b. Marzubān and the latter, abandoned by all his soldiers, soon afterwards died at Ardābīl, prisoners. Ismāʾīl soon afterwards died at Adharbaydjan, and laid Tarūm waste while Waḥsūdān sought refuge in Daylam. Meanwhile, Waḥsūdān’s general Shārmaẓan b. Miṣkīti, however, succeeded in defeating Ibrāhīm and the latter, abandoned by all his soldiers, sought refuge with his brother-in-law Rukn al-Dawla, who had married a daughter of Marzubān (355/966).

Rukn al-Dawla with his usual chivalry heaped favours on Ibrāhīm, and sent to Adharbaydjan his famous minister Ibn ʿAlīʾAmīd [q.v.] who reinstated Ibrāhīm. Waḥsūdān was replaced by his brother Dūṣṭān b. ʿAlīʾAmīd, who thoroughly impressed by the wealth of Adharbaydjan, proposed to Rukn al-Dawla to annex this province, but his master recalled him to Rāy, saying that he did not wish to be accused of coveting the inheritance of one who had sought his protection. After the return of Ibn ʿAlīʾAmīd, matters went badly and from the allusions in Miskawiyah we know only that Ibrāhīm was deposed and imprisoned (probably about 369/979, the year in which the Tadārīt al-unum stops).

The end of the Mūsafīrids. In the Muslim sources, the situation in Adharbaydjan till 420/1029 is obscure, but the statements of the Armenian historian Stephen Asolīk, Hist. universelle, part ii, book iii, tr. Macler, Paris 1917, chs. 11, 12, 18, 19, 29, 38 and 41, enable us to fill the gaps. According to Kasrawī, in 369/979, Ibrāhīm b. Marzubān was dispossessed of his lands in Adharbaydjan by the Rūhsuʿīd family (on which see the articles MARĀḠA, MARĀN, TABRĪZ, and Kasrawī, Shahrīyarīn, ii). The Son of Ibrāhīm Abu ʿl-Haydāja (the “Abhād Deltamastī” of Asolīk) retained Dīwān [q.v.], and on the invitation of king Mughul of Kars in 982-3 made an expedition into Armenia, where he desecrated the churches. This Abhādji later lost all his lands to his neighbour Abūlṣūp of Gohñī (i.e. Abū Dulfā Shāykhīnī, lord of Orduhād [q.v.]). He later wandered in Georgia and uncertain name of a district north of Shīrāwān; cf. Marquart, Streifzüge, 174: *Abkhan*, of Shākīkī [q.v.], of ʿAbd, of Dījzār wa-Saḥḥāyīn (Gurizwīn and Saḥḥāyīn to the west of Shīrāwān), of Vayots-drz (district of Siunie), of Ahar and Warzakan (north-east of Tabriz), of Khīzān (north of Bākū?), as well as the Arslanids, Bagratids and the princes of Khaṭṭān (west of Bardāʿa).
Armenia, and even visited the Byzantine emperor Basil II; he was killed by his servants at Ukhrūk (Olt).

Finally, another Abhādān, son of Rwād, amīr of Atrāpakān (Abū 'l-Haydājī b. Rwādāw of Abhādān), took from Abū Dūlar the "towns of Salar and after sucking Gok'tn marched on Dvin, seized this town and demanded from the Armenians the arrears of tribute" (Asolkī, ch. xviii.). King Simbat II hastened to accede to the demand. The Rawwādīs thus gained possession of the remainder of the possessions of the Mūsāfīrīds, of whom they claimed to be the successors. There is no reason to connect the Abār-Kurd Rawwādīs with the Mūsāhībīzādīn who were of Daylāmī origin, although there may have been intermarriage between the two families.

The Tārum branch. After the disappearance of the descendants of Marzūbān, Tārum, the original sīf of the dynasty, alone remained in their hands. Wahsūdān had extended his power over the adjacent districts of Zanjān, Abhar and Suhraward (the latter name is usually mutilated in the sources). A šāfīdā of al-Mutanābbī (Kasrawī, op. cit., i, 45) dated probably to 354/965 suggests that Rukn al-Dawlaw lived Wahsūdān from Tārum for a time, but his family had remained there, for from Yākūt, iii, 148-50, we learn that in 379/989, the Būyid Fakhr al-Dawlaw took Shāmīrān from the young son of Nūh b. Wahsūdān, whose mother he married (the child's name was probably Djustan; cf. Yākūt, i, 45). Kasrawī, in 387/997, after the death of Fakhr al-Dawlaw, Ibrāhīm b. Marzūbān b. Ismā'īl b. Wahsūdān seized the fortress of Sardjihan and Tārum. In 411/1020, "Salār Ibn al-Dawlaw" took possession of the remainder of the possessions of the Mūsāfīrīds, who were of Daylāmī origin, although there may have been intermarriage between the two families.

Nāṣir-i Khursaw, who was in this region in 437/1045, speaks in high terms of the lord of Shāmīrān Djustan (b. Ibrāhīm). His title was 'Marzūbān al-Abādān Djustan Abū Salīh, Mawāl Amīr al-Mu'āminin.

Under 454/1062, Ibn al-Athlr records the visit of the Ṣāliḥīk Toghrūl Beg to Tārum, where he imposed a tax of 100,000 dinār on Mūsāfīrīs, who is the last Mūsāfīrīd known. From Yākūt's words, we may conclude that the Ṣāliḥīs of Alamūt put an end to the rule of the family when they dismantled Shamlran. The Mūsāhībīs were of Daylāmī origin, although there may have been intermarriage between the two families.

During his childhood, Mūsahībīzādīn showed a deep interest in Karagoz[^3], the Turkish shadow play as a civil servant in different government offices.

people in the 17th and 18th centuries. Their tunes contain motives of the Turkish classical music. In those plays, the author side-stepped the ruling institution, which led to the decay of the Ottoman Empire, were shown and the comic element, usually consisting of overstatements and irony, was always in the foreground. Turkish traditions and conventions, life in the harem and selânilık, superstition, fanaticism, bribery, indulgence in sex, ignorance, inefficiency and laziness of the ruling body of the time, unequal treatment of women, oppression, inadequacy of the educators, and a blind admiration shown for western culture, were the popular themes of his plays, which he skilfully handled with a sense of humour. He avoided direct judgments, but gave his message through implication. He was in favour of a simple life, based on fairness, love, tolerance and honesty, and showed a great sympathy towards the humble characters of moderate social standing, in honesty, and showed a great sympathy towards the people of the country. He believed that those people had lost their sense of judgement and had thus become degenerate. This social touch is common to almost all Muşahib-zade Djelâl’s plays. His characters speak different dialects indicating their origin and social status, but differ from the latter in the sense that he reflects his close observation. He also made great use of folkloric elements. Typical Ottoman settings, like coffee-houses, gardens, house-interiors, streets, market-places and a great variety of local types with their original costumes, musical instruments and a lot of other accessories make his plays colourful and full of details but at the same time quite difficult for staging.

Muşahib-zade Djelâl wrote eighteen comedies, most of them with music composed by different composers, like Ismail Hakki Beg and Doktor Subhi Beg. Among these musical plays, Istanbul Efendisi, Aynaroz kadısı and Mum sönûda seem to be the most popular ones. They were collected and published in 1936. The names of his plays are listed below along with their performance dates: Istanbul Efendisi, 1913; Yedekci, 1919; Kasjiikcilar, 1920; Aynaroz kadisi, 1929; Gulsiim, 1930; Selma, 1931; xxx(xxxv), 1932; (with Kemal Samanci), 1955; a detailed evaluation of the Turkish national theatre by Metin And and in Cümrüyetin dönemi türk tiyatrosu, Ankara 1985; a short biography of Muşahib-zade Djelâl and excerpts from Istanbul Efendisi were published by Sükrân Kurduklu, Çağdaş türk ebediyyet meşrutiyet dönemi, vi, Istanbul 1986; see also Muşahib-zade Celâl in Ana Britannica XVI, Istanbul 1989, 315, and Masaîrah 3. In Turkey.

(M.EL. Young)

MUŞAĞAT, a legal term denoting a lease of a plantation for one crop period, with profit-sharing. The contract for such a lease is between the owner of the plantation and a husbandman (famîli), who undertakes to tend the trees or vines of the plantation for one season, at the end of which the proceeds of the crop are divided in agreed portions between the two contracting parties. The landowner’s portion constitutes his rent (șıdâr). The contract of hadith includes similar in its general features to that of musâdî (f. a.), the party to the contract; and (4) declaration of the period of the contract (whereas a contract of mûzârâ may be cancelled by the provider of the seeds for the crop up to the time they are actually sown); (2) if the term of the hadîth falls before the fruit has ripened, the husbandman has to cultivate the trees or vines without wage until the fruit ripens; (3) if ownership of the plantation is successfully claimed by a third party, and the trees are in fruit, the husbandman may claim a wage for the time he has been working from the other party to the contract; and (4) declaration of the period of the contract is not a necessary condition for the validity of hadîth (since the ripening period of any particular fruit is known in advance, and there is little variation between any two crops).

In contracts of musâdî the term “trees” (şâdâr) includes anything planted with the intention of leaving it in the ground for a year or more, i.e. any plant which has no definite term for being cut down, whether flowering or non-flowering. “Non-flowering” refers to plants which produce palm-branches, firewood, etc.

As in other contracts of şıdâr, cancellation (şâarih) may occur through either (1) the death of one of the parties (but if the trees already have immature fruit, the husbandman or his heirs are obliged to continue to tend the trees until the fruit is mature without consideration); or (2) by legitimate excuse (şâdîr).


(M.EL. Young)

MUŞALLA (a.), the noun of place from salât “to perform the Muslim worship, salât [s. a.], hence the place where the salât is performed on certain occasions.

1. Historical and legal aspects.
When Muhammad had fixed his abode in Medina, he performed the ordinary salāts in his dīr, which was also his masjid (not in the sense of temple). The extraordinary salāts, however, were performed in a place which was a part of the city in the territory of the Banū Salīma, outside the wall, northeast of the bridge on the wādī, where at present the street from the suburb of an-‘Anbariyā reaches the market-place (Abu Sa‘lī, Hist., ii, 47; Diyarbakır, Tavşık al-Khams, ii, 14; Yākūt, Muṣallā, ii, 104, 732). It is also said that the salāt for rain was held on the musalla (copious data in Tradition, cf. Wensinck, Handboek, s.v. Rain; and idem, bdb 6). On the two days of festival, Muhammad and his followers on their way to the musalla were preceded by Bilāl who bore the spear (Snææa [q.e.]).

It is also said that the salāt for rain was held on the musalla (copious data in Tradition, cf. Wensinck, Handboek, s.v. Rain; and idem, Mohamned en de Joden, 141). Further, it is related that the service for the dead was performed on this spot (al-Bukhari, Majma‘ al-Anwar, xiii, 392). The sacred character of the place appears in the fact that menstruating women were taught to avoid it (al-Bukhari, Haṣb, bāb 23). According to Caetani (A.H. 1, § 55, n. 3; cf. A.H. 2, § 24, n. 1), the musalla was used more frequently.

It was not only in Medina but in a large number of other places that the rites mentioned, or some of them, were performed on a musalla. According to al-Nawawi (commentary on Muslim’s Sahīh, Cairo 1283, ii, 296), this was the practice of most of the capitals. The custom prevails up to the present day. According to Doutté, the North-African musalla is used for the rites of 10 Dhu ‘l-Hijjah on 1 Dhu ‘l-Hijjah (al-Bukhari, Dondrz, bāb 4, 61; Wensinck, Mohammed en de Joden, 140). Finally, the musalla is mentioned as the place where executions took place (al-Bukhari, Tanh, bāb 11; al-Rabī‘i, 1: 1903). The geographical and orna-

tmental occurrence of massacres in the old musalla was used more frequently.

Since musalla denotes simply “a place for prayer”, it is not surprising that in many parts of the Islamic world the term does not imply a building at all; indeed, some musallas are temporary and fall into the category of mobile architecture. This extreme simplicity helps to explain why so few of the musallas mentioned in literary sources have survived. Nevertheless, there are occasional reports of royal patronage in the erection of these buildings, which suggests that those were not flown on occasions. Hilāl al-Sābi recounts how the caliph, his wa‘āris and other officials celebrated the beginning of the ‘id by assembling at dawn and then forming a splendidly attired and colourful procession en route to the musalla (apud M.M. Ahsan, Social life under the Abbasids, 170-299 A.H. 786-902 A.D., London, New York and Beirut 1979, 277). Al-Mā‘arrūkhī, Makbūsin Isfahān (Persian tr., ed. Ikhlāṣ, 1975), tells a similar tale. Such processions had the sanction of the Prophet’s own example. Al-Makrizī notes (Khutbat, ii, 451) that in 380/990 the Fātimid caliph al-Aziz renovate the musalla outside the Bāb al-‘Nāṣr constructed by Diwarān in 358/968-9. Nor was he the first; al-Mu‘izz had built one at al-Manṣūrīyya in 441/1050-59, and the same caliph officiated as imām when the great ‘ids were celebrated at the musalla of Raıkāda. The indoric occurrence of referring to the exacting of massacres of some architectural distinction is backed up by several scraps of physical evidence. The Mā‘mīd musalla at al-Manṣūra was decorated with panels of elaborate geometric brickwork, while that of Mashhad, 1087/1676-7, dated by an inscription, has fine tile mosaic. That of Harât had an ikhwān erected in 863/1458-9 by Sultan Abū Sa‘īd.

In its simplest form the musalla comprises merely a directional indicator—a mibrāb [q.e.]—either entirely
isolated in a huge open space, or set in a long wall. The development of the kibla [q. v.] might involve a projection of the mihrab beyond the kibla wall itself. Usually a mihrab is also provided, which can be a large permanent structure, complete with steps and a dome (as at Aswān). In more developed form (e.g., at Agra), the musalla would consist of a gigantic empty square enclosure provided with multiple entrances and with an unbroken kibla wall (e.g., Naṣīḥ, which has one, two and five entrances respectively per side, or the 8th/14th-century example at al-Manṣūra, with two entrances per side). In the eastern Islamic world, a more complex two-tier structure with a central iwān (e.g., at Turbat-i Djam and al-Bukhārā, 515/1121-2) might involve a kibla and the mihrab and the iwān flanked by domed chambers (Maghād). At al-Manāma [q. v.], the capital of al-Bahrān, Dīz recorded musalla with several naves built of rows of pillars with pointed arches which run parallel with the kibla wall. A jutting roof on octagonal brick pillars protects from the sun. The roofs consist of a layer of clay on wood. The kibla wall has no prayer niche. There are no court or side-iwāns. Further articulation could be provided by small square chambers defining the corners of the enclosure (Aswān). Sometimes trees or pools broke up the open surface of the musalla. These variations show clearly enough that there was no set form for this building type. The vast scale of the typical musalla (that of Abū Zakhraiyn in Tunis, of the 7th/13th century, which is described as "like a little town") posed special problems of communication. Hence relays of mukabharah raised above the level of the worshippers by multiple dikkas are often required to orchestrate the movements of prayer for such huge congregations. This human chain could be extended far beyond the musalla; in 380/990 in Cairo, al-'Azīz set up musabah for muezzins and fukahā along the route linking his palace with the musalla "so that the takhfr would be simultaneous from the musalla to the palace" (al-Maqrizi, Ḫithār, i, 451).

The modern expansion of many mediaeval cities has resulted in the loss of their musalla (e.g., the 8th-century musalla of Samarkand). The Konya musalla of 948/1541 is a rare exception. Often the names of city gates or quarters contain a reminder of such vanished musallas. Although exceptionally musallas might be situated outside a city (that of Aqīlījī adjoined the Friday Mosque, and that of Bukhārā was on the Rīgistan below the arg until 369/971, when a new musalla was built outside the city), most of the examples thus located have been incorporated into the urban fabric as a result of later expansion. Some of the larger modern cities have acquired more than one musalla; Karachi, for example, has no less than nine.  


3. In Muslim India [see NAMAZGAH].

MUSAMMAT (A.), [dḥr] namsmat or [kasida] musammatas, also kasida simtiyya), name of an originally Arabic (then also Hebrew, Persian, Turkish) stanzaic form of poetry. The name is derived from the Arabic simt "a thread, or string, having upon it beads or pearls; a thong, or strap; that is suspended from the horse's saddle" (cf. Lane, s.v.); the original meaning of musammat is probably "that which is arranged in strings (rows, lines)" (I. 'Abbās, Taḏkira, 221; cf., however, the etymological remarks of Ibn Rāshīd, al-'Umda, i, 180, and in Taḏkira, s.v. simt).

1. In the Arabic and Judaeo-Arabic traditions, in early Persian and in Turkish.  

Formal structure, metres, themes. The single stanzas, normally all of the same structure, consist of two elements: a first a fixed number of lines that rhyme with each other, and the rhyme scheme: aaa a, bbb a, etc. The number of lines with separate rhymes can be two (rare), three, four, five, six, and more. The four-line musammat (three lines with separate rhyme + one line with common rhyme) is called murabbā, the five-line muskammat, the six-liner musaadār, etc. There are said to exist also musammatas with stanzas displaying a varying number of lines (cf. Freytag, 405). In a particular variety of the musammat the first stanza is preceded by two introductory lines with common rhyme (aa bbb a, ccc a, ddd a, etc.): one stanza encounters the same metres (particularly ḫañīf, basīt, wafīr, ramāl, etc.) and themes (nasīr, praise, wine description, etc.) in the musammat that are also found in normal ḥmr.

The oldest specimens. The indigenous tradition attests to the existence of musammatas already in the 2nd/8th century: al-Layth b. al-Muẓaffar (d. ca. 187/803) gives an exact definition of a musammat murabbā (apud al-Azhari, Taḏkira al-lugha, xii, 348, s.v. simt). The oldest musammat known to date is ascribed to Abū Nuwās (d. 200/815 [q. v.]) (rhyme scheme: aaaa b, ccc a, etc.; metres: basīt; topic: wine and drinking party; 14 stanzas). Although this ascription is not quite certain—and Abū Bakr al-Ṣǔlī, rewrite of Abū Nuwāš's diwan, considers the poem to be spurious (cf. E. Wagner, Abu Nuwais, Wiesbaden 1964, 228)—it must date from the 3rd/9th century, since it is already quoted by Abū Ḥifūn (d. 255/869) in his Akhbār Abū Nuwas (ed. A. A. Farradj, Cairo 1953, 57 f.). The poem in question, instead of being read as a musammat, might also be viewed as a kasida with regularly applied internal rhyme (aaaa a, ...b...b...c..., etc.). The same is true for a poem...
MUSAMMAT

(metre: mutakarib; theme: nasib; three stanzas) that Abu 'l-Faradj al-Isfahani (d. 356/967) ascribes to mutakarib; theme: ca. Hammad al-Rawiya (d. 368-74). Two musammat (most frequent theme: aa bbb a, ccc a) adopts the rhyme scheme as bbb a, ccc a, etc., thus being a musammat murabba with introductory lines; written out as a kasida it looks as follows: ....a ....a ....b ....b ....b ....b, etc. Contrast this to these examples, the musammat wrongly ascribed to Imru' al-Kays [q.v.], quoted by Ibn Rashid (d. 463/1070), al-\Umda, i, 179; cf. 182, cannot be read as a kasida, because all lines of the poem have equal length. It shows the rhyme scheme as bbb a which means that it is a musammat mukhammas with introductory lines. The critic Isak b. Ibrahim b. Wabah al-Kaitib (4th/10th century) describes a musammat musaddas without introductory lines (bbbba, cccca, etc.) (al-Burhan fi wujdih al-bayan, ed. A. Matlub, Baghdat 167, 161). A musammat mukhammas (rhyme scheme: bbb a, ccc a; metre: wa'far, theme: nasib + eulogy; 31 stanzas) is included in the Diwan of the Egyptian poet Tamin (d. ca. 375/985) (ed. M. H. al-A'zami et alii, Cairo 1957, 368-74). Two muskhammas poems (both in the metre tawil; theme: ghazal (hawmi), considerably mixed with nature description; 10 and 20 stanzas respectively) were composed by the Andalusian poet Ibn Zaydun (d. 463/1070) [q.v.] (Diwan, ed. A. 'Abd al-'Azim, Cairo 1940; Ibn Hariri (d. 618/122) uses the musammat musaddas (aa a bbb a) in his 11th, 12th, and 50th makama (ed. Beirut 1958, 89 ff., 101 ff., 420 ff.).

Diffusion. The musammat, and particularly its murabba type, must have been used much more frequently than is suggested by the not exactly numerous pieces encountered in the diwans of the poets (cf. the remarks by Ibn Rashid, al-\Umda, i, 182, 2). It seems to have been particularly widespread in the 4th/10th century. Evidence for this is tierter aest the fact that the Hebrew poets who, in that century, adopted the Arabic metres and genres of poetry favoured the musammat murabba during their first steps into the new poetic art (cf. M. Hartmann, 113; S. M. Stern, 51). Some specimens can already be found with Eastern Hebrew poets (cf. Fleischer, 840 ff.); but it is especially the Andalusian Hebrew poets who use this stanzaic form (imusaddat) in Hebrew. A number of meruba\'s (bbb a, ccc a) by Dunqah b. Labrat have been preserved. Subsequently, the meruba acquires an important place in the canon of Hebrew poetry, liturgical as well as secular. A wider diffusion of the Arabic musammat murabba in non-courtly, more popular poetry is suggested by the fact that later Bedouin poetry also knows the musammat murabba alongside the kasida. This is attested for the 8th/14th century by Ibn Khalidun (Mukaddima, iii, 361) and for the 13th/19th century by A. Socin\'s collection Diwan aus Centralarabien (ed. H. Stumme, Teil I-III, Leipzig 1900-1, i, nos. 50 and 64; cf. i, 53). Lastly, one finds murabba\'s in the folk epic of the Banu Hilal (cf. S. Pantuec'ek, Das Epos uber den Westzug der Banu Hilal, Prague 1970, 123).

Takhmis. In later times, a special function has devolved upon the musammats type. It is frequently used to expand, to "gloss", an existing poem (cf. the Spanish poetic form "gloss") which means that it is a musammat mukhammas. Numerous examples can be found in the Diwan of Sa\'id al-Din al-Hill (d. ca. 752/1351 [q.v.]) (ed. K. al-Bustani, Beirut n.d., 26 ff., 36 ff., 63 ff., and elsewhere), who also composed normal musammats (cbcc cba cba, etc.). In the "glossed", e.g., the famous nujayja of Ibn Zaydun (tibd., 359 ff.), the first verse of the original poem, consisting of two rhyming hemistichs (now becoming lines), is preceded by three newly-composed lines with the same rhyme, length, and metre (+ a + a + a a); the remaining verses, each consisting of two non-rhyming hemistichs (now lines), are likewise preceded by three newly-composed lines which follow the first hemistich with regard to rhyme etc. (+ b + b + b b, + c + c + c ca, etc.). Such takhmis poems can be found in the diwans of numerous later poets.

Relationship with other stanzaic genres of poetry. The Andalusian zaqđid [q.v.] (most frequent rhyme scheme: aa a, ccc a) adopts the rhyme scheme of a musammat with introductory lines; the Andalusian musawwarah [q.v.], according to the opinion held by many scholars, has evolved from the musammat. Not to be confused with the musammat mukhammas (musaddas, etc.) is another type of musammats (musaddas, etc.), in which blocks of five (six, etc.) lines rhyme: aaaa bbb (or aaaa bbbb, etc.) (cf. M. Ullmann, Untersuchungen zur Rafa\'poesie, Wiesbaden 1966, 46 ff.).

Imitations in non-Arabic literatures. The Hebrew imitations of the musammat murabba (Hebr. meruba\') have already been mentioned in another context above. The attempt to assume a genuinely Hebrew development of the meruba\' in the older liturgical poetry (piyyutim) (Fleischer, 837 ff.) is completely normless. By to be deemed true, at least none of the Hebrew meruba\'s composed before the contacts of Jewish poets with Arabic poetry shows a true common rhyme; they all have a fixed recurrent word in its stead (aaaa w, bbb w). It is only after the contact with the Arabs, and doubtless under their influence, that the Jews have composed true musammats. At the most, one might assume that the existence of a similar type of stanza in the genuine Hebrew tradition facilitated the adoption of the Arabic musammat.

In the 9th/10th century, the Persian poet Manuchchi (d. ca. 432/1041 [q.v.]) introduced the musammat into the canon of Persian poetry. His Diwan (ed. A. de Biberstein Kazimizirski, Paris 1886, 151 ff.) contains 10 (not 11!) specimens, all belonging to the musaddas type (bbbba, cccca) (most common theme: description of nature as a prologue + eulogy of the ruler). In the Diwan of Safi (ed. M. Radawi, Tehran 1354 sh., 785 ff.) various types of musammat occur also in other Persian diwans (cf. Ruckert-Pertsch, 85 f.; Browne, ii, 41 f.). The Turks (Ottoman as well as qaghatay) adopted the musammat from the Persians (cf. Gibb, HOP, i, 91 ff.).

Around 1100 A.D. an exact equivalent of the Arabic musammat appears also in Proven\'al poetry (specimens in the collections of the oldest Troubadours, William of Aquitaine (d. 1127), Marcabrun and Cercamon) This fact, combined with the lack of a Latin, or other Romance, model for this "Arabic theory" who want to explain the genesis of the type of Provencal stanzaic poetry, is one of the strongest arguments of the proponents of the so-called "Arabic poetry" who want to explain the origin of Provencal poetry, at least in part, through influence from the Arabic.

The revival of musammats and other mediaeval Arabic stanzaic forms played an important role at the beginning of modern Arabic literature in the 19th century. The old stanzaic forms were used not only in own poetic efforts but also in the translation of Western poetry (cf. S. Moreh, Modern Arabic poetry 1800-1970, Leiden 1976, 11 ff.).

Bibliography: See also LA and T4, s.v. s-m-t; Ibn Rashid, al-\Umda, i-ii, ed. M. M. Abd al-Hamid, Beirut 1972, i, 178-82; G.W.

(G. Scholer)

2. In later Persian and Indo-Muslim literature.

After the Qhaznavid and Ghûrid periods, sporadic examples of the musammat are also present in the works of subsequent poets, such as Khâdîjûn of Kirmân (d. 753/1352 or 762/1361) and Jâmi (d. 889/1482). The musammat found special impetus from certain poets of the 18th and 19th centuries, notably from Kâ`ânî (d. 1270/1854), who used the medium for some of his finest poems. In all of Kâ`ânî’s musammat the lines of the first stanza rhyme together, and this rhyme continues in the last lines of the other stanzas. In the literary output following the establishment of the Constitution in 1906, the musammat gained increasing visibility, and was exploited effectively by Amârî (1860-1917), Bahâr (1886-1950) and, more particularly, by Iglîkî (1894-1924), whose long poem in this form, entitled Idrîs ("Ideal"), constitutes a valuable contribution to the poetic literature of modern Persia.

The type of musâdâd in which the first four lines rhyme with one another, whilst the remaining two lines rhyme among themselves (mattî b. cce, dde, eee, etc.), often called a târîkh-band because of its broad affinity with the latter, has also been popular. It has been employed widely in Urdu poetry, one of the best-known examples being Aîtâf Hâsûyn Hâlî’s (1837-1914 [q.v.]) long poem, Mâdd u dhârî ʿl-Islâm, also popularly known as Musâdâd-i Hâlî (Kulliyât-i nazm-i Hâlî, ii, ed. Itikhâr Ahmad Sâddqî, Lahore 1970).


MUSSANNAF (A., pl. musannafûû), an early technical term in Arabic literature applied to a collection of religious learning organised upon an abstract, structured subdivision in chapters, hence the opposed of munâd [q.v.], i.e. a collection arranged according to the first/oldest transmitter. Musannaf is the past participle of a denominative verb meaning ordinarily "to assort", "to distinguish", sc. the one sort (= "sort" or "species") from another. Allegedly the first in the Islamic world to compose a structured collection of ancient traditions, which however, may not have come down to us, was the Meccan hadîth expert Abd al-Malik b. Abd al-ʿAzîz (d. 150/767), mostly called after his grandfather Ibn Durayfî (cf. Ibn Hâdîj, ibid., 404 (3); the verbs datuwâna and sugana are not synonymous, the latter connoting a more sophisticated stage in tradition-collecting, cf. Gâs, i, 55). Other authors of early, allegedly structured, collections, which as such have not come down to us, are Sufyân al-Thawri (cf. al-Dîn 161/778 [q.v.]), the Kûfian jurist, to whom a dawwana is attributed (cf. Râmahuruzi, al-Muḥadthâdî fî ʿimâmbay tawâsîr wa ʿrâfîyî, ed. M. Adâdîdî al-Khâti, Beirut 1971, 612; Ibn Hâdîj, Hady al-sdn, mukaddamat Fath al-bârî, ed. Mubîh al-Dîn al-Khâti, Cairo n.d., 10(25), and Hâkmûb al-Salâm (d. 167/783), the Basra jurist, who is credited with an ṣâfîn, a term glossed as muassanât, but perhaps rendered best as "legal or ethical 'chapters'" or "sections" (cf. Ibn Hâdîj, Tahdhîb, iii, 12, 17, 15, 12, 65 (margin)). Others mentioned in this respect (cf. Râmahuruzi, 611 f.) are al-Râbî b. ʿAbî (d. 160/777) from Basra, ʿAbî b. Abû Arrûb (d. 156/773) from Basra, Khâlid b. Abd al-Brâ, who is said to have stolen traditions from others (cf. Ibn Hâdîj, Lišân al-mizzân, ii, 393), Mârmar b. Râghîd (d. 153/770) from Yemen, Sufyân b. Ṣuṣâyna (cf. al-Dîn 190/814) from Mecca, al-Wâlî b. Muslim (d. 194/810) from Damascus, Dârîr b. Abd al-Hâmid (d. 188/804) from Rayy, ʿAbî al-Brâ of Mubârâk (d. 1817/97) from Marw and Hughyam b. Baqîr (d. 183/799) from Wâsiî. The oldest musannaf-type works exist are the Sîra by Muhammad b. Ishâk (d. 151/768 [q.v.]), the Muwatta by Malik b. Anas (d. 179/795 [q.v.]), and works by Abû ʿUṣuf Yaḵûb b. Ibrâhîm (d. 182/790 [q.v.]), chief kâfî of Baghdad, and Muhammad b. Hasan al-Sâbiyânî (d. 189/805 [q.v.]), cf. Gâs, i, s.n. in ʿrâfî literature, allegedly the oldest structured collection of legal traditions is the Maqâmûs al-fîkh ascribed to Zayd b. ʿAbî b. al-Husayn (d. 122/740); its authorship, however, remains to be established definitively, cf. W. Madelung, Der Imam al-Qâsim ibn Ibrâhîm und die Glaubenslehre der Zaiditen, 54-7, and the literature referred to there.

The pre-canonical collections of Prophetic and/or
other hadith extant today, not all called musannaffe but arranged as such, are that of the lbaash al-Rabi' b. Habashville, 1792, 335 ff, 245; the Musannaf of 'Abd Allâh b. Humâyid al-Sâlimî, hâkhâyat al-dâ'îmi ahsâsh musnad ... al-Rabi' b. Habîb, Cairo 1926; cf. also J.C. Wilkinson, in Studies on the first century of Islamic society, ed. G.H.A. Juynboll, Carbondale 1982, 135 ff, 245; the Musannaf of 'Abd al-Razzâk b. Hammâm al-Šânîsî (d. 211/827), edited in 11 volumes by Hamîb al-Râhmân al-Âzâymmetric. One of his epigrams angered Abu Hanîfa and eighty lines are preserved, some of which are of doubtful attribution. All his extant poetry is epigrammatic. One of his epigrams angered Abu Hanîfa and was originally organised as such and later received a modern Turkish translation as "equality", the idea of human equality as a chimera, to which lip service was paid by political leaders in political manifestos but which is rarely taken into account in practice. Bibliography: Given in the article.

MUSANNAF, 'ALÀ AL-DIN 'ALI B. MAGGO AL-Dîs Muhammad al-Bîstâmî (or al-Harâwî), Persian work on logic by Risdla al-shamsiyya, [q.v.]. al-Miftdh by [q.v.]. The root is found frequently in the Kurgan, though also in modern Turkish musdwdt, bardbdri). MUSAWIR B. SAWWAR AL-WARRAK, a minor poet and minor muhaddith from Kûfa, who lived in the middle of the 2nd/8th century. He belonged to the Kays b. 'Aylân b. Mudar. He is also called a mawll of 'Adwân, a tribe of Qâdillât Kays; but his name and that of his father seem to indicate his Arab origin. Adwan, a tribe of Djadflat Kays; buq, name and Fraternity (the latter in the form of Pan-Arab and Pan-Turkish feeling; see KAWMIYYA. i-ii, iv) which were dominant in the minds of westernising Muslims, insofar as these concepts affected their thinking. The division by Islamic religion of mankind into the saved, the Muslims, and the damned, the non-Muslims, and the European socialist (see ISHTIRAKIYYA) and Marxist communism (see MÂRE [hurrîyya] began to have a vogue amongst certain sections of westernised intellectuals; hence Musâwî was the title of the social democrat workers’ party active from 1911 to 1920 in Russian Adharbaydjan [see HIZB. iv]. On the whole, however, Middle Eastern peoples have viewed the idea of human equality as a chimera, to which lip service is paid by political leaders in political manifestos but which is rarely taken into account in practice. Bibliography: Given in the article.

(M.C. Bosworth)

MUSAWIR B. SAWWAR AL-WARRAK, a minor poet and minor muhaddith from Kûfa, who lived in the middle of the 2nd/8th century. He belonged to the Kays b. 'Aylân b. Mudar. He is also called a mawll of 'Adwân, a tribe of Qâdillât Kays; but his name and that of his father seem to indicate his Arab origin. Short notices and fragments of his poetry are found in biographies of muhaddithûn (e.g. Ibn Hadâjar, al-Tuhîthî, Haydarâbîd 1325-27, x, 103) and several works of adab, notably al-Aghânî ed. Dâr al-Kutub, xviii, 148-33. Ibn al-Nadîm (al-Fihrist, Leipzig 1871-2, 162) mentions his verse as filling fifty folios; some eighty lines are preserved, some of which are of dubious attribution. All his extant poetry is epigrammatic. One of his epigrams angered Abu Hanîfa and
his followers, another placated them, notwithstanding its ironic tone (Aghdni, xviii, 151-2 and several other sources). His longest (35 lines) and most remarkable poem offers the earliest known example of a sub-genre of descriptive poetry which may be called "banquet poetry"; it combines static description of various dishes with more dynamic elements picturing the progress of the meal (Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, al-Id al-farid, Cairo 1948-53, vi, 295-7).

Bibliography: G.J. van Gelder, Musawir al-Warrak and the beginnings of Arabic gastronomic poetry, in JSS, xxviii/2 (1991), gives all the known references to Musawir and his poetry, with a translation and a study of his banquet poem. See also Sesgin, GAS, ii, 469. (G.J. H. Van Gelder)

MUSAWIR AL-WARRAK (A.), literally "the wearers, or bearers, of black", the name given to the partisans of the 'Abbasids at the time of the da'wah of Abū Muslim al-Khwārāsānī and Abū Salama al-Khalāl [q.v.], apparently from the black banners which these rebels against the Umayyads bore, so that they are described in some sources as al-akābīr al-rāyāt al-sawdā'ī.

The origins of this use of black are obscure and have been much discussed. In the first place, the use of black may have been simply a mark of rebellion, for the anti-Umayyad rebel in Khurāsān and Transoxiana, al-Ḥarīrī b. Surayjī [q.v.], active from 116/734 onwards, also had black banners. But the 'Abbasids may have adopted black as a symbol of their victory; the Prophet Muhammad himself, according to pro-'Abbasid traditions, had a black banner during his campaigns (see M. Sharck, Black banners from the East. ii. Revolt, the social and military aspects of the 'Abbāsid Revolution, Jerusalem 1992, 78-85). This may have been in accord with popular eschatological beliefs, in which the coming of the Mahdi [q.v.] was associated with the colour black [see 'Abbāsid], perhaps because of the idea of veiling from sight, concealment and the awaiting of a new birth or the launching of a new movement with millenarian overtones.

Black became the official colour of the 'Abbasids once they were in power, as opposed to the white colour of their enemies the Spanish Umayyads, and was accordingly used for garments worn at their court (āy al-khamsa, or amber, for the brief period when al-Ma'mūn [q.v.] adopted the 'Alīd colour of green) and for the ikhās or robes of honour [see āy al-khamsa] presented by the ruler, with the caliph himself normally wearing a black high cap or kalansuwa and jacket (kabā') (see A. Mez., Die Renaissance des Islam, 130-1, Eng. tr. 132; E. Tyan, Institutions de droit public musulman. i. Le califat, Paris 1954, 501-12; D. Sourdel, Questions de cérémonial 'Abbāside, in REI, xxviii [1960], 132-3; and Ībāsa, i).

The symbolism of colours in Islam (for which see, in general, LĀW) was powerfully felt. White became the colour par excellence of the 'Alids as well as of the Umayyads (see above), but various heterodox religious-social protest groups, especially in the eastern Iranian world, adopted different colours as their symbols, e.g. the green of Bihārīfard [q.v.]; the red of the Khurāsāniyya [q.v.], who were thus also known as muḥāmmidīn or surrāt-djīmānīn "wearers of red"; and the white of the followers of al-Mukanna [q.v.], hence alternately known as mubayyida or sapīd-djīmānīn. In some sources describing these episodes, Islam is characterised as the "black religion", in contrast to the "white religion", al-dīn al-ḥarbī, apparent the ancient religion of Persia which was to be restored (cf. al-Tabarī, iii, 1311, regarding the trial of al-Maḥmūd Haydar, accused of pro-Persian, anti-Arab sympathies. See further on colour symbolism in general to religious movements and ideas, B. Scarccia Amoretti, in Camb. hist. of Iran, iv, 513-14.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

MUSAYLIMA b. Ḥabīb, Abū Thumūmā, a man of Banū Hanīfah who lived in al-Yamama and led a large section of his tribe in revolt during the wars of the ridda [q. v.].

The suggestion of some European scholars (as in the article in EJ!) that Musaylima is a contemptuous diminutive of Maslama appears to be mistaken. Because he claimed to be a prophet he is often called al-Khwādhabī, the liar or false prophet. He is also said to have been called al-Rahmān (al-Balāḥṣurī, 105; al-Wākīdī, 82); this seems unlikely since al-Rahmān was a name of God. Musaylima believed that he received messages from al-Rahmān, and so might have called himself 'Abd al-Rahmān; and there could then have been some confusion over this name because of the allegation (Ibn Ḥīṣām, 200) that sūra XIII, 30, was revealed when some Meccan pagans said that Muhammad was being taught by a man in al-Yamama called al-Rahmān. This allegation about a human teacher is not convincing as the occasion for the revelation of XIII, 30, and is not mentioned in the commentaries of al-Ṭabarī and al-Bayḍāwī. If there is some truth in it, the most likely explanation is that the name al-Rahmān, which was frequently used in the sūras of the middle Meccan period, was understood by the pagans as the name of a human being, otherwise named. It is possible that Musaylima could have claimed prophethood at this date. He does not seem to have become a person of importance until after the death in 630 of Ḥawdha b. Āli, the king or ruler of the Banū Ḥanīfah, to whom Muhammad is said to have sent letters summoning him to Islam (al-Ṭabarī, i, 156; cf. Ibn Ḥīṣām, 971). Ḥawdha was possibly the strongest man in Central Arabia at this time, since he was in alliance with the Persian empire and guaranteed the security of its caravans for a large part of the route from the Yemen to ʿIrāk. This implies that he controlled at least the nomadic part of Banū Ḥanīfah; there was also a large settled agricultural section of the tribe. He is said to have responded favourably to Muhammad's envoy, but to have demanded a share in the political control of Arabia. He did not become a Muslim. He probably realised that the Persian empire was disintegrating and that he could not expect further support from it. After his death, the nomadic section of the tribe probably recognised Thumūmā b. ʿUthāl as leader, for this reason Muhammad sent a messenger to him (Ibn Ḥīṣām, 998, but not Ibn Isḥāq according to al-Ṭabarī). While Muhammad was negotiating with these two kings, a deputation went to Medina from the tribe, probably representing the agricultural section, and this deputation accepted Islam. Musaylima is said to have gone with the deputation, but to have remained with the baggage while the others spoke to Muhammad. This account may be no more than an attempt to claim that something Muhammad said about him was an acknowledgement of his prophethood.

It was presumably after the death of Ḥawdha that Musaylima made a bid for leadership in the tribe, possibly in rivalry to Thumūmā, and basing it on his claim to prophethood. He had strong support from al-Rahīlī (or Nahār al-Radjīlī) b. ʿUfūwā, who had been one of the deputation and may have encouraged him to establish a political system centred on a prophet on the model of Medina. Previous to this, Musaylima may have been proclaiming a religious message, but it is clear that his following was not extensive following. Now, however, his aim seems to have been to set up a strong principality in the Yamama
independent of Persia, Byzantium and Medina, especially in view of the decline of Persia and the likelihood that trade between the Yemen and Trak would decrease.

While the movement led by Musaylima thus dealt with political and economic realities, it had a genuine religious basis, which is not entirely concealed by hostile Muslim propaganda. He also made use of "sadi", rhythmical assonance prose, as in the early suras of the Kur'an, and some examples of this have ostensibly been preserved.

About the end of the year 10 (beginning of 632) Musaylima is said to have written a letter to Muhammad suggesting some division of spheres of authority, but the suggestion was rebuffed by Muhammad. His following among Banu Hanifa were Christians, and Musaylima had clearly been influenced by Christian ideas. He spoke of the kingdom of heaven, and taught belief in resurrection and the Judgement of the Last Day when people would be assessed about wine (Ibn Higham, 946) is to be rejected as Muslim propaganda. He also made use of "sadi", rhythmical assonance prose, as in the early suras of the Kur'an, and some examples of this have ostensibly been preserved.

Musaylima — MUSHT

the mulemde worked their own land and did not receive funds from the collection of taxes as the sipahis did. This special condition necessitated that they support one another when called up for military service; the mulemde were therefore organised into groups of thirty men each called a "hearth" [see organ]. They took turns in serving in the army; when five served, the other twenty-five in the hearth became "auxiliaries" [see aymak], providing a sum of money for the expenses and sustenance of the five during the campaign. The amount they gave ranged from 50 to 60 akces for the rich auxiliaries to 10 to 20 akces for the poor ones. The mulemde were under the command of troop leaders called erbahis and who were under the authority of the provincial governors. There were mulemde holdings in both Rumelia and Anatolia, and these were recorded in registers called mulemde defter.

After the Janissary corps expanded in the 9th/15th century and started their own units, the mulemde were relegated from fighting to accompanying the armies on campaigns as auxiliary labour teams. They discharged such duties as trench-digging and the hauling of cannon, often moving ahead of the main body of the Ottoman army with their spades and axes. Groups such as the gypsies of Rumelia were also organised into mulemde hearths during this century, their status as auxiliary labourers therefore being sent a large army against him under Khalid b. al-Walid. A fierce battle took place at al-'Akhrab (q.v.) with its centre in a walled garden or orchard (hadita), which came to be known as "the garden of death" because of the numbers on both sides killed there. The Muslims were victorious, but lost many kura or Kur'an-reciters. Responsibility for the death of Musaylima was claimed by various men, including Wahshi, the Abyssinian slave who had killed Hamza. Shortly before this battle Musaylima is said to have married Sadi'a (q.v.), the prophetess of the tribe of Tamim. W.G. Palgrave, travelling in Nadid in 1862, found Musaylima regarded as a prophet, and people quoted what Palgrave calls "burlesque imitations" of the Kur'an, though he does not reproduce any.


(M. Montgomery Watt)

MÜSELLEM (A.), an Ottoman military term alluding to provincial landed cavalrymen who later became transformed into auxiliary forces no longer employed in actual fighting but in discharging duties such as dragging guns, levelling roads, digging trenches, carrying provisions and casting cannon balls. Then, as the Ottoman state required them to pay taxes rather than serve in the army, they lost their privileged status and dissolved into the tax-paying populace.

The mulemde were established in the 8th/14th century during the time of Orkhan Ghazi (q.v.). They were each initially granted, in return for their service, a small parcel of land [see ciflik], on which they were excused from any dues or taxes, hence the name mulemde "exempt." What differentiated them from other Ottoman cavalrymen, the sipahis (q.v.), was that...
Idg. Forsch., xvi, 326; J. Saint-Martin, Mémoires historiques et géographiques sur l'Arménie, i, Paris 1818, 102). In Islamic times the name Tarünn (as spelled by Yaküü, iv, 534) is sometimes used for the town itself, as in al-Tabarî, iii, 1408 (cf. J. Markwart, Süd-Armenien und die Tigrisquellen, Vienna 1930, 354). The tradition of the Armenian historians connects the foundation of Mush with Mughel Mamikonean, the ancestor of the powerful, originally non-Armenian family of the Mamikones, who lived in the 4th century A.D. To him is ascribed the construction of a castle, the ruins of which are still visible on one of the hills that dominate Mush. This town itself is situated at the mouth of a mountain gorge, and before it extends, as far as the river, a large fertile plain, the "plain of Mush". During the first centuries after the Islamic conquest [see ARMENIA, II, 2], Mush remained a centre of Armenian national life; from 825-51 it was the residence of the Bagratid Bagrat. After the abduction of this prince to Bagdad in 851, the inhabitants revolted and killed the Muslim governor Yüsuf b. Abi Sa'id al-Marwani (al-Tabarî, iii, 1408-9). Later on, it was part of the vassal kingdom of the Bagratids. Occasionally, it was occupied by Muslim adventurers, as in the days of Sayf al-Dawla (Ibn al-Athîr, vii, 408) in 353/964. About this time, the name Mush appears for the first time in Islamic geographical literature (al-Muqaddasî, 150). In Sâlîdîk times, the influence of Islam became stronger; the atabegs of the Armanash dynasty disputed the territory of Khilât and Mush with the Artûkids and even the Ayyûbid Najîm al-Dîn laid siege to Mush in 604/1207 (Ibn al-Athîr, xii, 169, 180), and in 625/1228 Dîjalâ al-Dîn Khârâzmnshâh was master of the country; in that year, a battle was fought by him and lost on the plain of Mush against the Sâlîdîk ruler of Erzûrum (Ibn al-Athîr, xii, 314; Duwââynt, Ta'âbî-î Dîjalâl-î Dîn, ii, 181). This accounts for the ruined state of the town in the middle of the 8th/14th century (Hamd Allâh Mustawîf). After the Mongol period, Mush was raided by Tîmûrî in 788/1386, when he invaded the possessions of the Kara Kûnlû (Shâfarî al-Dîn, ii, 419). In 878/1473 the power of the Ak Kûnlû ruler Uzûn Hâsân was definitely broken in Armenia, and from that time on Mush belonged to the Ottoman Empire. In the 15th century most of its surroundings was already strongly mixed with Kurds and Turkomans. The direct authority was exercised by Kurîdî local chieftains, who, in the ruling system of the Empire, were subordinated, as sandjak beys, eithor to the pasha of Bitlîs or to that of Van. At the beginning of the 16th century, there ruled the Kurîdî Memûrîn Ermân Pâshâ, who was deposed in 1828-9 (Ritter, x, 676, and Mehmed Thûrâyû, Sidjîl-i 7ûhmûnî, i, 426). In the administrative changes introduced in the Ottoman empire after the Treaty of Berlin (1878), Mush town became the centre of a sandjak of that name in the new vilâyet of Bitlis carved out of the formerly very extensive vilâyet of Erzurum. At this time, Mush, with some 5,000 inhabitants, was half-Armenian Christian and half-Kurdish Muslim. There were bishops of the Armenian Gregorian and Catholic Churches and a Protestant community with schools directed by the American Mission. According to its inscription, one of the Armenian churches had been converted into a mosque in 797/1571 (Ritter). The surrounding countryside also had a mixed Muslim-Christian population, in which ancient Christian sanctuaries had long continued to exist, such as the monastery of Surb Karapet, called by the Turks Çufilî Kilise and described by Ewliya Çelebi.

Towards the end of the century, revolutionary activity in the Mush region was begun by the Armenian nationalist Dâshnak guerillas, starting ca. 1894. In the subsequent years, till 1904, bands under the Armenian leader Andranik were active, bringing savage reprisals from the Turkish authorities, culminating in the 1915 massacres in the Mush, Bitlis and Sasun districts by Turkish troops and Kurdish irregulars. In the summer of 1916, the Imperial Russian army overran northeastern Anatolia, including Mush, but this last was recaptured in 1917 by Mustafâ Kemâl's [see ATATÜRK] Turkish Second Army, and Russian troops withdrew from the whole area in accordance with the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk (March 1918). With the establishment of the ephemeral Armenian Republic in Transcaucasia 1918-20, Mush and Bitlis came theoretically within the boundaries as laid down, when the infant state was in fact already succumbing to Turkish and Bolshevik pressure, by the Treaty of Sèvres (1920).

Under the Turkish republic, Mûû has become a largely Kurdish town, the chef-lieu of the il or province of Mûû, with a population of 44,000 in the town and 234,000 in the province (1970 census).


MUSH采 (λ.) is a technical term denoting common and repartitional ownership by the entire village community of all agricultural lands of the village.

1. In the Near East. In villages in the Middle East where mushûc prevailed, the peasant community would convene once every year or two to divide the available land by lot to individual peasants. The history of the institution is extremely obscure. In the technical sense mentioned above, the word mushûc does not appear in classical Arabic dictionaries, which may suggest that the institution did not exist in classical Islam, despite the fact that it looks ancient. It is often associated with Bedouin concepts of landownership, but this association is far from certain. Thus Bedouin customary law of theBeer Sheba region in Mandatory Palestine was specifically said to lack any trace of mushûc (see A'rif al-'Arif, Kitâb al-Kadâbî bâyân al-badw, Jerusalem 1933, 236). Nor is the mushûc so much as mentioned in the 10th/16th century Ottoman agrarian kanûns and land surveys, where pieces of land are registered individually (all references to mushûc in Barkan's collection of 16th-century kanûns are to the literal sense of the word). Did the registration officials record the situation in a given moment, or was the mushûc as yet non-existent? This question must for the present go unanswered. Another important and difficult question is exactly where, geographically, did the mushûc institution exist? In the past it was usually held that practically the entire Middle East was governed by it. As research increases, the area of mushûc tends to diminish. Thus documents from the Judaean mountains in the early 20th century indicate that mushûc did
not exist there for a long time, if ever at all. In fact, the technicalities of the system raises some doubts whether mushâdâ had ever been very widespread in mountainous areas (periodical division necessitated bureaucratic inefficiency, the mushâdâ was doomed through this law and by the mid-20th century it was clearly on the wane, though still vigorous in some areas (e.g. Tell Toqaan in northern Syria).


(H. Gerber)

2. In the Maghrib.

The collective ownership of lands, which was originally the normal system in the regions where nomadism prevailed, has been preserved in the Maghrib, where stretches of uncultivated lands and those used for pastoralism still belong to nomadic or sedentarised tribes, though not without being the subject of legal suits caused by the rather rudimentary delimitation of lands. A right of grazing, belonging to all members of the tribe, is even recognised, in certain conditions, to passing strangers [see marsâ]. However, as more and more additional groups have been sedentarised, the area of collective lands has been reduced in favour of a development proceeding at the same time as private property, at first in the family, then in the individual, has increased. In the Berber areas, this property remains substantially undivided, as tradition recommends, at least for landed property.

In effect, although the principle by which “no-one is compelled to remain within the undivided property” is respected, current usage is that, under the authority and administration of the oldest member of the menfol, family communities comprising the descendants of this person, to which are added, at least among certain tribes in Morocco, the anaâzgal [see âzâ in Suppl.] and freedmen, are set up. All the members bring to their community the goods which they possess or which come to them by gift or inheritance during the period of the familial society. Among the Zemmour, the usufruct of these goods is personal, whilst in Kabylia, they remain the property of the person concerned, and the enjoyment of them is acquired by the family. Each person has to dedicate his work for the community and to hand over to his chief his earnings and gains. The chief must show perfect impartiality and, if he is unable to justify himself when his honesty is doubted, his authority can be revoked and can be replaced.

The women, who are not part of the familial society, only own the clothes and jewelry which they received at marriage or which they have subsequently acquired; more luxurious garments and the jewelry worn on feast days belong to the community. However, the mother of the family may take over the succession to her deceased husband. The society has an obligation to feed the daughters and granddaughters of a deceased member. When meals are not partaken of in common, the dry goods and oil necessary for each hearth are impartially distributed. A strict equality is also respected in the division by lot of the meat from an animal slaughtered in special circumstances.

The fertile lands are the indivisible property of the familial group. In Kabylia, they are divided out every two years among the chiefs of each of the hearths possessing a pair of oxen. In Morocco, the sovereign who, in his role of manager of the lands, has a right over those lands which are within the authority of the mushâdâ [q.v.], may recognise to a family a right of ownership over a stretch of useful land; this last, measured by a rope, corresponds to the area which can be worked in one season by a pair of oxen.

The death of a member of the familial community does not entail its dissolution; the social components are in effect handed down to the heirs who, if they do not wish to remain within the indivisible unit, receive the shares due to them. Thus the community may last through several generations. When, at the request of one of the heirs, it is broken up, both the movable and immovable property brought into it by the members are given back to them and those acquired during the period of its existence are shared out pro rata with the hereditary rights of each person. The landed property is defined by surface measurement (by a rope), and goods left outside all the division are allotted, with rights balanced out, to those members who offer the highest bid for them.


(M. Haddou)

MUSHÂ’ARA (A.), “poetical contest”, in Urdu usually pronounced mushâ’ara, has come to be applied in its wider aspect to denote an assembly where Urdu poets come together to recite their compositions.

Its origin in the Indo-Muslim cultural tradition can only be guessed. According to a statement by Shibli Nu’mâni, one may assume that the institution of the mushâ’ara must have appeared on the Persian literary scene in India by the beginning of the 10th/16th century. Shibli points out that from the time of the poet Fihgani [q.v.], who died in 925/1519, there grew up the custom of holding mushâ’aras in which poets competed with one another, thus promoting the cause of poetry by their activities (Shfi’r al-‘Ajâm, iii, repr. A’zamgâf 1943, 17). It is likely that a similar situation might have existed since an early period in Urdu poetry, which shared with Persian a common cultural context.
environment. Whatever the case may be, it is certain that by the early 12th/18th century, when Urdu was adopted as a medium of literary expression by the poets and writers of Dihli, the musha^ara was a familiar event in the capital, providing not only a venue for poetry recitation but also a forum of discussion for some leading poets of the day who were concerned with the improvement of the language.

The musha^ara was the product of a princely age, reflecting the sophisticated taste of its time. The etiquette connected with it was well-managed, and involved fixed ceremonies. One of these was the use of a lighted candle which, placed before a poet, signaled that it was his turn to recite. Much importance was attached to the correct order in which the poets were introduced. The first to recite were lesser poets; then came the masters in the ascending order, until the poet considered most important recited at the end. Both singing and declamation were employed for the rendering of the poems.

In the social milieu of the period, the musha^ara enjoyed a popular appeal, and played an important functional role in the oral propagation of Urdu poetry. Persons interested in literature were drawn to the musha^ara because it was the most common form of intellectual entertainment available in the prevalent urban setting. Further, the musha^aras compensated for the lack of a forum and supplant the poet within a suitable literary platform to disseminate his work.

The tradition of the musha^ara was linked with the ghazal [q.v.] and the two contributed to each other's appeal. The ghazals recited in the musha^ara were based upon a mird^-i i^arah, or half-line, providing a specimen of the metre and rhyme in which each poet had to compose his poem. This practice was intended to satisfy the competitive requirement of the musha^ara, as it allowed the audience to compare the individual performance of each participant who had to work within the same technical limitations. Indeed, competition dominated the spirit of the musha^ara, and not infrequently did it manifest itself in ugly scenes when poets would overstep the limits of decency in demonstrating their feelings towards each other. An extreme example of this behaviour is provided by the rivalry between Qulham Hamadani Mushafii (1750-1824 [q.v.]) and his one-time pupil Insh^a Allah Kh^an Insh^a (1766-1818 [q.v.]), whose jealous encounters were responsible for vitiating the literary atmosphere of Lucknow while these poets were alive.

With the desire for reform in Urdu poetry during the later part of the 19th century, an attempt was made to initiate a different kind of musha^ara. The stimulus for this came from Colonel W.R.M. Holroyd, an Englishman who was then Director of Public Instruction, Punjab. He, in cooperation with Muhammad Husayan Az^ad (1829-1910) and Al^ah Husayn Hali (1837-1914 [q.v.]), laid the foundation of a musha^ara which was devoted to poems written upon a specific theme instead of ghazals based upon a mird^-i i^arah. This musha^ara, which had its first meeting in May 1874, lasted only for a few months. Though it was short-lived, and had little effect in influencing the current trend of the musha^aras, it will nevertheless be remembered as the first poetical gathering of its kind which was to herald the modern period of Urdu poetry.

The meetings in Urdu held today for poetry recitation are known as musha^aras, despite differences in their form and content which separate them from their earlier counterparts. A typical departure is the discarding of the mird^-i i^arah as a pre-condition for the poems, and the freedom in the musha^ara to recite any kind of poem, including ghazals. The practice of passing around the candle from poet to poet has disappeared together with the entire ceremonial character of the musha^ara. The appeal of the latter, however, remains undiminished, and has been even furthered by the introduction of radio and television.

Durayd spoke of the verb as Yemenite and cited the word mashafa meaning "spade". Noldeke therefore concluded that the Arabs had borrowed these words from the Himyarties or (as above) from the Ethiopians. Similarly, Schwally regarded the sing. of subhaf, sc. sabba, as an Arabic coinage derived from the above Ethiopian or South Arabian root. Both scholars cite sources suggesting that the borrowing pre-dates Islam, although, since the form here discussed, mushaf, does not occur in the Kur, the variant readings attributed to certain prominent Companions, there developed references to "the mushaf" of 'Abd Allâh b. Mas'ûd, of Ubayy b. Ka'b, of 'A'îsha, etc., in which the readings were conceived to have been recorded. All of these Companion codices, are next thought to have been suppressed when 'Uthmân provided a single text of the revela-
tions to serve all the Muslims and ordered all other existing documents, whether fragments or complete codices, to be destroyed. That, however, did not prevent continued citation of these readings in the exegetical works of the 2nd/8th century, to which they furnished glosses, synonyms and brief extensions of the texts of the mushaf useful for the clarification of the syntax or the elucidation of the meanings of rare words. Simaode the Companions in legal discussions where, however, the readings attributed to the codices exhibit either differences in wording or additions relative to the text in general use in the ritual prayer and universally regarded as the mushaf or imân provided by 'Uthmân. As both these latter types of reading are critical to issues debated among the scholars, they are probably best regarded as instances of disagreement between the mushafs of the 'Irâkîs and those of the Hîdjabî-Syrian tradition or between those of the Kûfûn and the Basrân communities. Such lists are brief and concern only very minor matters, such as the occasional difference in brushing or the elucidation of the meanings of rare words. In the light of the reports adduced to the same end and from the same individuals in the same discussions and like which, indeed, they share an occasional duel, or even multiple attribution. For example, one encounters expressions such as "in one of the two mushafs—that of 'Abd Allâh or that of Ubayy".

Of a qualitatively different kind are differences listed in 2nd-3rd/8th-9th century writers of works on the masdhif as instances of disagreement between the mushafs of the 'Irâkîs and those of the Hîdjabî-Syrian tradition or between those of the Kûfûn and the Basrân communities. Such lists are brief and concern only very minor matters, such as the occasional presence or absence of a conjunctive wa' or preference for the conjunctive fa' as opposed to the conjunctive wa' and the like. These insubstantial differences visibly stem merely from ancient differences in the resolution of primitive written versions of one and the same text, and study of the lists confirms the underlying presence of a single Kûrân text universally shared by the Muslims of all regions since a remote date and symbolised in the common belief that copies of the Kûrân text had been disseminated throughout the newly-conquered territories from a single centre.

gain fame in Lucknow is obvious, and the quarrel with Insha\' was a by-product of this. But it is arguable that his “middle road” between Dhilī and Lucknow was a matter of taste and temperament, and not mere opportunism. Moderation in thought and expression and a feeling of malaise are, one feels, part of the man and the poet. As for his desire to show his superiority as a poet, it was a common failing, found also in Mir. Incidentally, when Mir wrote a maghna called Daryā-i-ṣiḥk, Mushafī responded by writing a similar one with the same title translated into Arabic as Bahār al-mubātma. Now this was the only instance, and not more opportunist. A re-assessment of this poet, then, is overdue. The process has already begun, though it cannot be completed till more of his poetry is available in print. Abu \'l-Ṭayyīb Siddīkī\'s Mushafī aṣr un kā kālām (Lahore 1950) was the first major study of the poet. A 100-page summary of it will be found in the same author\'s Lakhnāvīd kā dabistān-i-shaerī, Lahore 1955, 191-295.

While making no drastic amendment of the traditional view of Mushafī, Siddīkī places him third after Sawdā\'ī and Mir, and he claims that both the number and quality of his kāṣidas place him among the leading Urdu ode-writers (Dabstān, 270). A few years later, Firāk Gorkhāpūrī wrote a long essay to prove that Mushafī was not only a major influence in Urdu poetry but an outstanding poet (Diwān-i-Mushafī: intikhāb, ed. Hafiz Muhammad Mohānī, Lahore 1970). This essay is repeated verbatim, but in clearer print, in vol. i of the Kulliyāt Mushafī mentioned above, 11-53. Gorkhāpūrī believes that the main difference between the Dhilī and Lucknow Schools is that the former stressed meaning and the latter language. Mushafī represents a transitional stage, without whose influence it would be difficult to envisage later Lucknow poets like Anis [q.v.]; and Mushafī\'s poetry—including his ghazals—with its amalgam of simple yet colourful language, naturalness, realism and restrained passion, is sui generis, and the work of a genius. It remains to be seen whether these claims will gain ground.

Bibliography: Editions of Mushafī\'s poetry include Diwān-i-Mushafī, ed. Hasrat Mohānī, \'Allīgah 1905, which is almost entirely confined to short azads, as do several other mss. which do not mention the poet. Diwān-i-Mushafī: intikhāb (1965), seemingly a reprint of the above, and vol. i of the Kulliyāt Mushafī (1968), both containing Gorkhāpūrī\'s valuable essay, are mentioned above in the article. For an example of his maghna\'s, with a critical comparison of Mushafī with Mir, see Fārman Fatāḥpūrī, Daryā-i-ṣiḥk aṣr Bahār al-mubātma kā takāhālī mutāla\'ā, Lahore 1972. Mushafī\'s tagkīra of Persian poets was published as Uṣūl iqra\', ed. with intro. by \'Abd al-Hakkī, Dhilī 1934. One of his two tagkīras of Urdu poets was published as Riyāzul Fusaha, Dhilī 1934, with the same editor and editorial introduction. For detailed accounts of the poet, see the two works by Siddīkī mentioned in the text. Brief accounts include: Ram Babu Saksena, A history of Urdu literature, Allahabad 1927, 90 ff.; Muhammad Sadiq, A history of Urdu literature, London, Karachi, etc. 1964, 124 f.; L.C. Randhir, Ghazal—the beauty eternal, New Delhi, 61 ff., writes more favourably of the poet, and the whole book forms a useful general account of the Urdu ghazal. In Urdu, Muhammad Husayn Āzād, Ab-i-hayāt, Lahore 1917, 309 ff., provides a well-written statement of the traditional lukwārm assessment. To some extent, Āzād relied on the old tagkīras for his ancestry and criticism. A good example is Mushafī\'yār-i-muhārb by Hākim Abu \'l-Ḵāsim

Kudratullah Ḵāsim, ed. Ḵāṭīr Muḥammad Shārīyār, 2 vols., Lahore 1953: for Mushafī, see ii, 188-93. This book is a much needed and critical survey of Mushafī but a good deal more biographical material than most other tagkīras, which might best be described as chrestomathies. Finally, Sayyid \'Abdullāh, Shudder-i-ūrdū kā tagkīra aṣr tagkīra kā fann, Lahore 1952, 46 ff., gives a very short account of Mushafī\'s two Urdu tagkīras; but as a general critical history of the tagkīra form in the context of Urdu poetry, it is an essential reference.

(MUŠHAFA, MIĞTAṬ’ī B., DĀRĀYI-d al-LUKNĀNĪ, Lebanese historian and polemicist who is at the same time the most important of modern Arabic writers on the theory of music; the present article is devoted to his activity in this latter sphere, in order to complete the brief entry already given s.v. Muḥākā.)

Born in 1800 at Rashmāyā, he followed his family (after 1807) to Dār al-Kamār, the residence of the famous Amīr Bašīr Shīhāb II [q.v.] who was favourably disposed towards the elder Muḥākā. In 1819, the Amīr, having given offence to the Sublime Porte, was compelled to take refuge in Egypt, and the following year Muḥākād Muḥākā lived for the rest of his life, following the profession of a physician and a writer. He spent a short period (1845-6) spent in Cairo, where he studied at the Kaṣr al-Āyin school of medicine.

Muḥākā\'s particular studies had been directed to mathematics, the physical sciences and medicine, but about 1830 he began to take an interest in music (Parist, Mus. orient., 15). Piqued by the arrogance of Egyptian musicians, who were great favourites in Syria and boasted their superiority over the Syrians, Muḥākā decided to study the theory of music (Collanettes, 380) and took lessons from the best masters, including the šuyūkh Muḥammad al-\'Aṁṭār, “a master of several sciences and much learning”, as Muḥākā himself tells us. The šuyūkh had written a book on the theory of music, but Muḥākā was dissatisfied with it on the scientific side, and having “a good knowledge of mathematics and much practical skill in music” (Smith, 174), he decided to write a treatise himself. In this work was entitled al-Risāla al-Shihābīyya fi l-żinā\'a al-māṣīkīyya, its name being due to the Amīr Muḥammad Fāris Shīhāb, to whom Muḥākā attributed the germ of the work. We do not know the precise date of its composition, but as the oldest ms. is dated 1840, it must have been written at least as early as this year (cf. Ronzevalle, 2, 116). In 1847, (cf. Ronzevalle, 2; Brockelmann, II, 648) the work was presented in a free English translation by Eli Smith in JAS, i (1847), 173 ff. Among the Arabs, the book circulated in ms. until 1899, when the Arabic text was given by L. Ronzevalle in Machry, ii (1899), 149 ff., and in an octavo volume (1908), which soon ran out of print. In 1913, other mss. having become available for collation, Ronzevalle issued a fresh text, together with a French translation, in MFBO, vi (1913), 1-120. Muḥākā\'s work became the standard one on the theory of music in Syria and contiguous lands, and still holds that position. In the West, his theories have been much commented on by Land, Ellis, Parist and Collanettes.

In the early 1840s, Muḥākā came in touch with Eli Smith (his translator) and C.V.A. Van Dyck, two American missionaries in Damascus. Muḥākā, who was a member of the Melkite Greek Church in favour of Protestantism, and was appointed the American consul there.
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misconduct. Such securities are in fact demanded by certain Islamic banks and other financial institutions as a limited investment partnership (Mushārakah — Musha‘ṣaḥa‘) in different or ambiguous senses—is clearly beyond the scope of the present article.

**Bibliography:** 1. Primary sources. See for these the Bibl. to MUKASA. 2. Studies: N. Al Saheb, *Unlawful gain and legitimate profit in Islamic law*, Cambridge 1986, of which the bibliography is a good guide to both primary and secondary sources (123-6); idem, *The general principles of Saudi Arabian and Oman company laws*, Namara, U.K. 1981, notably 62-5 on the details of the distribution of profits and losses. A.L. Udovitch, *Partnership and profit in medieval Islam*, Princeton 1970, provides material that is essential to the understanding of the early development of the concept of partnership in Islamic law. On the use of the term mushārakah to translate the technical term “participation” in the (non-Islamic) context of health and accident insurance, see N. Ghatta, *A dictionary of economics, business & finance: English-Arabic with an Arabic glossary*, Cairo 1982, 404, (J. D. Dey (trans.))

**MUSHA‘ṣHA‘**; a Shī‘a Arab dynasty of the town of Hawīza [q. v.] or Huwayzā in Khūzistān (`Arabistān). The founder of the dynasty, Sayyid Muhammad b. Falāḥ, claimed to be a descendant of the Seventh Imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm [q. v.]. He was born at Wāsīṭ and studied with Shāykh Ahmad b. Fadl al-Ḥillā. The 9th/15th century was an important phase in the history of Shī‘a ghuldt extremism. But it was also fragmented power structure. In his environment Sayyid Muhammad developed strong views about his messianic mission; Shāykh Ahmad excommunicated him (tadfir) but failed to have him executed by the Amīr of Ubadah, as he pretended to be a Sunni Sufi.

One of the concern of Shāykh Ahmad was the definition of Sayyid Ahmad in 840/1436 (Kasrawī, *Tārīkh-i panadā sāla-yi Khūzistān*, 9; not 828/1424 as in Shūḥtāri, *Magālīs al-mu‘minīn*, ii, 395), he announced his mission (zuhūr) in the Arab tribes of the Banī Sūlāma, Tāyyī and Sudān in the marshy neighbourhood of Wāsīṭ. Although defeated in 844/1440, he devastated Shāwka and converted the Nays, a clan of the Ma‘ātī tribe, in the Dūb area, forcing them to exchange their cattle for arms. Sayyid Muhammad continued to fight against the local lords of Djiżā‘īr. Finally, after a heavy defeat by the governor of Wāsīṭ he turned towards Huwayzā which was in the hands of Shāykh Djişal b. Abī ‘l Khayr Djiżā‘īr, a representative of the Timūrid prince-governor of Fars, ‘Abd Allāh. Sayyid Muhammad and his son Mawla ‘Ali conquered this strategically important place (except for the citadel) on 4 Ramadan 845/16 January 1442. The lord of Baghdad, Ispand b. Kāra Yūsūf Kāra Koyunlu, exploiting the weakened position of the Timūrid rule in the eastern part of Persia, defeated Sayyid Muhammad, but the latter overpowered the Kāra Koyunlu garrison after Ispand b. Kāra Yūsūf had left for Shāba. Although Ispand, who had converted to the Shī‘ism in 840/1436-7, was not in a position to prevent the Musha‘ṣaḥa‘ continuing their missionary activity, they penetrate into the western and southern ‘Irāk, which it was only after his death in 848/1444, and that of Shāhrukh three years later, that the Musha‘ṣaḥa‘ began to challenge the weakened authority of the Kāra Koyunlu in middle ‘Irāk.

Sayyid Muhammad’s son and successor Sulṭān Muhammad strengthened the power of the Musha‘ṣaḥa‘ further. His rule extended into the area of Luristān, the land of the Bakhtiyāris and Fayfī Lurs, and a larger part of al-Dżazīr; even the area around Baghdad seems to have temporarily fallen under his control. He also attracted the attention of scholars like Mawlānā Shams al-Dīn Muhammad Kaldm al-Mahdi. According to the Magālīs al-mu‘minīn, the Musha‘ṣaḥa‘ practised a dhīrār which enabled them to perform extraordinary acts.

The devastation of the adjacent areas of Baghdad only came to an end when an army of Djahan-Shāh Kāra Koyunlu forced him to retreat. Finally, he was killed in the river Rūd-i Kūrdistān (Ṭāb) when campaigning in Kuš Giliya against Pīr Būdūk in 861/1456-7 (Kasrawī, *Tārīkh*, 17-19). In the same year, Sayyid Muḥammad was forced to take the field against Amīr Nāsir b. Farādīj Allāh who had moved from Baghdaḏ to destroy the Musha‘ṣaḥa‘. With his defeat near Wāsīṭ, their supremacy was finally established in Khūzistān and southern ‘Irāk. In the last years of his life, Sayyid Muhammad was mainly occupied with writing his Kūr`ān commentaries and prayers. He died in 870/1465-6 (less likely 866/1461-2, according to Sayyid ‘Ali b. ‘Abd Allāh in the history of his family).

The doctrines of Sayyid Muhammad. The etymology of the word musha‘ṣaḥa‘ is not clear. It may be connected with the notion of light, radiance, less possibly intoxication, although it rather refers to mystical exaltation. According to the Magālīs al-mu‘minīn, the Musha‘ṣaḥa‘ practised a dhīrār which enabled them to perform extraordinary acts.

The Kālām al-Mahdi by Sayyid Muhammad, the major source for examining the doctrine of the early Musha‘ṣaḥa‘, expounds ideas about Mahdism. The terminology of this doctrine comprises that of an esoteric sect. According to it, ‘Ali and the Prophet Muhammad are the revolving mystery (al-sirr al-dārīr) in heaven and on earth. Muhammad as the messenger was the embodiment (ḥādīb) of the truth (hakīka), which unlike the embodiment does not change its place. The body can become personalised but the truth remains in its unvaried state.

After attempting to show some caution, Sayyid Muhammad clearly expressed his mission as the Mahdi, declaring that he functioned like Muhammad and any other prophet. The ideas of Sayyid ‘Ali appear to have been more extreme. According to Shūḥtāri (Magālīs al-mu‘minīn, ii, 399-400), he claimed to be the incarnation of Imām ‘Ali, amīr al-mu‘minīn, a claim which raised considerable criticism among the leading scholars. In Baghdad, as an ensuing correspondence between them and Sayyid Muhammad indicates (Kasrawī, Tārīkh, 31).

**Subsequent history.** Sayyid Muhammad’s son and successor Sulṭān Muhammad strengthened the power of the Musha‘ṣaḥa‘ further. His rule extended into the area of Luris-tān, the land of the Bakhtiyāris and Fayfī Lurs, and a larger part of al-Dżazīr; even the area around Baghdad seems to have temporarily fallen under his control. He also attracted the attention of scholars like Mawlānā Shams al-Dīn Muhammad Astarabādī. The Shī‘i doctrine, now less extreme, was successfully spread throughout the area. A major role was played by the Mar‘aṣḥi sayyids [q. v.], of whom a branch had come from their homeland in Mzandarān and settled in ‘Uṣaynī, led by Dīyā‘ al-Dīn Nūr Allāh al-Ḥusayn al-Mar‘aṣḥi al-Shūḥtāri, whose grandson was Kādī Nūr Allāh, the author of the Magālīs al-mu‘minīn (Sayyid ‘Abd Allāh Nīmā’ al-Husaynī, Kādi‘: Tādghikī-yi Shūḥtār, 35).

The end of the reign of Sayyid Muḥsin coincided with the rise of Safavid power under Shāh Isma‘īl.
who laid claim to be recognised as the sole legitimate ruler. He was, however, only able to move against Husayn, for whom Mawla Mansur had turned against him. After Sayyid Fayyād, probably another son of Sayyid Muḥammad, had been killed with many of his supporters in Huwayza (so Khān Ṣināʾ, op. cit., 497). But according to Kasrāwī, Tārīḵ, 42, Fayyād was just another title for Sayyid Abū Muḥammad.

Although Sayyid Fayyād b. Muḥammad reconquered Huwayza and established himself as a semi-independent ruler, he remained mainly confined to Huwayza and the western parts of Khūzistān. Shāh Ismāʿīl was recognised by him as the overlord. Dīzūf remained in the hands of the Rāʾšānī shaykhīs. Shūṣhtar came under the control of a local ruler. During the reign of Shāh Ismāʿīl al-Dawrāk, the province was divided into 'Arabistān, the western part, which remained under the control of the Mushaʿshaʿ family, and Khūzistān, which was placed under the military command of the governors of Kūh Gāliya, or sometimes also under that of Fārs. When Sayyid Fayyād died in 920/1514, his successor Sayyid Badrān b. Fālah maintained some autonomy under the changing political fortunes of the two major powers, the Safawīs and the Ottoman empire. Shāh Tahmāsp confirmed his rule in 948/1541 (Ḥasan Khānūst, Ahsan al-tawdrikh, 88; see also Ḥasan Beg Munshi, Alam-ārā-yi Abbāsī, i, 95). Whereas Sayyid Badrān clearly indicated his loyalty to the Safawīs, under whose successor SaJJādīd, the Mushaʿshaʿ family seemed to have moved closer towards the Ottomans, probably under the pressure of 'Alī Pāsha, the governor of Baghdad, who dispatched a military force against Huwayza in 992/1584 (Niyyāy, Ḥasan-nāme, f. 38b ff.; Caskel, Etn. al-tawdrikh, 15). With the appointment of Haydar Kull Sultan as governor of Dīzūf, the Aḥḥārīs emerged as a major political force in northern Khūzistān and the adjacent area. The Mushaʿshaʿ family remained more or less confined to Huwayza. Sayyid 'Alī was followed in 992/1584 by his son Zanjīr 'Alī, who governed till 998/1590 (not 996, as in Minorsky, El Suppl., art. Mashaʿshaʿ).

During the troubled years of Shāh 'Abbās I's accession to the throne, the south-west of Persia, then mainly under the control of the Aḥḥārī amīrs, had been in turmoil. Sayyid Mubārak b. Muḥtālīb b. Badrān, who had spent his youth as a brigand in the region of Davārku and Ḥarmūz, drove his uncle Zanjīr 'Alī out of Huwayza at the end of 995-beginning of 996/November-December 1587. Mubārak tried to strengthen his position in Khūzistān by occupying Dīzūf and gaining control over Shūṣhtar. But in 1003-4/1594-5 Shāh 'Abbās I pacified the whole area: Luristan, Kūh Gāliya, Khūzistān and the border area, 'Arabistān. Khūzistān was given to a Shāmhūlī governor. Sayyid Mubārak managed to escape major punishment for his misdemeanour (İskandar Beg Munshi, Tārīḵh, i, 501-2). As the Shāh did not want to be engaged in major military operations against the Mushaʿshaʿ family, it is possible that the Ottomans might interfere directly in the affairs of south-western Persia, Sayyid Mubārak was reinstated as governor (bākīm) for 'Arabistān, a decision confirmed in 1005/1596-7, when another revolt of the Aḥḥārīs supported by him was crushed. The Mushaʿshaʿ family kept its independence, but was under pressure to conform to the Ottoman line with main stream Twelver Shiʿis teaching, supported by leading ḡulām of his time. The recognition of the special position of the Mushaʿshaʿ family came to power in 'Arabistān, particularly the Arabs in the Dājrāzī region. The integration of 'Arabistān into the Safawīs realm became easier after Mawla Muḥtālīb had turned against extreme forms of Shiʿī dogmas as expounded by earlier rulers. Sayyid Mubārak continued to bring his Šīʿī beliefs even further into line with mainstream Twelver Shiʿi teaching, supported by leading ḡulām of his time. The recognition of the special position of the Mushaʿshaʿ family came to power in 'Arabistān, particularly the Arabs in the Dājrāzī region.

The integration of 'Arabistān into the Safawīs realm became easier after Mawla Muḥtālīb had turned against extreme forms of Shiʿī dogmas as expounded by earlier rulers. Sayyid Mubārak continued to bring his Šīʿī beliefs even further into line with mainstream Twelver Shiʿi teaching, supported by leading ḡulām of his time. The recognition of the special position of the Mushaʿshaʿ family came to power in 'Arabistān, particularly the Arabs in the Dājrāzī region.
attitude towards members of his family. The ensuing revolt was suppressed by the governor of Luristan, Muhammad Mirak b. Marwan, who occupied Huwayza and sent 'Ali Khān, together with his children, to the court in Isfahān. According to the author of the Riyāḍ al-firdaws, 'Ali Khān was driven out of Huwayza by Arab tribesmen after he had killed a son of the Shaykh al-musha'ārā Shāykh Khālaf b. Hammūd b. Marwān (Muḥammad Mirak b. Marwān), Riyāḍ al-firdaws, 231:2). Zamān Khān, governor of Kūh Gilīya, however, arranged 'Ali Khān's return to Huwayza which was considered to be an important link in the defence system against the Ottomans after 1048/1638-9.

Increasingly, the family of the Musha'ārā fell into internecine fighting. After Sayyid 'Ali Khān's death in 1092/1681, heavy conflicts broke out among his sons in which the Arab tribes of Al Fudul and Ka'b became involved. His brother Sayyid Aḩmad Khān ruled only eight months in 1097/1685-6. Under Faradāj Aḥmad b. 'Ali Khān, the Musha'ārā renewed their expansionist activities at the western border. Both Bašrā and Kūrāna were taken from Shaykh Mānī b. Mūhāmads and his Muntāfik tribe [q. v.] in 1109/1697-8. But the former was recaptured by Ottoman troops in 1112/1700-1. Faradāj Khān's success in 1112/1700-1 only showed that the new military governor in Huwayza, Ibrāhīm Khān, did not support him. He had him replaced by his nephew Sayyid 'Ali in 1112/1700-1 and imprisoned until 1120/1708-9 (Kasrāwī, Tārīḵ, 94-5).

The frequent changes of the waqfī reflected not only the widening gulf between them and their mainly Arab tribal following but is also a strong indicator of the increasing disorganisation at the Safavid court. The members of the Musha'ārā family affiliated themselves to different parties there but also tried to win support among the Arab tribes. The lack of law and order, and the continuous fighting outside Huwayza, considerably damaged the rich agriculture of the region. With the fall of Wakhshūṭ's family in Shūhtar, Khūzistān and 'Arabistān were deprived of one of their stabilizing factors. In 1114/1702-3 Sayyid 'Abd Allāh Faradāj Khān was appointed as the new waqfī, but he faced strong opposition from his father. When strife and discord in Huwayza had become uncontrollable, the Safavid court was forced to reappoint Sayyid 'Ali in 1127/1715. By now Safavid power was a shadow of its former self. Threatened by Arab tribes, the waqfī turned for help to the Ottoman governor of Baghādād. Nevertheless, the Safavid administration seemed to have intervened again in 1132/1719-20, when Sayyid Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh became waqfī of 'Arabistān, supported by Safavid troops.

Still, the waqfī remained a major factor in Safavid politics. When in 1135/1722 the Aḡfāns attacked Isfahān he was one of the remaining military forces on which the court relied for the defence of the capital. However, the waqfī seems to have played a rather ambiguous role in the battle of Gulsābād against Maḥmūd Aḡfān. The sources are not clear whether the khān of Huwayza actually was 'Abd Allāh, as some of the European sources and a later Persian source claim, or a certain Muḥammad Khān b. Faradāj Khān who has been mentioned as governor of Huwayza after 'Abd Allāh had been in collusion with the pāša of Baghādād in 1122/1719-20 (Sayyid 'Abd Allāh, Tall-išqān, 135). A letter of the Saḏafīd dynasty, dated 132-4. However, Kasrāwī, Tārīḵ, 102-4 'Muḥammad Khān', and Caskel, Die Wall's von Huwezeh, 429, assume that 'Abd Allāh had returned from Baghādād where he had moved in 1719, and was leading an Arab contingent in the battle, but was at that time no longer a Persian border province. In the short-lived peace agreement between the Ottoman government and Aḩraf Khān in 1140/1727, Huwayza was allocated together with the other western provinces to Turkey, but this did not change the situation in the south-west of Persia as the main Ottoman thrust was directed against Kurdistān and Irāq-i Fārādāj. After the 1730s and 1740s, Huwayza was restored as a Persian border province. Nādir Kuli Khān (Nādir Shāh [q. v.]) had repossessed it in Ramāḏād 1142/March-April 1730. The peace treaties of 1733 and 1736, confirmed in 1746, re-established the boundary between the two powers as agreed at Zuhāb in 1638 (Olson, The siege of Mosul and the Ottoman-Persian relations, 1718-1743, 90-1, 99-104; Lockhart, Nādir Shāh, 255). Nādir Shāh reorganised the administration of the south-west in 1150/1737-8 and appointed a Persian governor for Khūzistān with his seat in Huwayza. The Musha'ārā ruler Sayyid Faradāj Khān was moved to Dawrār, which became his new residence for the following ten years (Caskel, Wall's, 430-1). During Nādir Shāh's last years of rule, Sayyid Muṭṭalib b. Muḥammad b. Faradāj Khān overthrew Nādir's governor for Khūzistān, Muḥammad Khān Balātū, and returned to Huwayza in 1606/1747.

Nādir's successor 'Abd Shāh confirmed Sayyid Muṭṭalib, but in the ensuing power struggle over the control of Shūhtar and Dīzful, the Al-i Kāther under Shāykh Sa'd strengthened their commanding position in Khūzistān, operating from their camp between the Kāthera and Dīzful. Internal strife among the Al-i Kātheri and Dīzful increasingly, the Al-i Kātheri gained the upper hand. Sayyid Muṭṭalib was killed by the sons of Shāykh Sa'd in revenge for the murder of their father. The Zand ruler Karīm Khān [q. v.] himself was forced to move to Khūzistān [q. v.] to restore order. The Musha'ārā were from now on mainly confined to their old capital (Kasrāwī, Tārīḵ, 126-7).

After the death of Nādir Shāh, the well-organised and mainly sea-borne power of the Banū Ka'b [q. v.] emerged as the major force in the coastal region, having previously managed to stand on the sidelines in the constant wars between the Al-i Kāther and the Musha'ārā. In southern 'Arabistān their position had been checked by Karīm Khān Zand between 1763 and 1768 as the Zand ruler was able to enforce some control over them. In Huwayza, Sayyid Muṭṭalib was succeeded by his cousin Mawlā Dīdī Allāh, and after him, Mawlā Isma'īl. Following Karīm Khān's death in 1779, 'Ali Murād Khān Zand tried to stem the process of disintegration of the Zand rule in that area by taking a stronger interest in the affairs of the Musha'ārā. He appointed Sayyid Mawlā Muḥsin, under whose rule a certain Ḥāshim built a canal further up the Khalīja, diverting the irrigational water for the agriculture and garden culture of Huwayza and so. Huwayza is to become the supper base of the continuous internal strife for the control of Dīzful and Shūhtar among the Arab tribes in the area accelerated the economic decline of Huwayza even
further, although a major catastrophe could be averted when another son of Djud Allah, Sayyid Mawla Muhammad, who had been appointed a'ali at the demand of the agriculturalists, dammed the new water channel.

At the beginning of the reign of Fatḥ 'Ali Shah, 'Arabastān/Khūzistān was split into various rival factions: Shūštar, Dizful, the areas of the Al-i Kāthlr, and the powerful Kāb. The former three were put under the control of Muhammad 'Ali Mīrzā Dawlātshāh. Rām Hūrmuz, Fālābīyā, Hindiyān and the southern part became the responsibility of Huwayz 'Ali Mīrzā Farmanf. The Musha'sha' came in 1221/1806-7 to restore order in Shūštar, but he does not seem to have interfered in much of the internal affairs of Huwayzā (Kasrawī, Tārīḵ, 138). The Musha'sha' family ruled on behalf of the Persian governor of Khūzistān, collecting taxes and paying revenue to him. Compared with previous periods, the province had lost its major status. The Persian governor normally acted as deputy for the governors in Kirmāngān, Shīrāz or Isfāhān.

Manūšār Khūn Mu'tamid al-Dawla, governor of Isfāhān, Luristān and Khūzistān, appointed Mawla Farajāl Allah as šāhm of the whole province in 1257/1841, after Shāykh Thāmir and Shāykh 'Abd al-Riḍā, head of the Banū Ka'b, had fled to the Ottomans. The southern parts of the province 'Arabistān, from Hindidjan to Muhammara [see KHRURAM-SHAH], remained the responsibility of Fāhād Mīrzā, the deputy governor of Fārs (Fāsā', Persian governor of Kirmāngān). The Treaty of Erzurum in 1843 conveyed full sovereignty of land on the eastern bank of the Shatt al-'Arab, Muhammara included, to Persia. With this began the rise of the local Ka'b (Muhaysfn) ruler Shāhīd Dājīr Khān, who was supported by the Persian authorities. He was able to extend his active control over most of the Arab tribes like the Banū Turūf, Bāwiyā, Nāṣir and Rābī'. The Musha'sha' leaders were increasingly fighting their own nomadic followers. By acting mostly as his deputies they practically became subordinate of Shāhīd Dājīr Khān, who in fact had been given a fairly free hand in this part of 'Arabistān (Talib Hamid, History of 'Arabistān, 1857-1897, 147). The Persian governor-general of Khūzistān still remained officially in control of affairs.

In 1872 Hamza Mīrzā Highmat al-Dawla installed Sayyid Mawla Muhammad b. Naṣr Allāh as 'Abd Allāh (?), the new ruler in Huwayzā. Mawla Muṭṭalib b. Naṣr Allāh was recognised as ruler in 1881 but Nīzām al-Salṭāna replaced him with Sayyid Mawla Naṣr Allāh, probably in 1888 (Lorimer, Gazetteer, Affairs of Huwash district, 1848-1896, 1680 ff.). This decline in the authority of the Musha'sha' rule led to the breakdown of the Banū Turūf, who refused to pay tribute any longer. Although the Persian troops were successful in putting down the Serious disturbances in Huwayzā, after a further rising of their inhabitants against the garrison in 1894, Shāykh Mīḍal b. Dājīr Khān was entrusted to deal with the affairs in Huwayzā and sent his brother Khāz'al there in 1300/1882. Mawla Muṭṭalib b. Naṣr Allāh was forced after considerable resistance to move to Dizful, where he remained for the rest of his life. Shāykh Khāz'al married a Musha'sha' woman and appointed his wife's brother in place of Sayyid Mawla 'Abd al-'Ali in 1910. After the deposition of Shāykh Khāz'al in 1924, Mawla 'Abd al-'Ali was recognised as head of the Musha'sha' but did not play a political role any further.

Cons. The Musha'sha' exercised the right of coinage. Probably the oldest known coins are two silver pieces from Shīrāz, dated 906, which bear the name Fālāb al- Muḥamsin (University of Tübingen, Collection of Islamic coins). Several dirhams have been found at Sūṣa struck at Shīrāz and Dizful in the name of al-Mahdī b. al-Muḥamsin, which may belong to a son of Sayyid Muḥamsin, probably Fāsyād, dated 914/1508 (Caskel, Ein Mahdides 15. Jahrhunderts, 93, changes it to al-Muḥamsin b. al-Mahdī). Kasrawī (Tārīḵ, 94) mentions a coin of Huwayzā dated 1085/1674-5, but although having the Shīr'ī legend 'Ali wa'li Allāh it was probably issued in the name of the shāh. Coins called huwayza played a important part in the rites of the Ahl-i Ḳabb [q.v.].


AL-MUSHATTĀ or AL-MAHŠATTĀ (A., presumably...
mushatta “a place where one spends the winter, winter camp”), a palatial, ruined structure almost cer-
tainly of early Islamic date, in what is now Jordan, situated 35 km south of 'Amman just east of the main
north-south road connecting the capital with Mâ'ân. It consists of a nearly square stone-walled enclosure
measuring ca. 144 m. internally on each side and divided into three sections by north-south walls of
which the foundations are preserved. The wider cen-
tral zone has three main elements—blocks of sym-
metrically arranged rooms adjacent to the northern and
southern enclosure walls and a central courtyard
57 m. square which once contained a central pavilion
or water-basin. Both groups of rooms consist of a cen-
tral zone flanked by two lateral ones. The centre of the
southern block consists of an entrance hall followed by
a courtyard, whereas the northern one has a basilical
hall with a triple-arched façade and a tri-apsed inner
chamber. These central zones were flanked by a
number of smaller chambers. The northern ones are
four separate suites of rooms or bayts consisting of
pairs of small rooms flanking a larger central
chamber; each unit faces a courtyard. The residential
character of these bayts is underscored by the presence
of latrines in each of the three adjacent wall-towers.
The northern block of rooms had brick walls on stone
foundations. The small chambers were covered by brick
ceilings and vaults, with a more typical Tri'âk. Some elements of the central ornamental style have precedents in
Coptic Egypt and still others are reminiscent of Sâsânid
designs from Tri'âk or Persia. Also, more recently the
presence of a basilical chamber with a triple apse has
been used by I. Lavin to link al-Mshatta with a group of
monumental structures from Syria, Egypt, Con-
tinople and the Roman Mediterranean. These
findings, however, serve more to underscore the
hybrid artistic culture of Umayyad Syria than to
elucidate the particular circumstances which led to the
creation and abandonment of the palatial enclave
presently known as al-Mshatta.
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1969, i/2, 578-606, 614-43, pls. 112-36; F. Tükân,
al-Hîra, bâdîya fi ’l-kubaysi al-Umaysiya fi ’l-
bâdîya, 'Amman 1979, esp. 71-2, 326. For illustra-
tions of Mshatta, see architecture, pls. X-XIII.

MUSHFIKI, the pen-name of the Persian poet
'Abd al-Rahman, who was born ca. 945/1538 in
Buğhârâ. His ancestors came from Marw, which is
probably why he sometimes refers to himself as
Marwî. According to Sa'id Nafisi, he received a
religious education during his youth, but went on
to choose the poetical vocation, in which he was the
disciple of Mawlâna Hasan Kawakbî, a well-known
poet of Buğhârâ (for. end of the 9th—beginning of the
10th/15th centuries). In 972/1565-6 Mushfîki
went to Samarkand, where he subsequently worked as
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MUSHFIKī — MUSHIR 677

The same usage, which perhaps came from the Salāḥīs, is still more clearly established in the Ottoman chancellery. We actually find the word mushīr among the alḵāb of the Turkish ważir (waṣīr) and almost at the head of the formula, which shows its importance: dāșīr-i mukkērem, mūṣīr-i muṣaffakhan, nizām iš-šālemt. Whence in the epistolary style, the epithets mūṣīrī and mūṣīrīn are used along with dāșīrī and dāșīrīn or ḫātīdhī and ḫātīdhūnā to designate all that belongs to an official of the rank of ważir.

Sultan Maḥmūd II, in creating the principal ministries, naturally thought of again giving a real value to this title of mūṣīr, which he gave to the principal ministers, and in the reign of his successor ʿAbd al-Meqdīd ʿalām, eleven mīṣārī and three officials of the first rank” (Bieni. Le premier annuaire impérial de l’Empire Ottoman, Paris 1848, 7; Bieni translates mūṣīrī by “councillor or under-secretary of state”, and has been followed by Barbier de Meynard in his Supplément, the references in which should be taken with this reservation). In 1250/1834–5, the title of mūṣīrī was given to the new nāzhīr of the Interior (Maḥkīm-i nāźīr = the former kātabūd) and of Foreign Affairs (Maḥkīm-i waṣīr = the former reyʿ-i ālī-kātabī). (Lutfī, v, 29). The dalībīyye mūṣīrīhūnī was created in 1262/1846 (Lutfī, viii, 87).

Maḥmūd II also created the post of beynīkī waṣīr or chief of the imperial guard, who bore the title mūṣīrī-ı ʿaṣārī-ı ḵāṣeṣ (paṣa), an officer who took rank after the reyʿ-i waṣīr or War Minister (Hammer. Hist. de l’Emp. Ott., xvii, 188–9). This title was soon to become the usual one of that of mūṣīrī-ı ʿaṣārī-ı ḵāṣhe (cf. Lutfī, v, 28). The ministers did not long bear the title of mūṣīrī, which gave place to nāzhīr, but the former of these titles, perhaps under the influence of the word “marshál”, which it more or less resembles, became a special military title. It became the highest rank in the army, corresponding to vizier in the civil service and of kadī-vaṣīr in the religious hierarchy. At first, the title redīf-i maṭūrī mūṣīrī (cf. Lutfī, v, 68, 74) was given to the waṣīr of certain provinces, or simply mūṣīrī of such-and-such a province (ibid., 165 ff.; v, 102–3; vii, 70). This corresponded to the demarcation of the army corps.

The number of mūṣīrīn or ‘marshals’ soon increased, and in the reign of ʿAbd al-Hamīd II there were 39 in 1890 and 31 in 1895 (see the Sāḥīm-i waṣīr for the years 1306 and 1311). Those who had the right to this title were the reyʿ-i waṣīr, the topkāhī-ye šīʿī mūṣīrī or “grand master of artillery”, the sārdy mūṣīrī or “grand master of the Palace” (replacing the old topkāhī baṣhī), according to Ahmed Rāzmī, Taṭāḥī, i, 156, 180, the khāṣeṣ mūṣīrī (as under Maḥmūd II), the commanders of the seven army corps (kūl ordu), the heads of the army services, the aides-de-camp to the sultan (yaṣār-i ekrem). The only duty of five of the mūṣīrīs was to superintend the ceremony of the Selāmīk (selāmīk reyʿ-i waṣīr-i šīʿī). The officer in charge of the police station (merkez) of Beḥshīkta, near the Yıldız Kiosk, was also a mūṣīrī (MSOS, vii [1908], part 2, 40). Instead of sārdy mūṣīrī, the more usual phrase was maḥbūn mūṣīrī (Lutfī, vii, 62).

The honorific form of address for a mūṣīrī was dawādīt (dawādīla) or dawādīt huzarītī. In the plural, the Persian redīf-i maṭūrī or with epithet mūṣīrīn-i ʿṣārī. The name of the office was mūṣīrīyet or mūṣīrīk, more rarely mūṣīrī (Lutfī, v, 91).

The title of mūṣīrī, which was borne by Mustaʿfā Kemāl Attāturk himself, has survived in the Turkish
Foreign Secretary Lord John Russell proved unreceptive to such Persian requests as an indefinite guarantee by the British government of Persia's territorial integrity, and Mushir al-Dawla left London in June 1861. A year after his return to Tehran he was appointed mutawwili of the shrine at Mashhad [q.v.], but died two months later in Qummad II 1279/November-December 1862.

Among his compositions, in addition to the risāla mentioned above, was a popular manual of mathematics (Tehran 1263/1847 and subsequent editions) and three other works still in manuscript.

**Bibliography:** Mihdi Bābdīd, Ṣāḥib-i hā'ī nīājī-i Īrān dar ṣūrī-i 12 wa 13 wa 14-i ḥidrī, Tehran 1347-51/1968-72, i, 341-4; the mukaddima to Muhammad Mushīr’s edition of the Risāla-yi ṣabkīšt-i sarhaddiyā, Tehran n.d. [1348/1969] (a Russian tr. of this had been published at St. Petersburg in 1877, together with the account of Mushir al-Dawla’s Ottoman Turkish counterpart on the boundary commission, Khushīd Efendi, as Otpisanie putešestviya po turfetsko-peredskoi granitii; Sir Denis Wright, The Persians amongst the English, episodes in Anglo-Persian history, London 1985, 74-81, 119-20.

(C.E. Bosworth)

MUSHĪR HUSAYN KIDWAĪ, Indian lawyer and politician (1878-1937), born at Gada, Bādbīd, India, where he was educated at Lucknow and London (Baratter-Law). He received the Order of Othmāniyya from the Sultan of Turkey, and proposed the idea of the Andįme-i Khudādam-i Karba [q.v. in Suppl.] (1913-18) for the protection of Mecca and other holy places as a reaction to the Turco-Italian and Balkan wars (Y.B. Mathur, Muslims and changing India, Delhi 1972, 145-64). He played a leading part in the Khilafat Movement [q.v. representing the militant trend within the movement, presiding over the Awadh Khilafat Conference in May 1920 at Faizabad (Faydābād), and was also active in the All-India Muslim League (AIML) in the 1920s; he took part in its enquiry into the Majilla uprising (1921) and was a member of the AIML committee to frame a scheme of constitution for India (1924). Elected to the central legislature three times since 1924, he became the leader of the Socialist group there, and a member of the Council of State (1931 till his death). He was furthermore the president of the non-communal All-India Independent League. A keen gardener, his name is immortalised in the “Kidway” rose; he died on 23 December 1937. His published works included The future of the Muslim empire, London 1919; Swaraj and how to obtain it, Lucknow 1924; Pan-Islamism and Bolshevism, London 1937; and Woman under different social and religious laws, repr. Delhi 1976. His Urdu poems are collected in Nāṣir-i Mūshīr and Nāma-i Mūshīr.


(Ẓafarūl-Īslām Khaīn)

MUSHĪR (A.), active participle from the form IV verb arzha, literally “oversee, supervisor, controller”, the title of an official who appears at various times and with various duties in the history of the ‘Abbasid caliphate and its successors, from the Maghrib to the eastern Islamic lands.

1. In the Arab and Persian lands.

republic, but in its early years there was only one mushīr (modern orthography, musīr) in office, the Chief of the Supreme Court, who was appointed by the

In Khedivial Egypt, there was a half at a stage where the influence of the reforms of Mahmūd II was still felt. The rubet mushīr there was, down to the reign of King Fu‘ād I [q.v.], exclusively the highest grade of officers, but without distinction between military and civil offices. It was also in theory a civil rank (rubta mulkiyya) to which all the princes of the khedivial house had a claim.

In modern Arabic usage, mushīr is used in a military context, as in modern Turkish, for “field-marshall”, as used e.g. by ʿAbd al-Hakīm ʿAmīr, Commander-in-Chief of the Egyptian armed forces under President Djamāl ʿAbd al-Nāṣīr [q.v. in Suppl.], and by the President of the Yemen Arab Republic (North Yemen), ʿAlī Sāliḥ. In a civil context, however, mushīr is a general term for “adviser”, but has tended to be replaced in formal administrative usage, e.g. for the sense of “adviser to a minister, ruler, etc.” by the related term mustashdr [q.v.].

In Persian, the title mushīr has been rarely used. Note, however, the case of the mushīr al-dawla (cf. the similar title above) borne by an aide-de-camp of Naṣr al-Dīn Shāh (L. Feuvrier, Trois ans à la Cour de Perse, 1847, 678), and see also mushīr al-dawla (Bīrahīd, J. Dasy). Sommaire des archives turques du Caire, Cairo 1930, index, s.v. mouchir, Mme. Kibizdī-Mehemet-Pacha, 30 ans dans les Harems d'Orient, Paris 1875, 126 (description of a ceremonial presentation of a mushīr’s firman); on the word mushūriyya in early 20th century use in Damascus, cf. Saussey, Les mots turcs dans le dialecte arabe de Damas, in Mil. de l’Inst. fr. de Damas, i (1929), 117; iA, art. Mūṣīr (M. Tayībī Gābulgīn).

In the first Mushir al-Dawla, Mirzā Sayyid Dā‘īfar Khān Tabrīzī, Muhandas Baqā (ca. 1790-1862), who will concern us here. He had been one of the group of five Persians sent in 1815 by the Crown Prince ʿAbbās Mirzā [q.v.] to London for four years to train as a military engineer. During 1848-52 he was in charge of a detailed survey of Persia’s western boundary with the Ottoman empire, experiences which he set down in his Risāla-yi ṣabkīšt-i sarhaddiyā (see Bih.). Already on the accession of Naṣīr al-Dīn Shāh [q.v.], he had been appointed to the post of official in charge of important matters relating to foreign affairs (nishār-i hā’ī-i dawlat-i khāνīga), and then in 1858 he became president of the supreme advisory council to the Shāh, rāz-i dār al-ḵūrā, whose constituting was a first, very tentative step towards the limiting of the monarch’s autocratic power; he held this post till his death, and shortly after his presidency also became a member of a second council, the māḏljī-i ḡūrā-i dawlatī. In 1860 Naṣīr al-Dīn Shāh appointed him, by now a distinguished elder statesman who had received the lakab of Mushir al-Dawla and had already headed missions to France and Russia (Bih.), to London as ambassador, to promote the strengthening Anglo-Persian relations and of securing support against possible threats from Russia, but the
The office of ishrāf seems basically to have been a financial one. The supervision of financial operations was the task of the diwan al-żimān al-azīmā (see diwan. i. The caliphate); in the reign of al-Mu'taṣim, the inspector appointed to control the actions of his vizier al-Fadl b. Marwān was called a zamām (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 1183). By the early 4th/10th century, however, mushrif was regularly used for inspectors sent out to the provinces to check financial affairs there, e.g. it is used for the inspector sent out by the vizier al-Kāsim b. Ubayd Allāh b. Sulaymān in 287/900 to investigate the estates of the Banu 'l-Furat [see Ibn al-Khayyar al-Qasim b. 'Alī, Al-Jārā' al-farā'ah, ed. ibid., 452].

Under the Umayyads of al-Andalus, the mushrif was in the 4th/10th century likewise an inspector in the running of the markets and the coining of money, besides this one, from that of the royal treasury to those of the falcon-house and the arsenal (V. Minorsky, Tadhkurat al-muluk, CMS, London 1943, 30, 158), but before the reign of the Tughluqid Firuz Shah, the mushrif-i mamdlik mustawfi 'l-mamālik, the title mushrif was known, on the evidence of al-Kalkashandi (Ṣūh b. 'al-qāšā, v, 454), who says that the mushrif in these states was in charge of the royal kitchens, watching over the food cooked there, and responsible to the wād-dār al-suhba. Subsequent usage of the term seems, however, to have been mainly in the eastern Islamic world. In Il-Khānīd Persia, the mushrif al-mamālik was one of two or more financial officials attending the head of the finances, the mustawfi 'l-mamālik, this last person being, in B. Fragner's surmise, the prototype of the Safavid darūgah-yi daftar-khāna (Camb. hist. of Iran, vi, 454). By Safavid times, in fact, mushrif seems to have designated middle-level inspectors and supervisors; Chardin states that the mushrif ('mouchref ou écrivain') was one of the overseers of the state or palace household workshops (būyātāt) (V. Minorsky, Tadbirat al-mulāk, GMS, London 1943, 30, 158), but the Tadhkirat al-mulāk itself lists several other mushrifs besides this one, from that of the royal treasury to those of the falcon-house and the arsenal (ibid., tr. 93-5).

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(C. E. Bosworth)

2. In Muslim India.

Before the reign of the Tughluqid Fīrūz Shāh, the mushrif-i mamālīk was essentially the accountant-general, ranking immediately below the wazīr and the nārb wazīr in the diwan-i wazīra; the office of auditor-general was filled by the mustawfi al-mamālik (Shams-i Sirāj 'Affī, Ta'rīkh-i Firuz-Shāh, Bibl. Ind. ed., 419; Diya'ī al-Dīn Barānī, Ta'rīkh-i Firuz-Shāh, Bibl. Ind. ed., 24). A redistribution (or possibly a re-definition of the latter's quittance in the time of Fīrūz Shāh left the mushrif entitled, with some one else, the mustawfi 'l-mamālik, to supervise the collection of revenues and the expenditure ('Affī, 409-10). The mushrif, assisted by a nāsrī, supervised the collection of revenues over the
entire sultanate through local staffs, and was also responsible for the audit of local accounts. A musrif also inspected crops in order to determine the government share (Barani, op. cit., 288 f.), where the word seems to refer to a local government official rather than to an officer of state.

By the time of Shehr Shahr, the musrif was an official under the shikhadar, the administrator of a shirk or pargana; the word seems to be used loosely as synonymous with amin and musrif, although 'Abbas SarwanT.

The Arab astronomers, like Pythagoras and Ptolomy, put Jupiter in the sixth sphere (falak) from within, i.e. the third from without. On the interior it adjoins the outer surface of the sphere of Mars and on the exterior the inner surface of the sphere of Saturn. The following table gives the least, mean and greatest observed northern (geocentric) latitude as 2° 8'. Its period of sidereal revolution is given by al-Kazwini (Althar, ed. Wustenfeld, i, 26) at 11 years, 10 months, 15 days.

Al-Mushtari in astrology. Al-Mushtari is the ruler (rabb) of the Bu'ayi al-Rami (Sagittarius, night-house) and al-Huat (Pisces, day-house), also night-ruler of the 1. Muthallatha (Triquetrum), which consist of 3,150 Arab miles (I Ar. m. = 1,973 metres; cf. Meinmser, Babylonien und Assyrien, Heidelberg 1929, ii, 404); in the later Akkadian period it is always identified with the nomen supremum Marduk (Biblical Merodach). In Hebrew it is called Sedek, in Greek — just as among the Babylonians, as the symbol of the highest deity — δω της δικτης. As a synonym of al-Mushtari we find (e.g. in Hady) the name Bardj on (cf. li'da al-'Arab, vii, 323).

The movement of Jupiter is, as in the Almagest, represented to be through four circles (afldk) (cf. al-Battani, Op. astr., ch. 31). The astronomical tables take for its mean daily sidereal motion the value of 5'. Its true values are 2.56 (i.e. 170 times greater) than was to be expected from the Almagest, taking into account the precession.

The true geocentric distances of the planet Jupiter are actually about 11½ times greater than given by al-Battani for example. It should, however, be pointed out that the relation of 37 : 23° 11'/8 for the greatest and least observed apparent diameter remained constant. In the case of Jupiter, the agreement is remarkably well with the modern estimate. The apparent diameter of Jupiter at the medium distance is given by al-Battani as 1/12 of the diameter of the sun. From this and the mean distance he calculates the true diameter of Jupiter at 4'/3 diameters of the earth (= 8'/3 radii), and its volume at 81 times that of the earth (i.e. 4'/3). The true values are 2.56 (i.e. 170 times larger); diameter of Jupiter = 11.14 diameters of the earth, volume = 1,380 times the volume of the earth.

The planet Jupiter is a star of good fortune because its good influence was to assess the produce of the crops, and an amm's duty was to inspect crops in order to determine the government share (Barani, op. cit., 288 f.), in Ibn Sin{ (Avicenna), the term qualifies a noun "which has come into use" and is associated with several meanings. In Ibn Sin{ (Avicenna), the term qualifies a noun associated with a certain number of meanings, i.e., a noun which can have several meanings. As used by modern linguists, it denotes "polysemy". This is the name which al-Zamakhshari gives to the fourth part of his K. al-Mufassal, in which he treats of phonetic phenomena which are "common" to the three parts of the discourse or to two of them. These phenomena are nine in number: the inclination of the vowel "al" towards the vowel "i"; pause; the lightening
of the glottal stop (hamsa); the coming together of two quiescent letters; and the letters inserted within other (hamzd); the evidently imported nature of some of his concepts, al-

kindl articulates scale structures in terms of frettings,

for he observes that, since the verb mutähraka is intransitive, it cannot be used in the passive except when it is fol-

lowed by a preposition and a pronoun which stands for the subject; one must accordingly understand fi hi, and read mutährak fi hi.

Bibliography: Dżurđjani, K. al-Tarżūj, Beirut 1965, 229-30; M. A. Goichon, Introduction à Avicenne, son époque et ses contemporains, Paris 1933, 34; eadem, Lexi
gue de la langue philosophique d'Ibn Sīnā, Paris 1938, 160-1; eadem, Avicenne, Livre des définitions, Cairo 1963, 13, 19; Ibn Ya
tirah, Shāhī al-Mufassal, Būlāk, ix, 53. (G. TROUPEAU)

MUSIKI, later MUSIKlbrace, music.

1. Theory. Mūsikī, strictly speaking, the theory of music, and contrasts therefore with gīhna, song (i.e., musical practice). But the distinction is not rigidly maintained — the lilwān al-Sāfa' even equate the two — and the term mūsikī is not associated partic-

ularly with the works of Greek-inspired theorists, even though its Greek origin is normally acknowledged. It is typically defined as the science of the composition of melodies (al-ta∫īf al-alḥān), but the use of e. g. musikāriti to denote the performer clearly shows the tendency, which has increased through time, for its meaning to encompass music in general (except only specifically religious genres such as Kur'ānic cantilla-

tion — for the religious controversy over the legality of music see Sāmā'ī). Normal in modern Arabic is such phraseology as al-mūsikī al-alḥābīyya "popular music", while in Persian we have e. g. mūsikī-yi maballī and in Turkish tuk mūsikisi "folk music" (in Turkish mūsikī/musiki has now also to compete with the French-derived mūzik). Here, however, discussion will be confined to theory, broadly understood, prac-
tice being covered in the articles gīhna and mārāk.

Beginnings. If the first great achievements in this field are to be found in the 3rd/9th-century treatises of al-Kindi, it should not be thought that the subject begins with him, nor that it is to be identified solely with the elaboration of the Hellenic legacy. Although the works of earlier writers have failed to survive, there is ample evidence of musical speculation, and many of the main concerns of the first two centuries of Islam can be established from the abundant mate-

rial preserved in the Kitāb al-Ağhānī. One theme that emerges clearly, but is only sporadically tackled by later theorists, is that of origins, together with an interest in change viewed in historical perspective. Not surprisingly, there is no general creation myth for music (although a mythical origin is provided for vari-
able instruments: the invention of the 'iud (lute), for example, is ascribed to Lamak [q. v.], who constructed it, in order to mourn his son, on the analogy of parts of his dead body), but rather conjecture as to the in-
thinity of the primitive genres of Arab music. According to a commonly held, if not unanimous, view the hūdā (cameleer's song), the earliest genre, contrasts with gīhna, under which three types are subsumed, nasb, sinād and hazadā, the last two being analogically, the former characterised as "heavy", the latter as "light". Behind such speculative (but not unreasonable) reconstructions may be detected an awareness of functional differentiation, of the con-

trast, say, between work-songs and entertainment music. Further, a realisation of the separate status of ceremonial music may be discerned in the recognition that the nasb (lament) fails to be integrated into such schemes. Given this presumed pre-Islamic background,
whether real or ideal, on the fingerboard of the Arab lute, an approach followed by all major theorists down to the 9th/15th century.

The philosophers. For both Ishâk al-Mawâliî and al-Kindî, the basic scale is Pythagorean diatonic. In this system the subtractions of a perfect fourth (4/3) to a perfect fifth (3/2) yields a (major) whole tone (9/8). Two whole tones make a (slightly sharp) major third of 408 cents (81/64) which, when subtracted from the fourth, yields a semitone of 90 cents, termed limma, while the subtraction of the limma from the whole tone yields a slightly larger semitone of 114 cents, termed apotome [see also Mâkâm]. For Ishâk the fretting on any one of the four strings of the 'âd will yield the sequence whole tone, limma, apotome, limma, e.g., c d e fâ f. Al-Kindî adds a fifth string, but this is a notional entity designed to encompass the two octaves of the Greek greater perfect system, the tuning of the strings being in fourths throughout, e.g., G-c-fb-k(+). (It is in this area of analysis, in particular, that theory will justify the placing of music among the mathematical sciences, the medieval quadrivium, in such classificatory works as the 4th/10th-century Ishaq al-Wâlimî of al-Fârâbî and the Mâwîth al-Wâlimî of al-Kharazmî [q.v.].) But al-Kindî is also aware of practical considerations: he lists variant tunings in which the pitch of the lowest string is changed to reinforce a modally significant note, and gives a detailed account of an elementary lute exercise.

The several short treatises attributed to al-Kindî are quite eclectic. They not only encompass material of a descriptive, scientific nature (the Aristotelian end of the spectrum), but also deal with the doctrine of ethos, cosmological affinities and numerology (the Neo-Platonic end). On the former side we may note, further, schematic outlines of melodic movement which interestingly imply visual metaphors (through such terms as lâwliî ‘spiral’, dâfir ‘braid’ and muwaghâkhî ‘girdled’); and a descriptive account of the rhythmic cycles used in his day which is in some respects puzzling and imprecise, possibly because it is a pioneer attempt not relying on previous analytical models. (Later treatments of rhythm will be more obviously indebted for their concepts and terminology to prosody — not for nothing is al-Kindî’s ud, for example, allow connections to be made related to the number of strings: the basic four strings of the ‘âd, for example, allow connections to be made with the elements, humours, seasons, and points of the compass, while in the Kitâb al-Muqaawamat al-awâriyyas various instruments are ordered according to the number of strings, from one to eight, each with particular associations: to that with two strings, for example, is related a sequence of pairs beginning day/night, sun/moon, and essence/accident, while its seven frets match the days of the week and the seven heavenly bodies. Such apparently gratuitous assemblages form part of a wider theory of correspondences involving, also, according to al-Kindî, the right choice of rhythmic cycle to fit the time of day and the mood of the poem being set. Aspects of the same psychology of music that will be further developed by later writers concern the effects of music on the soul and the emotions, and the belief in its therapeutic value, while cosmological affinities will in later centuries crystallise around particular sets of modalic modes (see Neubauer, Arabische Anleitungen zur Musiktherapie).

Cosmology and numerology are, however, largely ignored by the next two great theorists, al-Fârâbî and Ibn Sinâ [q.v.]; indeed, by the latter they are brusquely dismissed. Their works represent the first great peak of scientific enquiry, utilising and building upon Greek sources, especially in such areas as the physics of sound and the technical analysis of intervals and scales with particular reference to the various tetrachord species. (The full history of the transmission of Greek musical ideas into Arabic has still to be written (for a general survey see d’Erlanger, La musique arabe, ii, 257-306), but it is clear that the main sources, directly or indirectly, are Aristotle, Aristoxenos, Euclid, Nicomachos and, above all, Ptolemy, through whom others are filtered.)

The Kitûb al-Mûsîkî al-kâhirî of al-Fârâbî (d. 339/950) has been justly praised as an outstanding intellectual achievement. Despite the range of interests exhibited by al-Kindî, little in the preceding literature anticipates its scope and analytical profundity. Its qualities are demonstrated at the outset in an extensive methodological introduction beginning with basic concepts (of music itself and its production; and of the discriminating and creative faculties) and marked by rigorously logical argumentation. The Aristotelian tone is reinforced by repeated reference to the Posterior Analytics as the introduction proceeds with such topics as types of melody (viewed as evolving towards a present state of perfection) and classification of instruments (the highest status accorded those that most closely approximate to the human voice). Consideration of theory — to which practice is deemed temporally and logically prior — begins with a distinction within lâhn, melody, of essentials (wusûl) and non-essentials (fuzûdû) that echoes the conceptualisations of practising musicians, and proceeds to a discussion of questions of scale. The means of demonstration is again the fingerboard of the ‘âd, with the addition of al-Kindî’s hypothetical fifth string to complete the second octave. Insistence on being able to produce all the notes of one octave in the other leads to an increase in the number of frets postulated, and al-Fârâbî also goes beyond the Pythagorean confines of al-Kindî’s (and Ishâk al-Mawâliî’s) fretting by introducing a neutral third (wusâl saţûl). Here al-Fârâbî is reflecting current practice, as also in maintaining the mutual exclusivity of the notes produced by the second (wusâb) and third (bîsmîr) fingers. The remainder of the introduction and, after an initial discussion of the physics of sound, the beginning of the second part, are devoted to interfacial analysis (definitions, addition, subtraction), and to the combination of intervals within a fourth, that is, to the exposition of various tetrachord species. Here the link with contemporary practice is broken: many of the species listed (particularly among the chromatic and enharmonic sets) can have had no place in the Arab music of the day, and this part of the work is quite clearly indebted to, and a synthesis of, Greek theory. The emphasis becomes even clearer in the ensuing treatment of the greater perfect system and the dispositions of the tetrachord species within it — a topic that will also recur in later sections.

Just as theoretical, but independently constructed, is al-Fârâbî’s treatment of rhythm. This can be viewed as a daring attempt, not to analyse just the rhythmic cycles in use, but to construct a global classification able, through the use of variables, to account for virtually any possible cycle, flexibility being provided by the disjunct (mufasâl) cycles, made up of feet of differing lengths. Al-Fârâbî also introduces the concept, used by later theorists, of a
disjunction (fāsilā) between cycles: a cycle is deemed to terminate not with the last time unit preceding the onset of the next but with the last time unit marked in the basic percussion pattern. Other works by al-Fārābī devoted solely to rhythm (Neubauer, *Die Theorie vom Ikk*) give a rather different picture, contrasting more on existing cycles and on the many techniques of differentiation applied to them (Sawa, *Music performance practice*).

Further important topics covered in the *Kitāb al-Musīkil al-kabir* are instruments and melodic structure. Treatment of the former is revelatory, but at the same time restricted, dwelling almost entirely upon the scale-systems associated with each instrument: there is virtually nothing, despite the model of al-Kindī’s account of the lute, on construction, dimensions, materials or context of use. Not surprisingly, given the emphasis on pitch discriminations, there is no mention of percussion, and the initial classification simply separates strings from wind, dividing the former in two ways: plucked or bowed, stopped or open. Extraordinary in the material on scale is its sheer variety. If we ignore the extended treatment of theoretically possible frettings and the schematic presentation of variant tunings, we are left with radically different scales associated with the *ṣā‘id*, the *tunbūr ḥurbūddī* (the scale of which is analysed in terms foreshadowing the later Systematist scale), and the *rabāb* (*q.v.*). (The earliest attested bowed instrument). We are evidently faced here with material taken from different analytical traditions, but in contrast to the composite fretting of the lute, which in some areas such alternative definitions, there is no real attempt at integration, and it may be that the various instruments were associated with particular regional and still markedly different idioms.

Melodic structure is considered in two ways: in relation to the text, and to pitch organisation. Melismatic and syllabic styles of setting are explored, as are aesthetic aspects of phonology and voice production. As with rhythm, the treatment of melodic shape is largely schematic and is to be seen more as a codification of possible combinational patterns than as an attempt to describe contemporary melodic norms. It was, nevertheless, to be influential, being reproduced by several later theorists.

Ibn Sīnā’s (*d. 428/1037*) major contribution to the theory of music is contained in a chapter of the *Kitāb al-Ṣafā* (*q.v.*). There are, in addition, two slimmer (and nearly identical) texts, one Persian (in the *Dānishāmāy ‘alā‘ī*) and the other Arabic (in the *Kitāb al-Nafā‘ī*), but these add nothing new. The treatment of music in the *Kitāb al-Ṣafā* is considerably briefer than that provided by al-Fārābī, is necessarily narrower in scope, and fails to break much new ground; but it is in some ways more logical in its organisation. Of particular interest in the introduction are the ideas about the nature of sound, seen ultimately as a signalling device designed to help preserve the species, but also as a means of expression that can be used to aesthetic effect. Although by no means identical, the following treatment of intervals (involving definitions, consonance ranking, addition and subtraction) and scalar analysis is clearly dependent on the model provided by al-Fārābī, while the examination of tetrachord structures is carried even further to include one or two species not derived from Greek sources: a clear indication of the ways in which areas of theory could develop as autonomous fields of speculation increasingly divorced from practice.

There follows an extensive treatment of rhythm, again indebted to al-Fārābī, and employing the same technique of including variables to construct periodic structures comprising cycles with differing totals of time units as well as differing patterns of percussions. Instruments are then briefly considered, of particular interest being the organological classification. For chordophones Ibn Sīnā adds to al-Fārābī’s criteria a distinction regarding the mounting of the strings, and differentiates between aerophones according to whether the air stream passes through a hole, across a reed, or is produced from a reservoir. Pitchless percussion instruments are again ignored, and the chapter concludes with a lute fretting to which is appended a definition of the intervallic structure of some of the best known melodic modes of his day.

Modal analysis was to become one of the major concerns of the Systematist school, but some two hundred years separate the *Kitāb al-Ṣafā* from the *Kitāb al-Adwār*, the earlier of the two treatises by Ṣafī al-Dīn al-Urmawi, its first and most influential theorist. The intervening period is one from which there are very few works of theoretical interest, the only one of real note being the *al-Kaṭf fi ‘l-musīkil* by Ibn Zaylā (d. 440/1048 [*q.v.*]), a pupil of Ibn Sīnā, and it may well be that the apparent decline in theoretical writing, particularly of the scientific kind, is to be causally linked with the eclipse of philosophy as a major intellectual concern. It is true that many works of these, as of earlier centuries, have failed to survive, but unlikely that there were any subsequent to the lost treatise of Ibn Bāḍyja (d. 533/1139 [*q.v.*]) that might have rivalled those of al-Fārābī and Ibn Sīnā. At the same time, it should be emphasised that the tradition they represented was not the only one to produce significant writings about music, and the Neo-Platonic tradition that they rejected was to prove, with its emphasis on numerology and cosmological affinities, extremely durable, reaching its first important expression, after the initial exploratory forays of al-Kindī, in the *risāla* on music of the Ikhwan al-Safā (9th/10th century [*q.v.*]). This relates the rhythms and the strings of the *ṣā‘id* to a more elaborate series of associations, headed by the seasons, which includes also colours and perfumes, integrating such material under the general notion of a cosmic harmony governed by ideal numerical relationships which yield the music of the spheres. Related concepts of equilibrium inform discussion of the moral and medical effects of music. But practice is not wholly ignored: definitions, however opaque, are given for the rhythmic cycles, and details on proportions and construction are given for the lute. On the more strictly scientific side the *risāla* is noteworthy above all for a clear expression of the theory of the spherical propagation of sound. Nevertheless, the *risāla* is perhaps less remarkable for its handling of any one issue that for the way in which all contribute towards a broad educational and ethical design: it is not without significance that the *risāla* concludes with aphorisms on music culled from the philosophers and anecdotes about religious ecstasy.

A further work from the same period that deserves mention is the *Kamāl Adab al-qamāl* of al-Ḥasan al-Kātib (late 4th/10th or early 5th/11th century). This presents a unique combination of materials derived from earlier theorists (it preserves, interestingly, fragments from the lost work of Ṣafī al-Dīn) combined with extensive discussions of areas of interest to practising musicians. The former are less interesting than the latter.
which include examination of such issues as aesthetics, etiquette and deportment in performance, and investigation of an unexpectedly rich vocabulary of technical terms relating to instrumental performance and, in particular, voice production and quality. A similar range of topics is also dealt with in a slightly later work of the same genre, the Häwät al-funun of Ibn al-Ṭabḥan (5th/11th century).

The Systematists. Such a proliferation of the concerns of the Kitāb al-ḏehlān will recur only fitfully in later writings. The most influential of all later treatises, the Kitāb al-Adwar of Ṣafi al-Dīn al-Urmawī (d. 693/1294), which ushered in the Systematist school in the first half of the 7th/13th century and was to be commented on, copied many times, and translated, reverts to the theoretical high ground previously covered by al-Ṭarābī and Ibn Sinā. A compressed but precise work, it proceeds by alternating innovatory and traditional material, making its principal contributions in the fields of scale; the use of a consonance grading to generate the tetrachord types found in practice; modal analysis; the description of the rhythmic cycles in current use; and notation. The scale system, derived from that of al-Ṭarābī’s tunbūr khwāsānī, has the cardinal virtues of coherence and symmetry; the octave is divided into two tetrachords plus whole tone, each tetrachord into two whole tones plus comma (the comma being the difference between limma and apotome). For purposes of presentation and analysis the neutral seconds and thirds of practice were thus adjusted upwards to (minor) whole tone and (virtually just intonation) major third respectively, but these and other distortions were insufficient to prevent the enthusiastic adoption of this system by all the major theorists of the next two centuries, most of whom explicitly recognise their indebtedness to Ṣafi al-Dīn. They also take over his modal analysis, which over-emphasises the octave as a structural framework, and probably disguises one important tetrachord type, but otherwise allows fairly realistic representations of scale structure.

Where the speculative theorist takes over is in the systematic organization of all 17 degrees of the octave for transposition games, and in the importation of essentially redundant material from al-Ṭarābī, on tetrachord species and melodic movement, into his second and more extensive (but less original) treatise, the Risāla al-ḍarāfyya. A more significant contribution is his analysis of rhythm, again characterised by clarity of presentation and general economy of means. After an initial exposition of technique, using a straightforward equivalent of the prosodic foot to indicate combinations of time units (a short syllable representing one time unit, a long two), attention is concentrated on representing the basic set of common rhythmic cycles, the appropriate syllable sequence being qualified by a verbal statement of the number and position of those time units marked by a percussion. Thus ḥabīb aswād, for example, is given as tanan tanan tanan tanan, i.e., 16 time units, with the first time unit of each foot marked by a percussion, giving an internal 3 + 3 + 4 + 2 + 4 pattern. This information is then represented in the form of a circle, the syllabic outline, coupled with symbols for the presence or absence of percussions, being inscribed around the perimeter. (Such circles, which give the K. al-Adwar its name, are also used to indicate the number of consonant relationships in some of the modes, shown as lines across the circle joining the notes in question inscribed around the perimeter.) The only drawback to Ṣafi al-Dīn’s description of the rhythmic cycles is the insufficient detail it gives about variability: the extent to which percussions could be added (or suppressed), and the extent to which contrasts of timbre were an integral aspect of structure. But to voice this as a criticism might imply that the business of theory is to describe practice, and the relationship between the two is often by no means straightforward. Thus the fact that Ṣafi al-Dīn is the first theorist to supply examples of notation in some way relatable to music that was performed (Ibn Sinā had only managed a chant, but apparently failed to deliver) should not make us think that his purpose was to provide an accurate record of part of the repertoire: in a purely aurally transmitted tradition this would serve no useful purpose. Rather, his aim is as much to demonstrate a technique of notation as it is to manifest the melodic structure of particular forms. One of the instrumental examples may have been, quite deliberately, an archaic and technically elementary exercise having a solely pedagogic function; and it is significant that in his second and otherwise fuller treatise the total number of examples is reduced, as it also is in later works that draw from Ṣafi al-Dīn.

The one theorist who does, exceptionally, include a fully notated piece—a song by Ṣafi al-Dīn—is his first great successor, Kūṭb al-Dīn Shirāzī (654/1256-710/1311 [q.v.]). His technique of expanding Ṣafi al-Dīn’s alphabet and numerical representation of pitch and duration into a grid, the divisions along the horizontal axis representing time units, while the various superimposed layers provide for pitch, the text, a percussion part, indications of expression and dynamics, and specifications of change of mode respectively, would manifest the melodic structure of particular forms, showing in particular that the modal system allowed for a large number of looser concatenations of basic elements in addition to the fixed combinations making up the great majority of the modes recorded by Ṣafi al-Dīn. Most of the ensuing theoretical works of the 8th/14th and 9th/15th centuries are also to a greater or less extent derivative of Ṣafi al-Dīn, either directly, or through the intermediary of the treatises of his most influential successor, ʿAbd al-Ḳādir al-Marṣīḥī (d. 859/1453) who, like Kūṭb al-Dīn, wrote in Persian. Of the various commentaries on the Kitāb al-Adwar, by far the most significant is the so-called Şahr Mawładān Muḥarrak Şahī bar ʿadwar (777/1375), a work that in its intellectual rigour and willingness to scrutinise and question basic concepts can be ranked alongside those of al-Ṭarābī and Ibn Sinā. Equally important are the works of ʿAbd al-Ḳādir, but less for their purely theoretical contributions than for the ways in which they reflect developments in musical practice. By reputation the greatest composer-performer of his day, ʿAbd al-Ḳādir sheds light on the major changes that had affected the systems of modes and rhythmic cycles (having himself made a significant contribution to the development of the latter by the invention of several new cycles including one, darb al-faḥī, that has survived, albeit much altered, into the modern period). But he also discusses areas that had received scant attention from earlier writers, notably form and instruments. In his major treatise, the Durrat al-ḥudūr, the catalogue of forms gives a succinct description of the major structural features of each, noting any
associations with particular rhythmic cycles and, more characteristically, with verse in a particular ... to provide evidence to help date the emergence of the now dominant shashmakom tradition (see Jung, Quellen, 1989).

The scientifically and mathematically dominated heritage of al-Fārābī and Ṣafī al-Dīn finds its last significant expression in the works of four mid- to late-9th/15th-century authors: the Majdala fi 'almāsīkī of Fath Allāh al-Shirwānī (d. ca. 857/1453); the Risāla al-futūhyya and the Za'īn al-ḥudūl of al-Ladhikī (of which a second version survives); the outline drawings found in the earlier work, but in the number of examples considered. It presents information, arranged according to a broad string/wind/ (pitched) percussion classification, on some 40 instruments drawn from various cultures (including Indian and Chinese) that were presumably to be encountered, even if only as curiosities, in Timūrid Central Asia. Little detail is given on structure, unfortunately, attention being concentrated on, say, the number of strings and their tuning.
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The latter, in contrast, betray their origin readily enough. Although comparative material is sometimes present (lists of makāmīn 'equivalences, for example), there is little, if any, agreement as to whether or not the majority of this group (the corpus as a whole still awaits critical evaluation) reflect specifically Indian practices and concepts, being heavily influenced by (when not actually translations of) the Sanskrit literature on music [see HIND. viii. Music].

The modern period. Assuming the continuing existence of the neutral intervals first noted in association with Zelzal at the beginning of the 3rd/9th century, the descriptive accounts of Cantemir and the Şahgara dâbi al-akâmn imply the existence of an approximate quartetone, and it is in relation to this (and a theoretical octave of twenty-four intervals derived from it) that modern Arab ideas of scale will largely in terms of a more general reaction to a domi-}

What may sometimes be seen as a veritable obsession will follow other paths, but all three traditions have, in varying degrees (the Persian being the least affected), reverted to the mathematical expression of what may sometimes be seen as a veritable obsession with intonation. This development is to be understood largely in terms of a more general reaction to a domi-

nant Western culture, exemplifying as it does the responding to modern Western music (the intonational norms of the latter being by}

assumed to have been a nine-comma interval. The urge to rhythmic analysis, another major area of enquiry for earlier writers, there is again little that is new, the most important contributions being the extensive catalogues of the repertoire of existing cycles to be found in Arabic and Turkish sources. In short, the general trend, both here and in the analysis of mode, has been towards codification and systematisation, original thinking being largely eschewed in favour of the production of implicitly or explicitly prescriptive compendia with regulatory and didactic aims that find their natural outlet as conservatoire teaching manuals.

But the danger of ossification should not be exaggerated. Many scholars have now had a Western training, and are writing more within the general discipline of ethnomusicology (and are increasingly doing so in Western languages). Despite the dangers this may present of creating on the one hand a further cultural gap and, on the other, a possibly unhealthy uniformity, conformity even, the development is not unwelcome. For all its great achievements, the indigenous theoretical tradition has tended to concern itself with an increasingly narrow range of issues, thereby neglecting large areas of the phenomenon of music conceived of as social interaction. Such new approaches, provided they become readily accessible, could act as a valuable intellectual stimulus within the culture. What we need at this time as they help to make available fresh insights to those interested in the phenomenon.


MUSIKI 687


MÜSKİ — MÜSLIM B. AKIL B. ABI TALIB


2. Musical instruments. See bûr; darabukka; duff; qhayta; qijâpra; malâkh; mehter; mizâf; mizmâr; narkârâ-ghâna; nawra; rabâb; tabâli; tonbûr; ג'; urghan.

3. The social history of music in Islam. See qînâ; kânya; mehter; narkârâ-ghâna, and also the arts. on individual singers and musicians, including *Abd al-Kâdir b. Qhayta; al-Ghidir; Ibn Bâna; Ibn Qâmi; Ibn Suraydî; Ibrahim al-Mawsili; Isâk al-Mawsili; Mâbad b. Wâhe; Mâlik b. 'l-Sârib; Munâqiqâm; Bus'ân 'l-zâykar. MUSLIM, the adjectival form of the 17th noun of the root š-t-m, designates the person who professes Islam [g.v.], *islami* being exclusively used today for what is relative to Islam and having, as a corresponding term, the forms in western languages *islamic, islamique, islamisch*, etc. However, in the 4th/10th century the theologian al-Aâhâri [g.v.] called his heresiographical work *Muskâlât al-Isâlimiyin in al-Isâlim*, the act of professing *islam*.

While forms like *mohammedan, mahomedan, mohametan*, etc., whose use is justly deprecated by Muslims, have tended to disappear, *muslim* has been adopted, as a noun or adjective or both together, in an unchanged form or in the variants *mosim*, *moslem*, above all in English, in which *muslim* has fallen out of use. The origin of this term is probably the word *muslim*, which in the various sectors could or could not be called *muslim*.

the support of all branches of his family, including in particular that of his brother 'A'kil [q.v.], with whom he was on strained terms. The report implies that Muslim was no longer the legal heir of his father even earlier date is suggested by an account that during 'Umar's reign Muslim took part in the conquest of al-Baharnaas [q.v.] (Ps.-Wakidi, Futuḥ al-Shām, Cairo 1354, ii, 136, 146, 153, 159, 160, 169, 181, 184, 185, 190), in the course of which two of his brothers, DjaalI, were killed [q.v.].

When Bilal discovered the identity of his mother's guest, he waited until morning and then notified Ibn al-
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brothers, DjaalI, were killed [q.v.].

Far and ii, 177).

(Ps.-Wakidi, [q.v.]) Futuḥ al-Shām, (ibid., ii, 177). He is said to have been appointed as the first Muslim governor of the town, and to have retained this position until 'Uthman's caliphate, when he returned to Medina, leaving his brothers and sons behind (ibid., ii, 193). Other accounts, in contrast, point to a date of birth in the late 30s/650s: according to these accounts, Muslim's mother, an umm walad of Nabataean origin (cf. Muhammad b. Habib, al-Musammād, 505) whose name is variously given as Ulayya, Khalila and Hilya, was bought by 'A'kil in Syria, with the help of Mu'awiya. This purchase probably took place after 'Ali's assumption of the caliphate (in Dhu 'l-Hijja 35/June 656), which is the time usually given as the beginning of 'A'kil's friendship with the Umayyad ruler. Further corroboration of this date appears in the story of an encounter between Muslim and Mu'awiya (cf. 60/680) which is said to have taken place when Muslim was 18 years old, some time after 'A'kil's death (in 50/670). In this encounter, Muslim told Mu'awiya that he owned a plot of land in Medina worth 100,000 dirhams, and persuaded Mu'awiya to buy it from him at this price. When the caliph later heard that the land in fact belonged to al-Husayn he had it returned, while letting Muslim keep the money; al-Husayn praised him for this act of generosity (Ibn Abi 'l-Hadid, Sharh Nahdi al-baladga, ed. Muhammad Abu 'l-Fadl Ibrahim, Cairo 1378-83/1959-64, xi, 251-2).

Muslim came into prominence when he was sent to Kufa as al-Husayn's personal representative. His task was to measure the extent of Kufan support for the Prophet's grandson. He set off from Mecca on 15 Dhu al-Hasan praised him for his act of generosity (Ibn Abi 'l-Hadid, Sharh Nahdi al-baladga, ed. Muhammad Abu 'l-Fadl Ibrahim, Cairo 1378-83/1959-64, xi, 251-2).

Muslim came into prominence when he was sent to Kufa as al-Husayn's personal representative. His task was to measure the extent of Kufan support for the Prophet's grandson. He set off from Mecca on 15 Dhu al-Hasan praised him for his act of generosity (Ibn Abi 'l-Hadid, Sharh Nahdi al-baladga, ed. Muhammad Abu 'l-Fadl Ibrahim, Cairo 1378-83/1959-64, xi, 251-2).

When Bilal disappeared. He wandered despondently in the alleys of Kufa, until he finally found refuge with a woman from Kinda called Tawfiq. When Bilal discovered the identity of his mother's guest, he waited until morning and then notified Ibn al-
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statements in his chapter headings, in comparison with which Muslim’s chapter headings were felt to fall short (although they were later considerably improved upon by al-Nawawi). But whereas his abrushal is often a bit of an exasperation, Muslim’s and al-Bukhari’s chapter headings may show up a broad resemblance, the respective contents of the chapters do not. The chapters in al-Bukhari’s Sahih are presumed to be organised strictly according to their juridical content, but closer scrutiny reveals this organisation to be somewhat loose, with, in the majority of chapters, several traditions added from vaguely related, and consequently, even unrelated juridical foci. All along it had been al-Bukhari’s design to contribute as many angles of approach to this organisation to be somewhat loose, with, in the majority of chapters, several traditions added from one particular problem or issue, many of which show up a broad resemblance, the respective contents more numerous than in al-Bukhari’s, are virtually clusters solely in its different versions plus accompanying isnad strands. But one consideration has to be borne in mind: close scrutiny of the isnad strands of the uṣūl yields the information that, contrary to what one might expect, they are more often than not of relatively late origin, whereas various accompanying mutābi’ūn strands usually show up much older common links. In short, because of Muslim’s particular arrangement of his traditions, with uṣūl being illustrated by mutābi’ūn, both of which rubrics allow with the help of al-Mizzī the quick identification of the respective common links, both then followed by shawāhid, which testify to the extent of isnad prolifera- tion and sometimes even contain clues as to authorship, Muslim’s Sahih, in contrast to the other canonical collections, is indispensable for tradition analysis.

One important, unique feature of Muslim’s Sahih is its introduction. For an annotated translation and appraisal, see Bibli. Its final section deals with a controversial point, the (un)acceptability of muṣa’nan isnads [q.v.], in which Muslim is reported to have taken a somewhat more flexible stance than his fellow-traditionists. Muslim is credited with a number of other works. Of those mentioned in GDS, i, 143, the K. al-Kanā‘ and the K. al-munfarīdāt wa ‘l-wuhddān are quoted from in Ibn Ḥadījār’s Tahdīb, cf. Juyboll, Muslim tradition, 239.

Bibliography: The best, and because of its multiple hadīth numberings the most useful, edition of the Sahih is the one by Muhammad Fu‘ad Abū al-Bākī, Cairo 1955-6, 5 vols., for which the editor elected to utilise excised Nawawi’s qurūb, otherwise available in the reliable Cairo 1349 edition in 18 parts; a complete English translation (however without the introduction) was published by A.H. Siddiqi in 4 vols, Lahore 1976; for the introduction, see G.H.A. Juyboll, Muslim’s introduction to his Sahih, translated and annotated etc., in JSAI, v (1984), 263-302; for the transmission of the Sahih to following generations, see J. Robinson, The transmission of Muslim’s Sahih, in JFRAS (1949), 46-60; for the isnad-analytical technical terms mentioned in the article, cf. G.H.A. Juyboll, Muslim tradition. Studies in chronology, provenance and authorship of early hadith, Cambridge 1983, index s.v.; idem, Some isnad-analytical methods illustrated on the basis of several woman-demeaning sayings from hadith literature, in al-Qantara, x (1989), 345-84; idem, Some notes on the earliest fuqā‘ā‘ of Islam distilled from hadith literature, in Arabica, xxxix (1992); idem, On the origins of the poetry in Muslim tradition literature, forthcoming in the Ewald Wagner Festschrift; idem, Analysing isnads in hadith and akhbar literature, in L. I. Conrad (ed.), History and historiography in early Islamic times: studies and perspectives, Princeton 1992.

G.H.A. JUYBOLL
significant Bedouin Arab dynasty; during his reign the struggle between Fātimids and ʿAbbāsids for supremacy in Syria and al-Djazīra was decided in favour of the latter.

In the year 433/1042 the 20-year-old Muslim was chosen chief of the tribe after the death of his father Kuraysh b. Badrān and succeeded him as ruler of al-Mawṣil. Like most Arab rulers of the lands of the Euphrates, he recognised the Fātimid caliph in Cairo as his suzerain, partly because he was himself a ʾShīʿa. Quite early in his reign he began to cherish the ambitious plan of gradually extending the rule of his tribe over al-Djazīra. Every means of extending his power was taken by him. The first opportunity occurred when in 458/1066 the Saldjūk Sultan Alp Arslān [q.v.], after conquering the Khārazmians, was proceeding to establish his supremacy in Syria. For this he had to entice the Arab chiefs from the sphere of influence of the Fātimid caliph and win them over to an alliance with him and to a recognition of the ʿAbbāsīd caliph. He therefore concluded an alliance with Muslim and granted him several towns in al-Djazīra. As a partner in this alliance, Muslim defeated the Banū Kīlāb who were vassals of the Fātimids. In 463/1070 Alp Arslān died. The alliance was renewed with his son Malik ʿShāh [q.v.]. With his help, Muslim was able a few years later to extend his power into Syria and take Aleppo. In 472/1079 this town had a strong owner; it was held by the Kādī al-Ḵhuṭaytī, and the citadel by one of the last Mirdāsids [see Ḥalab and Mirdāsids]. There was a lack of provisions, as the town was continually threatened by enemies and the roads to it were cut off.

Damascus was in possession of the Saldjūk amīr Tutuš [q.v.], to whom his brother Malik ʿShāh had granted Syria, which was still to be conquered. It was natural for Tutuš to wish to bring Aleppo also into his power, but the people did not care for him because of his cruelty and greed, shut their gates against him and appealed for help to Muslim. After Tutuš had withdrawn, Muslim approached the town with large supplies of provisions and, after lengthy negotiations, both town and citadel were handed over to him [see Ḥalab] and the Mirdāsid chiefs received some smaller towns in compensation. He received a grant of confirmation from Malik ʿShāh, who did not want his brother to become too powerful, on paying a considerable annual tribute. Muslim extended his territory by adding to it al-Ruḥā (Edessa), Harrān and a number of smaller fortresses, out of which he drove the leaders of Turkish bands so that his power stretched from northern Syria to the Euphrates. Instead of being content with this, he undertook ambitious missions in order to present himself not only to his subjects, but also to his enemies, and only survived a few years longer (till 489/1090) as governor of al-Mawṣil [q.v.].

Muslim is described as an active and just man, and his tolerance of Christians was remarkable for its time. His rule is said to have been able and orderly, and indeed, he did bring the finances of Aleppo into order in a very short time after taking it. In any case, he had wide vision and successfully endeavoured to maintain the power of the Arab tribes in Syria and al-Djazīra. It ended with him; henceforth Turkish generals of the Saldjūks became the rulers of Syria and al-Djazīra.


Muslim b. 'Ukba of the Banū Murra [q.v.], famous commander of the Sufyānids caliphs. We know very little about the early stages of his career. We find him early established in Syria, to which he probably came with the first conquerors. Completely devoted to the Umayyads and of great personal valour, he led a division of Syrian infantry at the battle of Siffin [q.v.], but he failed in an attempt to take the oasis of Dāmat al-Djandal [q.v.] from ʿAll the caliph Muʿāwiya appointed him to take charge of the ḥarādī, the finances, of Palestine, a lucrative office in which he refused to enrich himself. Muslim was prominent at the death-bed of Muʿāwiya. The caliph had charged him and al-Ḍabāḥ b. Kays [q.v.] with the regency until the return of Yazīd, who was in Anatolia at the head of his troops. The confidence which the great Sufyānid had in his loyalty is seen in his advice to his heir: “If you ever have trouble with the Ḥidjāz, just send the one-eyed man of the tribe of Murra there” (Muslim had only one eye). This time had now come.

Muslim had been a member of the embassy sent to Medina to bring the Anṣār back to obedience. All other efforts at conciliation having failed, Yazīd I decided to resort to force. In spite of Muslim's age and infirmities, Yazīd felt he was the man to command the expedition. He was obliged to travel in a lit-
ter on account of his infirmity. At Wadi '1-Kura, Muslim met some Umayyads who had been driven out of Medina; they informed him of the military situation of the town. When he reached the oasis of Medina, Muslim encamped on the barra [q.v.] of Wākīm and for three days awaited the result of the negotiations begun with the rebels, Ansār and descend- 
antes of the muḥādjīrin of Kuraysh. On the fourth day, all overtures having been rejected, he made his plans for battle. It was a Wednesday, 26-7 Dhū '1-Hijādža 63/26-7 Aug. 683). After a slight interval, he advanced on the Ansār, the battle ended at midday in the complete rout of the rebels. The Syrians followed them into Medina and began to plunder the city. Anti-Umayyad legend has much exaggerated the horrors and the duration of this pillaging which it extends to three days. On the day after the battle, Muslim's intervention restored order and he used the next few days in drawing up the case against and trying the principal leaders of the rebellion who had fallen into his power.

Having established order in the town, which he left in charge of Rawḥ b. Zinbā [q.v.], in spite of the aggravation of his malady, he resumed his march on Mecca to deal with 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr [q.v.]. Arriving at Muhghallal he became so ill that he had to stop. In obedience to the caliph Yazīd's instructions, he desisted from his advance in company with Rawḥ b. Zinbā, Muḥayyayn b. al-Numayr [q.v.], his second-command in-in-command. He died at Muhghallal, where his tomb long continued to be stoned by the passers-by (cf. Ziyārāt, 51). Writers with Shī'ī sympathies are fond of twisting the name Muslim into Muṛif (spendthrift, one who acts irresponsibly: an allusion to Kurā'īn, V, 36, VII, 79, XI, 29, 36, and ṭassim). One statement which must be a red herring is that this is etymology, but this recension has not come down to us (there are only few traces of it in the Maghribī script of the preserved copy might sug-

 vantecy which makes us take him as one of the most representative of the types of this generation of soldiers and statesmen, whose talents contributed so much to establish the power of the Umayyads. Dozy described him as "un Bedouin mécréant". Muslim, it must, as regards subject matter, number among his contemporaries. His drinking songs deserve special mention. Although Nöldeke only very rarely finds in them "the natural effusion of Bacchantic joy as so frequently in Abū Nuwâs", Arab critics are of another opinion. These two poets are to them practically the same in this respect, and we must confess they are right. His drinking-songs are not only of great value for the descriptions of society and social life in the cities, but from the point of view of poetry they are among the best of Muslim's work. If we look at the matter and style of his poems, he was on quite traditional ground. In addition to his on-

Muslim was on terms of friendship or enmity with many contemporary poets, e.g. Abū Nuwâs, Abū 'l-ʿAtāiyā [q.v.], al-ʿAbbās b. al-Aḥnaf (who maliciously called him Sarī[s] al-Qalīdān or Sarī[s] al-Kāʾ), Abū 'l-Shīr [q.v.], al-Husayn b. al-Dāhîbāk [q.v.], etc. His literary influence was not inconsiderable: Dībīl [q.v.] was his pupil (which did not prevent him exchanging satires with Abū Nuwâs); Abī Tammām was particularly fond of studying his poems. His Diwān has been transmitted in very unsatisfactory fashion; it was collected in alphabetical order by al-Sūlī [q.v.], but this recension has not come down to us (there are a few traces of it in the Kitāb al-Aghānā); another story speaks of the collection made by al-Mubarrad.

The manuscript long considered as unique, that of Leiden University Library (Or. 888), is very incomplete, since it contains only vols. ii and iii of the recension and commentary of the Andalusian scholar (d. Shāmī, 1847) through his transcriber. Abū Wālīd b. ʿĪsā al-Ṭabīkhī (not al-Ṭanjī as the Maghribī script of the preserved copy might sug-

Muslim was on terms of friendship or enmity with many contemporary poets, e.g. Abū Nuwâs, Abū 'l-ʿAtāiyā [q.v.], al-ʿAbbās b. al-Aḥnaf (who maliciously called him Sarī[s] al-Qalīdān or Sarī[s] al-Kāʾ), Abū 'l-Shīr [q.v.], al-Husayn b. al-Dāhîbāk [q.v.], etc. His literary influence was not inconsiderable: Dībīl [q.v.] was his pupil (which did not prevent him exchanging satires with Abū Nuwâs); Abī Tammām was particularly fond of studying his poems. His Diwān has been transmitted in very unsatisfactory fashion; it was collected in alphabetical order by al-Sūlī [q.v.], but this recension has not come down to us (there are a few traces of it in the Kitāb al-Aghānā); another story speaks of the collection made by al-Mubarrad.

The manuscript long considered as unique, that of Leiden University Library (Or. 888), is very incomplete, since it contains only vols. ii and iii of the recension and commentary of the Andalusian scholar (d. Shāmī, 1847) through his transcriber. Abū Wālīd b. ʿĪsā al-Ṭabīkhī (not al-Ṭanjī as the Maghribī script of the preserved copy might sug-
gest). The 75 surviving pieces of verse are not classified according to the alphabetical order of the rhymes. They are succinctly presented but more extended lithographically, without the introd., notes and indices (which were in Latin), by Mirzá 'Ali Muh. al-Husaynî, at Bombay in 1303/1885; in 1325/1907 there appeared at Cairo, with a reclassification according to the alphabetical order of rhymes, a reproduction of De Goeje's Arabic text, soon followed, again at Cairo, n.d., by a further pirated edition. Finally, one may consider as definitive the work of Sâmi Dahrân, who published at Cairo in 1376/1957 a Šahr Dîwân Sâri al-Ghawdînî of 69 + 524 pp. This remarkable work, based on the Leiden ms., includes a long introd. on the poet, his work and the history of the Dîwân, and then, after the 75 pieces, 205 fragments drawn from various sources, the texts of notices devoted to the poet by 45 mediaeval authors and seven indices (introduced by A. F. Riél, 'Anâr al-Muhammadî; Cairo 1927, 374-92; Sezgin, GAS, ii, 528-9). (I. Kratschowský)

MUSLIMûN (a. Musulmân)

1. The old-established Muslim communities of Eastern Europe
2. Migrant Muslims in Western Europe
3. Migrant Muslims in the Americas

A. The Muslim communities of northern Europe

(1) Poland. The Muslim community of Poland was constituted by the arrival and settlement, in the 14th and 15th centuries, of a number of Muslims from Bosnia-Herzegovina (a region of the Golden Horde and the Khânates situated on the Volga (arriving in the 14th and 15th centuries), and the others comprising emigrants from the Crimea (see Ćirkân) (arriving especially in the 17th and 18th centuries). Subsequently, these two groups were fused into a single entity, living in harmony with the diverse populations of the region, but conserving their religious and cultural identity. It is generally reckoned that, around 1930, these Muslims numbered approximately 10,000. Decimated and dispersed during the Second World War, this community was to lose a large proportion of its members following the changes to the eastern frontier of the country which favoured the USSR. Currently, no more than some 2,200 Tatars remain in Poland (notably in the villages of Bohoniki and Kruszyniany, also in Warsaw, Gdánsk and Białystok). On the history and recent situation of this community, see Leh; Lipka; A. Popovic, La situation actuelle, in L'Islam en Europe à l'époque moderne, Paris 1985, 99-104; G. Lederer and I. Takacs, Chez les musulmans de Pologne, in La transmission du savoir dans le monde musulman périphérique (C.N.R.S./E.H.E.S.S., Paris, Centre d'information, no. 8), January 1988, 39-47, which contains the list of principal publications on the subject.

(2) Finland. The Muslim community of Finland consists of about a thousand "Turko-Tatars", the descendants of emigrants from the Ide Ural and Volga regions, who seem to be perfectly integrated in their new domicile. Some of them arrived in the country during the 19th century, and the majority after the Soviet revolution of 1917. These Muslims live dispersed among a dozen towns and villages, and almost all are engaged in trading in furs, fabrics and carpets. They would include a number of wealthy individuals. Relatively little is known of the current conditions of life of this tiny community, still less of its potential role in the international scene. It was officially recognised in 1925, and its headquarters are located in Helsinki; see Popovic, op. cit., 105, where other references are to be found; and, in particular, a valuable article by the best contemporary expert on the subject, Harry Halen, Islamiskoskisita Suomessa, in Eriпinos, no. 5 (Helsinki 1984), 341-53, containing a thorough bibliography.

B. The Muslim communities of South-Eastern Europe

(1) Hungary. Two Muslim communities have existed successively in Hungary. Both have subsequently disappeared in peculiar circumstances. The history of the disappearance of the first Muslim community of the country is well-known. This had been formed between 1526 and 1699 as a result of the Ottoman conquest and occupation of some Hungarian territory, but it had disappeared totally in the aftermath of the reconquest at the end of the 17th century, with the flight of Muslim populations, and the massacre or summary conversion to Christianity of the populations who remained. Subsequently, especially from 1878 onward, the birth was witnessed of a new Muslim community in the country, and this for two reasons: on the one hand there was an influx of a number of Muslims from Bosnia-Herzegovina (a migration provoked by the military occupation of these two regions by Austria-Hungary in 1878, under the terms of the Congress of Berlin, and the annexation in 1908 by the Double Monarchy [see Bosna]; on the other hand there was an influx (as a result of increasingly close ties with Turkey) of a
number of Ottoman Turkish citizens (artisans, merchants and students) who were soon to form, especially in Budapest, what amounted to a minor Turkish colony. Subsequently, both these groups were to be progressively weakened (particularly during the first half of the 20th century) as a result of the increasing and significant number of mixed marriages (there being a shortage of Muslim women in the country), ultimately becoming assimilated into the local population. Although a few "individual" Muslims are still to be found in Hungary, no longer exists a Hungarian-Muslim community in the sense in which it existed some fifty years ago, and this in spite of recent efforts on the part of various foreign Muslim sects such as the Ahmadiyya, and also of the Bahá'ís. See Majdar, Mağdristan; A Popovic, L'Islam balkanique, Berlin-Wiesbaden 1986, 184-95; G. Lederer, Sur l'Islam à Budapest, in La transmission du savoir... Lettre d'Information, no. 6, November 1986, 23-57; idem, 'Abdu-'l-Baha's visit to Budapest, in Lettre d'Inf., no. 9, February 1989, 13-25.

2. Rumania. The Muslim community of Rumania must currently number some 50,000 persons, Turks and Tatars living, for the most part, in the Dobruja [q. v.] (although a handful also exists in Bucharest and there are a few others dispersed across the country). The Rumanian state had inherited this small community from the Ottoman Empire in 1878, a minority which was later to belong sometimes to Rumania, sometimes to Bulgaria, according to the political vicissitudes of the time and the successive phases of unification or partition of the "Greater Dobruja" (formed from what is correctly called the Dobruja and the Quadrilateral). Finally, it may be added that the small Danubian Muslim community of Ada Kale [q. v.] which comprised approximately a thousand persons, was dispersed in 1968, when the island was submerged by hydraulic constructions at the Iron Gates.

The great majority of this population is composed of farmers (there being, apparently, no more seminomads in the Dobruja, just as the steppes, described (although there exists a madrasa at Bucharest). No mosque, cemeteries, public baths and other buildings belonging to the local Muslims and of a local Islamic review, as there are also some town-dwelling Muslims, in Constantinople and Istanbul, in the case of the Bosnian Muslims, and in theory at least, in Bucharest. No precise information; of primary schools; of two secondary schools; of a "symodological" wakf; (that of Mesudiyye) of Medjidiyya [see Medjidiyye], Mangalia, Tulcea, Macin, etc. In most cases, this is a population of relatively modest social status.

This community is governed by the mufti of Constantinople and by a "symodological" college [which exists more in theory than in practice]. After the end of the Second World War, it seemed to be living in a precarious condition; the closure of Turkish and Tatar schools in 1957, the closure of the "Muslim seminary" of Mesudiyya (the only establishment of its kind in the country) in 1967 (or as early as 1962?), the non-existence of Islamic religious publications, the impossibility of participating in the pilgrimage to Mecca, etc. Then, in 1972 or thereabouts, the international situation and the economic difficulties of the country obliged the Rumanian authorities of the time to grant to the local Muslim community certain concessions, with the object of visibly improving the image of the regime vis-à-vis a number of Arab and Muslim countries. Among the developments witnessed in the recent period have been the dispatch of Rumanian Muslim delegations to these countries, the publication of a small book of propaganda relating to the local Muslims and of a local Islamic review, as well as a very different (but constantly growing) renewal of pilgrimages to Mecca, financed by the Libyan government. At the time of writing (end of 1989), nothing is known of the likely consequences, for the small Muslim community of Rumania, of the collapse of the local Communist régime. See Bogdan: Klaw; Popovic, L'Islam Balkanique, 196-253.

3. Greece. The Muslims of Greece must currently number between 130,000 and 150,000 persons. It should, however, be born in mind that in the past a large number of Muslims have been obliged to leave the country at various times, between 1821 (the start of the Greek insurrection against the Ottomans) and 1923 (the exchange of populations between Greece and Turkey) [see Muragir. I]. They belong to three clearly distinct communities which are not united in a common organisation. The communities in question are the Turks (and gypsies) of eastern Thrace, the Bulgarianophones (mainly the islands of Rhodes and Kos, see Oniki Ada) consists of between three and four thousand Turkish-speakers, most of whom have opted in recent decades for Greek nationality. This is a community in an advanced state of decline, containing a high percentage of elderly people and showing practically no sign of organised community life beyond the absolute minimum (Friday prayers, the major religious festivals, weddings and burials). Its schools have been closed since 1972, and its cultural life such is virtually non-existent; the mosques, cemeteries, public baths and other buildings belonging to the wakfs have been neglected, and the mufti, who died in 1974, has not been replaced.

(b) It is very difficult to supply accurate information regarding the Muslim community constituted by the Bulgarianophones. Among the developments witnessed in the recent period have been the dispatch of Rumanian Muslim delegations to these countries, the publication of a small book of propaganda relating to the local Muslims and of a local Islamic review, as well as a very different (but constantly growing) renewal of pilgrimages to Mecca, financed by the Libyan government. At the time of writing (end of 1989), nothing is known of the likely consequences, for the small Muslim community of Rumania, of the collapse of the local Communist régime. See Bogdan: Klaw; Popovic, L'Islam Balkanique, 196-253.

(a) The "Muslim community of the Dodecanese" (principally the islands of Rhodes and Kos, see Oniki Ada) consists of between three and four thousand Turkish-speakers, most of whom have opted in recent decades for Greek nationality. This is a community in an advanced state of decline, containing a high percentage of elderly people and showing practically no sign of organised community life beyond the absolute minimum (Friday prayers, the major religious festivals, weddings and burials). Its schools have been closed since 1972, and its cultural life such is virtually non-existent; the mosques, cemeteries, public baths and other buildings belonging to the wakfs have been neglected, and the mufti, who died in 1974, has not been replaced.

(c) We are much better informed regarding the history and the current situation of the Turkish-speaking Muslims of eastern Thrace (between 100,000 and 120,000 persons). These are in the main Turks and a certain number of gypsies but also, perhaps, included among them are a few groups of Roumelites from various Balkan regions (and from diverse origins) who turned towards Turkey before 1912 and stopped off on the way. It is a living community, although muted by the local authorities and very much dependent on everyday relations between Greece and Turkey, relations in which it is itself a weighty factor. It nevertheless leads a relatively intense religious and cultural life: we may point out the existence of two "major" muftis (those of Xhanti and of Komotini) and one "minor" mufti (that of Didimothio); of an administration of wakfs; of numerous religious, sporting and cultural associations; of primary schools; of two secondary schools; and finally of a local Islamic review in Turkish. They write their Turkish in Arabic script, including elementary school books. No precise infor-
mation is available regarding religious life as such, but worth mentioning is a vigorous participation in the pilgrimage exhibited two notable peculiarities: it was on the one hand (unlike the situation in the other countries of the region), a perfectly homogenised community, in view of the fact that all the Muslims of the country were Albanians, by racial stock and by language; on the other hand it was composed in reality of two parallel communities: that of the Sunnis (very much the majority, comprising 75 to 80% of the Muslims of the country) and that of the Bektashis (see BEKTASHIYA), accounting for the remaining 20 to 25%.

These phenomena had, however, no bearing on the changing fortunes of local Islam (and of religion in general), a process which reached its climax some twenty years later during the Albanian "cultural revolution" of 1967: the date of the absolute suppression by the authorities of the country of all religious organisations and the closure of all places of worship, without exception.

This act had been preceded by two clearly distinct periods, that of 1945-53 and that of 1954-67.

During the first of these periods, the authorities quite rapidly dismantled all the religious organisations, eliminated their religious and secular rivals and ultimately brought into line the leaders of the four religious persuasions (Sunnis and Bektashis Muslims, Orthodox and Catholic Christians), whose official pronouncements demonstrated their degree of subservience to the régime. There is documentary evidence available for this first period which shows, on the one hand, the process of this step-by-step seizure of control, and, on the other, the first attempts of adaptation and internal reform on the part of the two Muslim communities which very soon degenerated into total collaboration with the officially approved "clergy".

Documentation subsequently becomes increasingly rare, and practically nothing is known of an official nature regarding Albanian Islam after 1954, with the exception of a few titles of religious publications (year books for the most part) which are now virtually inaccessible. This period of decline is characterised by the fact that the Albanian government no longer seeks public approval from the Muslim authorities for its major policy decisions, excluding them from celebrations and major popular rallies. The final blow was to be struck in 1967.

Two subsequent dates are to be noted: 28 December 1976, the date of the adoption of the new Constitution, of which articles 37 and 35 stipulate: "The State does not recognise any religion; it supports and promotes atheistic propaganda to inculcate in the people the materialist-scientific concept of the world"; "The creation of organisations of fascist, anti-democratic, religious or anti-socialist nature is forbidden"; the second date, end of 1976-beginning of 1977, marks the publication of a decree ordering the changing of names of Biblical or Kur'anic origin. It is estimated that their assimilation (imposed with excessive force by the authorities in recent years) is in a process of acceleration from day to day, and that their religiosity has suffered since 1878 (the date of the creation of Albania) and especially since 1945, the corrosive effects of time.

(b) The most important group, by far, is that of the Turks. Their number has varied considerably since 1878, and is evidently susceptible to further variation, in view of the volatile and still unpredictable political situation of the region. It is estimated that there are currently some 500,000 (or possibly more) Turks distributed among various regions of Bulgaria (Deli Orman, Dobrudja, along the Danube, the eastern Rhodopes) but we have no knowledge of how many of them are actually believing Muslims.

(c) There are also in Bulgaria a few thousand Tatars, of whom at least a part (impossible to quantify) is of the Muslim religion. They speak Tatar and in the main inhabit the region of the Dobrudja, although there are also a few scattered pockets elsewhere.

(d) Finally, it is appropriate to mention the existence of a certain number of Muslim gypsies, whose exact number is unknown and who are generally of very tenuous religious affiliation.

The religious situation of the Bulgarian Muslim community is very unfavourable. The practice of religion is officially free, but the Bulgarian state has since 1945 followed a sustained policy of secularisation and bulgarisation, using every available means to restrict religious liberty (of Muslims and Christians alike) with the result that today religion is undoubtedly in decline throughout the country. As regards the Muslim community in particular, this is expressed by the following: state appointment of senior religious leaders, suppression of religious festivals, the outlawing of a Muslim press, measures to prevent Bulgarian Muslims from participating in the pilgrimage to Mecca or establishing contacts with external Muslim communities, proliferation of societies of "scientific atheism" designed to intensify work on the land, etc. The recent campaign aimed at the bulgarisation of Turkish names provoked the mass emigration in 1989 of some 300,000 Muslims, a number of whom have however returned to Bulgaria since. See BULGARIA; Popovic, L'Islam balkanique, 66-106.

(6) Yugoslavia. The exact number of Muslims currently living in Yugoslavia is unknown, in view of
the fact that recent censuses have not taken account of
the religious affiliations of the population, but their
number must exceed, to a considerable extent, the
figures given above; in Serbia, in the out of a total population of
22,418,331 inhabitants (census of 1981).

The three principal groups are located in Bosnia-
Herzegovina (Slavs of "Muslim nationality"—
whose existence was officially recognised by the
authorities, for political reasons, in 1969—Muslims of
Serbian nationality and Muslims of Croatian
nationality, a total of approximately 2 million per-
tens of thousands of other Muslims, belonging to all
the nationalities aforementioned, dispersed through-
out the country. Thus it is evident that the Yugoslav
Muslim community exists in the form of numerous
regional communities whose official (and non-official)
relations with the authorities, and whose actual situa-
tion, are different, show significant differences. For
this reason, the researcher seeking to unravel and
understand this complex situation should examine the
case of each of these communities separately.
(a) There is little of significance to be said regarding
the Muslim community of Montenegro [see KARADAĞI], whose representatives are seldom seen in
public and play, in any case, a modest role in the
administration of the "Supreme Islamic Authority"
of Yugoslavia.

(b) The Muslim community of Serbia is composed
of Albanians. Its centre is located at Pristina which is
the capital of the region of Kosovo. The community
possesses a madrasa (of inferior status compared to that
of Sarajevo) and publishes, in Albanian, its own
religious review entitled Edukata Islame, which is
generally considered to be an edition aimed at the
Albanian populations of the country, of the official
Yugoslav Muslim review Glasnik Vrhovnog Islamskog
Starjeinstva of Sarajevo.

(c) Little has been heard since 1945 of the Muslim
community of Macedonia [see Makedonija] (com-
pose, as stated above, of Macedonians, Albanians
and Turks), whose recent and present circumstances
have been a subject generally avoided. The riots of
Kosovo in April 1981 and the fears of the Macedonian
authorities, faced with a massive influx of Albanians
from Kosovo into Macedonia (a further manifestation
of a process which has been continuing for decades),
suddenly set in motion a whole series of actions (it is
impossible to be more specific), concerning a part of
this community. This has since been balanced by the
hasty construction and inauguration of a regional
madrasa at Skopje, by the launch of a local Islamic
religious review, and most of all by a quite extraor-
dinary insistence on the Macedonian origin of the
local Muslim Slavs, whose existence and potential as
an object for research are issues to which efforts are
now being addressed.

(d) The Muslim community of Bosnia-
Herzegovina [see Bosna] is the most numerous and
the most important Muslim community of Yugoslavia,
recently recognised "Muslim nationality", and entirely
 secularised, to the extent that it considers
itself simply as being "of Muslim descent", and has
virtually no contact either with the Muslim religious
authorities or with the Muslim press of its country
(except in the case of a complex political game
between the Muslims in power, belonging to the
recently recognised "Muslim nationality"; and those
who govern the Muslim religious affairs of the
country).

Since the history of these various groups of
Muslims of Yugoslavia is beyond the scope of this arti-
cle, we shall confine ourselves to describing very
brieﬂy, in a global fashion, the current situation.

The Yugoslav Muslim community is composed of
four quite distinct strata:

1. The Muslim intelligentsia which is non-believing
and entirely secularised, to the extent that it considers
itself simply as being "of Muslim descent", and has
virtually no contact either with the Muslim religious
authorities or with the Muslim press of its country
(except in the case of a complex political game
between the Muslims in power, belonging to the
recently recognised "Muslim nationality"; and those
who govern the Muslim religious affairs of the
country).

A popular stratum, composed of the rural
population and of the urban middle and lower classes,
which professes a traditionalist Islam linked inex-
tricably to certain local customs and traditions. This
category lives in a style that belongs intimately to the
totality of the Islamic umma of yesterday and of today,
to which it feels itself bound by the whole of the com-
mon mythic past. The characteristic features of this
category are universally known: the great importance
of the family and of family ties, high birth-rate,
primacy of males, relative absence of the woman in
social life, primitive level of religious education,
importance of magical-religious customs and (some-
times) of Muslim mystical sects, strict observance of
religious festivals, a perceived attractiveness of the
pilgrimage to Mecca, etc.

The Muslim religious intelligentsia, com-
pose most of all (although not exclusively) of the
urban middle classes, which generally professes a
reformist Islam adapted to a pronounced socialist
tendency. The representatives of this category have
often studied in the Arab countries: in Cairo (al-
Azhar), in Medina, in Libya or in the Gulf States,
having received their initial education in local Muslim
theological high schools, and remain much inﬂuenced
by a certain category of contemporary Arabic
religious publications. They are by nature very
mistrustful of western scientiﬁc Islamology (and of
orientalism in general), disciplines which most of the
time they are aware of only at second or third hand,
but which are supposed to be the most subtle weapons
of Western imperialism and of other "maleficent
forces" of our time. On the other hand, the represen-
tatives of this category admire immensely European
apologetic publications of inferior quality, publica-
tions which they distribute on a wide scale alongside their own home-produced articles, envying the major futures of the Muslim world of the past (Ibn Khaldûn, Muhammad ʿAbduh, Avicenna and Djamâl-al-Dîn al-Afghânî in the first place). However, it is futile to seek, on the part of the current Yugoslav Muslim religious intelligentsia (for tactical reasons?), any statement of position or controversial issues such as the policies of Gaddafi, Khomeini, etc. Finally, there is a (currently still very small) stratum of young Islamologists and Muslim ‘orientalists’ (who are divided into two groups, that of theologians and religious functionaries, and that of secular persons of Muslim descent), experienced in modern scientific methods and perfectly conversant with the results obtained in these disciplines outside the frontiers of the country, which is making gradual progress but in rather difficult circumstances. In fact, as regards Islam and the Muslim world, it is caught in a vice between the mistrust and suspicion of local traditionalists Muslims on the one hand, and the incomprehension, more or less total, of non-Muslim Yugoslav intellectuals on the other. See Popovic, L’Islam balkanique, 254-365.

Bibliography: Given in the article. It should however be stressed here that a large section of the professors of the Muslim countries (but also for ideological reasons, or influenced by a naïve tendency towards apologia belonging to another age, or a combination of both) is in the habit of inflating figures to a considerable extent and of presenting a mythical vision of the situation, much removed from what is to be observed “on the ground”. For an impression of the damage which this deplorable tendency is liable to produce even in the best work, see for example M. Ali Kettani, Islam in Post-Ottoman Balkans: a review essay in Journal of the Institute of Muslim Minority Affairs, ix/2 (July 1988), 381-403. (A. POPOVIC)

1. Migration Muslims in Western Europe.
(i) Until 1945

There have been individual Muslim traders, diplomats and travellers visiting and sometimes settling in Europe probably for as long as Islam has existed historically. In eastern Europe, the Tatar successors of the Mongol empires and the Turkish and Islamicised populations of former Ottoman territories continue to form substantial Muslim communities today. However, this article will concentrate exclusively on the immigrant Muslim populations of the countries of western Europe.

Although the Muslim presence in western Europe is in general conceived of as being a phenomenon of the years after 1945, the roots of Muslim immigration can be traced back to the 19th century and earlier. Thus the origins of the Muslim communities in Germany lie in the increasingly close links which the German states developed with the Ottoman empire through periods of war and peace. A substantial number of stragglers and prisoners were left in the southern German states after the Second World War, the Ottoman empire declared its adherence to Sunni Islam in 1935. In 1944, King George VI inaugurated the Islamic Cultural Centre on a site in Regent’s Park donated in exchange for a site in Cairo for the new Anglican cathedral.

Muslim immigration into France before 1945 shows, perhaps, much greater continuity of character than elsewhere. Certainly there were businessmen and students, the most well-known of the latter being the Egyptians sent by Muhammad ʿAli [q. v.] and his successors. But already before the First World War there were labour migrants from Algeria, most of them from Kabyle tribes, and by 1912 there was a significant Algerian labour force in olive oil refining and related industries in the region of Marseilles. Others were to be found in the industrial areas of the east and the north. During the First World War, there was a major immigration of Moroccans, Algerians and Tunisians into the civil and defence industries including a majority of requisitioned men. In recognition of this war involvement, the French government sponsored the opening of a mosque in Paris in 1918.

North Africans continued to seek work in France between the wars, although the uncertain economic situation, especially after 1929, made for an often erratic pattern of movement back and forth. During the Second World War, the Vichy government in 1942 contracted to supply North African labour to help the Germans build the Atlantic Wall.

(ii) After 1945

Immediately after 1945, the economies of Europe were for a short time busy working towards reconstruction of industry and absorption of military personnel into the civilian labour force. But soon growing economies began to seek labour further and further afield. The first West Indian immigrants had begun to arrive in Britain by 1950, and during the following decade people from the Indian subcontinent joined the movement, although it was not till the end of the decade that significant numbers of Pakistanis migrated. In France the number of Algerians reached over 200,000 in the 1954 census. For a time, much of the rest of Europe, including West Germany, was able to staff its expanding industry from the poorer coun-
tries in southern Europe: Greece, Yugoslavia, Italy, Spain and Portugal. But in 1961 Germany entered into a treatent with Turkey for the supply of industrial labour. During this decade Turkey entered into similar agreements with Austria, the Netherlands, France and Sweden. In 1962, in the Eivan agreement ending the Algerian war of independence, France granted privileged access to Algerians, and in the following year West Germany signed a labour agreement with Morocco, as did the Netherlands in 1969. Other countries to enter into such treaties were Denmark, Belgium and Switzerland, while Tunisia joined the countries sending migrant workers abroad.

Virtually all the migrants who entered western Europe during this period came to work and had no intention of settling. This perspective began to change when the gates were closed to men seeking work. It was in Britain that this first happened with the introduction of the first Commonwealth Immigration Act in 1962. Ten years later, the rest of the countries of western Europe followed suit, as economies went into stagnation or recession with the rise of oil prices. Immigration continued to take place in substantial numbers, but it was now wives and children who arrived. As families were established, so practical issues of everyday life necessitated a much more conscious definition of attitudes towards Islam and its cultural expression than hitherto had been the case. A feel for the onset of a traditional type of a traditional type of migration, which the extended family was broken up by migration. The role of male and female both inside and outside the family became a critical area, as women had to shoulder much more individual responsibility in running family affairs, while their husbands were working unsocial hours. They had to deal with social and health authorities in surroundings which were alien to their experience. Children had to go to schools which had little or no comprehension of the force of Islam in their lives. Children have been growing up in cultural and political systems which have emphasised tolerance and liberty of thought but which, with an ever stronger experience of prejudice and racism, are perceived to have withheld that tolerance from the Muslim communities.

Others have sought Islamic identification clearly distinct from that of their European surroundings. By the mid-1980s there was evidence of a change of attitude in the Muslim communities. As families were established, so practical issues of everyday life necessitated a much more conscious definition of tolerance from the Muslim communities. Others again, though fewer, have moved into political life. And social commitment in the European surroundings, usually in some form of radical activism against racism.

Individual countries

In the following paragraphs, the specific situation of each country, or group of countries, will be outlined with reference to the numbers and ethnic origins of the Muslim communities, the types of Muslim organisations and mosques and their legal status. Hardly any countries maintain religious statistics, so population figures have to be estimated from national figures, with the exception of Britain where the base data is on place of birth. At various times censuses have been held, but most regular statistics (again with the exception of Britain) are those issued annually by the civil registries, which in most countries keep records of all residents by district. This does not, by definition, include those who are "irregular" or "illegal". The data on mosques is equally uncertain because legal definitions of places of worship differ not only among countries but also internally as between national legislation and local authority regulations for different purposes such as taxation or town-planning. In the following, the term "mosque" means any building which is used regularly for prayer and often as a place of at least simple Islamic instruction — hence most mosques, on these terms, are older buildings converted to Muslim use.

France

The overall population of Muslim background is about 3 million. The 1981 census showed about 800,000 Algerians, 430,000 Moroccans, 190,000 Tunisians, and 125,000 Turks. In addition, there are nearly half a million "Harkis", Algerians who had remained loyal to France during the war of independence. There are also a fast-growing number of Muslims from West Africa, especially Senegal and Mali. The largest concentrations of North African Muslims are to be found in and around Paris, Lyon and Marseilles. Turks have particularly settled around Lille and in Alsace, as well as Paris. The vast majority of immigrants have retained their nationality of origin, but their children born in France are entitled to French nationality if they wish. Strict separation between citizens from the beginning of the 20th century has meant that, with the exception of the Paris mosque, Muslims have had to rely on their own resources. In 1976, a new law was passed allowing public support for the cultural activities also of Muslim associations, and in 1981 an old distinction between foreign and French associations was abolished. A 1978 estimate indicated that there were at least 87 mosques and prayer houses, while a 1985 estimate suggests almost one thousand. Many early organisations were linked with Algerian or Moroccan political conflicts, but with time other movements have entered the field. The Şûh orders of the countries of origin maintain a strong presence also in France. West African Muslims were prominent in the creation of immigrant trade unions during the automobile factory strikes in the early 1980s. Since then, a major new development has been the spread of the Dîmasat al-Tablîgh, known in France as Foi et pratique.

Great Britain

Serious attempts to estimate the Muslim population of Britain reach about one million, although some Muslim spokesmen claim up to three times as many. About one-third of the total originate in Pakistan and a further 10% each of the total from India and Bangladesh. Smaller significant groups come from the countries of East Africa, mostly of Indian origin, West Africa, Cyprus, Malaysia,
Iran, and a variety of Arab countries. People from all of these ethnic origins are concentrated in London. Outside London, Muslim populations, overwhelmingly of Indian subcontinent origin, are concentrated in the West Midlands around Birmingham, in Yorkshire around Bradford, in Manchester and its suburbs, with smaller but still significant communities in cities like Glasgow, Leicester, Sheffield, Leeds, Cardiff and Southampton. As most of the countries of origin are members of the Commonwealth, British law allowed routine extension of nationality until 1985. All children born in Britain are automatically citizens. So by the end of the 1980s almost half of the Muslim community is British by birth, while the majority of the rest have acquired full British passports. While some of the older churches operate under parliamentary legislation, there is no general legal framework for the recognition of religious communities. Most Muslim organisations and mosques are registered under the law of charitable organisations. The first major growth in the number of mosques took place after 1964 and accelerated from the mid-1970s. By 1985 there were almost 400 mosques at a time when the registration of new mosques was averaging thirty a year. The process of organisation has been dominated by movements migrating from the Indian subcontinent. As most Pakistanis have come from Punjab and Mirpuri villages, the Bareli movement and its various subgroups is prominent. Against them have often been ranged the Deobandi network and its related movement Djamâat al-Tahâbî. A smaller number in numbers, but influential and widely visible outside the community, is the Djamâat'î-Islāmî with its daughter organisations in Britain: the UK Islamic Mission, the Muslim Educational Trust, and the Islamic Foundation. Sûfî-related groups have taken on a more public shape during the 1970s, particularly Nâsâkhâbandîs, Kâdîris, and Çûbîs, in addition to the older ‘Alâwî presence.

In Germany. The total of less than two million Muslims in 1988 is made up of an overwhelming majority of around 1.5 million Turks. The rest are small numbers (tens of thousands) of Iranians, Pakistanis, Bangladeshis, and Surinamese of various nationalities. Between a quarter and a third are resident in the federal state of North-Rhine-Westphalia, concentrated in the industrial region from Cologne in the south through Duisburg to Dortmund in the north-east. Other concentrations are to be found in all the major industrial cities across the Federal Republic. Most Muslims remain of foreign nationality, partly because it has become increasingly difficult to acquire West German citizenship, but also because government policy has been that the foreign communities are migrants, or ‘guest workers’, not immigrants and settlers. The Federal Republic has a legal status of recognised public body (Körperschaft öffentlichen Rechts) by which the main churches and the Jewish communities have an arrangement whereby a voluntary ‘church tax’ is collected by the state on their behalf. Since the early 1970s, a number of different Muslim organisations have sought similar recognition without success. However, under existing legislation Muslim organisations have access to public funding for cultural activities (usually flexibly interpreted by the authorities) and are entitled to Islamic instruction in schools for Muslim children. The latter issue has been complicated by the lack of agreement to cooperate among various Muslim organisations, and in consequence some state governments have taken the initiative to develop such instruction. There are almost one thousand mosques across the country, including several in West Berlin. Until the early 1980s, most Turkish Muslim associations, almost all linked to a mosque, were related to movements banned in Turkey. The Gülen movement’s Sûleymans with smaller numbers linked to the Millî Görûş and the Nurçülûk (Djamâat’î al-Nûr). Then a more active religious policy on the part of the Turkish government, encouraged by the German government, led to a significant growth in the number of mosques and associations linked to a federation sponsored by the Religious Affairs Department of the Prime Minister’s Office (Dîyanet), so that this growth has become the largest by the end of the 1980s. There is an active association of German-speaking Muslims and a number of organisations grouping together various Muslim ethnic communities.

The Netherlands. The Dutch Central Bureau for statistics is one of the few such agencies in Europe which keeps religious data. In 1986 it gave a figure of 337,900 Muslims of foreign origin at a time when the general trend was upwards at an annual rate of about 5,000 a year. The majority of this population was in 1988 made up of 180,000 Turks and 120,000 Moroccans. The largest proportion of the remainder were Surinamese of Indian origin and a few thousand each from Pakistan, Yugoslavia, Indonesia, and Arabs other than Moroccans. The Muslims are concentrated in the two major conurbations of Amsterdam, Utrecht, Rotterdam, with smaller communities in most other significant industrial centres. The vast majority of Muslims remain citizens of their countries of origin. The Netherlands is constitutionally a lay state with strict separation between religion and state. Part of the system is, however, a recognition of the social and institutional function of the religious communities, traditionally the Catholic and the various Protestant churches, in particular their involvement in education. Government structures have, through commissions of inquiry, local support, and the like, attempted to incorporate the new Muslim presence into the traditional system, with mixed results. A Muslim organisation has been allocated regular times on Dutch radio and television. Since 1988, over ten publicly-funded Muslim schools have opened. There are over two hundred mosques. On the Moroccan side, most are autonomous, although there have been attempts to organise them through a federation sponsored by the Moroccan government. On the Turkish side, the pattern of organisation is similar to that in West Germany.

Belgium. The total number of Muslims was in the region of 300,000 in 1986, two-thirds of whom were from North Africa, mainly Moroccans, and the majority of the rest Turks. The main concentration is around Brussels, with other significant communities in the main industrial towns. While most remain citizens of the country of origin, Belgian nationality law was changed in the late 1980s to make acquisition of Belgian nationality significantly easier. In 1974 Belgium added Islam to the list of recognised religious communities with the consequence, in Belgian law, that Muslim children would be entitled to Islamic instruction in schools at public expense. It took almost ten years for the implementation of this under the central direction of the Islamic Cultural Centre in Brussels. The process has not been without problems because the Centre is sponsored by the Muslim diplomatic community with Saudi Arabian leadership, a situation which many Turkish and Moroccan associations have found unsatisfactory. The pattern of Turkish and Moroccan associations is similar to that in West Germany and France respectively.
The Muslim population of about 100,000 at the end of the 1980s consists mostly of Turks, but there are about 15,000 Yugoslavs and almost 10,000 Austrians. Muslims are concentrated in the region of Vienna and the western province of Vorarlberg. Most Muslims retain their nationality of origin. The majority of Austrian Muslims are descended from Muslim citizens of the old Austro-Hungarian empire who moved to Vienna in the decades before the end of the empire. With the occupation of Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1983, the imperial government sponsored Muslim institutions within the government structures, including a Mufti in Vienna. In 1912 Islam was given full recognition, but the law fell into disuse after 1918. In 1979 the law was revived, giving the Muslim community access to religious instruction in schools and to religious broadcasting on the government radio and television. There are about thirty mosques in the country, most linked to organisations which are affiliated to the legally recognised federal association.

In 1984 there were around 15,000 Muslims in Norway, half of whom were Pakistanis, and the rest mainly from Turkey and Morocco. Well over half were resident in and around Oslo. The Norwegian government gives financial assistance to religious congregations, by the late 1980s to about a dozen.

In Southern Europe. Reliable information on the Muslim communities in Italy, Spain and Portugal is almost impossible to find, primarily because the vast majority of foreigners are unregistered. In Portugal, most Muslims, possibly two-thirds of a total of 50,000, are stateless immigrants from former Portuguese colonies in India or southern Africa. Under General Franco, Islam was forbidden in Spain, and it is only slowly that Muslims are coming to public notice. Most are immigrants or temporary residents from Morocco or Algeria. Italy has the largest number of immigrant Muslims, some estimates ranging as high as 200,000, mostly from North Africa including a good proportion of Libyans. To be found in almost all major industrial cities, there are particularly large numbers in Sicily around Palermo.

The Muslim population in Denmark approached 50,000 in the late 1980s. Over half originate from Turkey, and there is also a significant Pakistani population. During the 1980s, the number of Iranians increased from a few hundred to almost 10,000. The vast majority live in and around Copenhagen and smaller numbers in provincial cities such as Odense and Aarhus. Most retain their original nationality, although a number of Pakistanis are nationals of the United Kingdom, having immigrated under European Community rules. Mosques and associations operate under the general laws of association, but the liberal “free school” legislation has allowed the creation of about a dozen publicly funded Muslim schools, mostly in and around Copenhagen.

Scandinavia. Sweden since 1945 has, in addition to immigrants, also had a relatively liberal refugee policy. Consequently, it is particularly difficult to estimate the number of Muslims, since many of the large number of Turkish citizens are also Orthodox Christians. Two different government publications gave 37,000 in 1981 and 22,000 in 1984. Another source estimated 70,000 in 1989, whilst others estimate 100,000 in 1991. Whatever the figure, most are of Turkish origin (including a large number of Kurds) with a smaller group of Yugoslavs. The largest concentrations are in greater Stockholm, Gothenburg and Malmö. Many have become Swedish citizens. Next to the Lutheran state church, all religious congregations with a membership above a certain number are entitled to state funding, and many Muslim congregations have achieved this status on a regular basis. There are about fifty mosques, but the influence of Turkish Muslim associations of the kind to be found in West Germany is minimal.

The Muslim population in Denmark approached 50,000 in the late 1980s. Over half originate from Turkey, and there is also a significant Pakistani population. During the 1980s, the number of Iranians increased from a few hundred to almost 10,000. The vast majority live in and around Copenhagen and smaller numbers in provincial cities such as Odense and Aarhus. Most retain their original nationality, although a number of Pakistanis are nationals of the United Kingdom, having immigrated under European Community rules. Mosques and associations operate under the general laws of association, but the liberal “free school” legislation has allowed the creation of about a dozen publicly funded Muslim schools, mostly in and around Copenhagen.
searched everyone who entered a mosque or major meeting, acted as ushers, and sometimes as enforcers of discipline. He disappeared under the leadership of Elijah Muhammad’s leadership in 1934. After some internal conflict among his followers, Elijah Muhammad (1897-1975), formerly E. Poole, the son of a Baptist preacher in Georgia, who had moved to Detroit in 1923 in search of work and had become acquainted with Wallace D. Fard in 1931, led a major faction of the organisation to Chicago, which became the main headquarters of the movement. Under Elijah Muhammad’s leadership the movement was consolidated and grew emerging in the 1950s as the most prominent organisation of Muslims in the United States, holding considerable organisation. Its prominence was further enhanced at this time by the conversion of Malcolm Little (1925-65), also the son of a Baptist preacher, later to become known as Malcolm X, signifying that he was an ex-smoker, ex-drinker, ex-Christian and ex-slave. Doctrinal disputes with other African-American groups as well as predominantly Arab ones also strengthened the movement. Because of its numerical strength, its popular appeal among African-Americans, who appreciated its outspokenness on socio-economic conditions and its alleged Islamic character, the organisation was seen as a possible ally of the Muslim World, particularly in countries such as Egypt, India and Pakistan, which were showing an interest in international Islam. To strengthen these relations, Elijah Muhammad visited Egypt, Ethiopia, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria and Turkey in 1959, where he met Muslim scholars and politicians including the former Shaykh al-Azhari, Mahmud Shaltut and Gamal Abul-Nasir. His regard for Muslims in the East was diminished by the poor social and economic conditions he encountered among them.

The rise of political radicalism in Africa, the Middle East and the United States, the growth of the immigrant Muslim population and the new organisations founded by them, had a profound impact on the Black Muslims. The emergence of Pakistan in 1947, the Egyptian revolution in 1952, the independence of Sudan and the nationalisation of the Suez canal in 1956, encouraged Elijah Muhammad to demand that the United States allocate land to be controlled exclusively by his followers. Malcolm X played a central role in conveying Elijah Muhammad’s message in the United States as well as abroad. He became one of the most articulate critics of racial injustice in the United States during the civil rights period. He rejected the non-violent approach of Martin Luther King, Jr., arguing that separatism and self-determination were necessary if Blacks were to achieve full equality.

After 1964, when Malcolm X had made the pilgrimage and been converted to orthodox Islam, taking the name El-Hajj Malik El-Shabazz, a niqaba derived from the teachings of Wallace D. Fard claiming that the Black African diaspora were all of Muslim heritage, the ‘lost-found members of the tribe of Shabazz’, and as a result of an internal scandal known as the ‘Elijah affair’ which referred to Elijah Muhammad consort with his secretaries and fathering a number of children, Malcolm X left the organisation and founded his own one, the Muslim Mosque, Inc. in New York. He published Muhammad Speaks, now renamed Bilalian News. Shortly after he was assassinated.

When Elijah Muhammad died in 1975 his son, variously referred to as Warithuddin Muhammad, Wallace or Warith Deen Muhammad, Chief Imam Wallace D. Muhammad, etc., in spite of three expulsions for disobedience by his father, succeeded him to the leadership of the Nation of Islam. Influenced by his pilgrimage to Mecca in 1967, he started a process of moving the organisation towards embracing orthodox Islam as soon as he took over the leadership, opening up membership to Whites and encouraging his followers to participate in the civic, social and political life of the country. Up to this point the Black Muslims, with the notion of Black supremacy, were not Muslims by any definition of that word, e.g. they had been observing seven daily prayers and fasted in December. Black Muslims observed Ramadan for the first time in 1976. The name was changed to World Community of Islam in the West (WCIW) and subsequently to American Muslim Mission (AMM), indicating that he was trying to develop closer links with the worldwide community of Muslims, an attempt also indicated by the use of the name Bililians. The same emphasis appears in the community’s weekly American Muslim Journal. Like his father he established cordial relations with leading religious and political figures in the Islamic world, including Anwar Sadat. Muslim World leaders have always been interested in establishing an indigenous outpost in the United States. By inviting Warith Deen Muhammad to take part in conferences of Ministers of Foreign Affairs and in 1978 naming him the sole consultant and trustee for the recommendation and distribution of funds to all Muslim organisations engaged in da‘wa or missionary work in the United States, they have found a way of doing so. He has been given the title muhammad and the rights of certifying the hajj to Mecca from the United States.

These changes were rejected by some Black Muslims. Under the leadership of Minister Louis Farrakhan, also known as Minister Louis X, born Louis Eugene Walcott, they broke away from the American Muslim Mission in 1977 and returned to the original teachings and ideals of Elijah Muhammad. They publish The Final Call, originally started by Elijah Muhammad in 1934 and resurrected by Louis Farrakhan in 1979. This group demands social and economic justice for all Black People, equality of employment and education, the freeing of Black prisoners, control of Black institutions and a separate territory. They denigrate integration with whites. In 1984 he pledged a voter registration drive for Jesse Jackson, convinced that a black man could make a credible run for the U.S. Presidency. His fund-raising visit to Libya and his anti-Jewish pronouncements as when he told Jews, “Don’t push your 6 million (Holocaust) victims when we (Negroes) lost 100 million (in slavery)”. forced Jackson to repudiate the views for which Farrakhan had become notorious. In the 1988 presidential elections he supported Jesse Jackson against Michael S. Dukakis.

Schisms are not a new phenomenon among Black Muslims. In the 1960s, Hamaas Abdul Khaalis led a secession of Hanafi Muslims. One Abdul Muhammad, who rejected Wallace D. Fard’s teaching that Black Muslims were not Americans and did not owe allegiance to the American flag, led another splinter group, based on loyalty to the American Constitution and the flag. The latter group has not survived.

(b) Doctrines. The original Black Muslim movement had basic beliefs that did not conform with Orthodox Islam. Its effect to participate in the “hidden Islam” regarding the knowledge about the Black Man, God, the devil, the universe, etc. It assigns a cosmic significance to the racial divisions of the human race.
Their creed expresses their Black nationalistic trends. It stated, "In the Name of Allah who came in the person of Master Farad to his Detroit followers as a brother and an emissary of the Muslim World. He assured them that racially he was one of them, and that all belonged to the first inhabitants of earth, the Original Black Man. He subsequently became known as the Mahdi, Prophet and the Son of Man, who had been expected for two thousand years. It is said that he later upgraded his status and announced that he was the Supreme Ruler, Allah in person.

This anthropomorphic concept of God, under Elijah Muhammad, took on a collective dimension. Allah seems to have become identical with the collective entity of the Original People, the Black Nation, the Righteous. Thus the Kur'ān verse “He is the first and the last” (LVI, 3) came to mean that the Black Man was the first and the last, was the maker and owner of the universe. Hence the attributes were Allah alone, yet one of them was so in a special sense. Knowledge, wisdom and power were His chief attributes.

Similarly the belief in the Messenger of God has been centred around the person of Elijah Muhammad. The Black Muslims believed in the earlier prophets, including Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah, conceding that the Kur'ān was revealed but otherwise ignoring him with evil him. He was described as “a sign of the real Muhammad”. A corollary of this is the claim that Elijah Muhammad’s interpretations of the Scriptures were authoritative and that they, including the Kur'ān were time-bound. It has been misinterpreted by most Muslim scholars and will be superseded by another revelation.

They believed in the metaphysical view that identifies the devil with evil and what people with the devil. Yakub, a Black mad scientist in rebellion against Allah, created the white race, a weak hybrid race devoid of any humanity. The race would rule for 6,000 years through trickery and deviousness, causing chaos and destruction. At the end of their time their rule would end in a cosmic apocalyptic battle with the Black Man, who would emerge victorious, since he belongs to a higher order of humanity. This central teaching about Yakub functions as a theodicy, as an explanation and rationalisation for the pain and suffering inflicted upon Black people in America.

Black Muslim eschatology is earthy. The Day of Judgement will occur late in the 20th century. It will mark the destruction of American international, political and economic hegemony. Heaven, thought to be in Mecca or the Muslim world, was said to be a human state of material welfare and spiritual peace. Hell was supposed to be in America, which would be consumed by fire. The political developments in the Middle East in the 1950s and the throwing off of the colonial yoke were events with an eschatological significance. Prophetically, the “devil” was being thrown out of the Original Man’s lands. The Hereafter is the period which will follow the end of the dominance of the White man and the destruction of his “world of sin” inaugurating the never-ending rule of the Original and righteous man. Consistent with their denial of “spirit God”, they do not believe in life after death. Heaven is on earth and consists of freedom, justice, equality, money, good houses and friendships in all walks of life, enjoying peace of mind and friendship with the God of the righteous and the Nation of the righteous.

Elijah Muhammad’s debates with Muslim scholars during his visit in 1959 influenced him in two directions. On the one hand, he was impressed by their arguments in favour of the transcendence of Allah, the mission of the prophet Muhammad, and the natural humanity of European-Americans, in spite of the fact that these were in direct contrast to those he propagated as fundamental to his religious and social philosophy. On the other hand, it seems to have confirmed him in his convictions that his was the “true” Islam.

Malcolm X’s religious beliefs were influenced by developments in the Middle East and his experiences there in 1960 and 1964, and became interwoven with his activist political ideology. Whereas Elijah Muhammad had used the expression “God helps those who help themselves” (cf. Kur'ān, VIII, 55/53, XIII, 12/11), Malcolm X’s characteristic phrase was “God aids those who get involved and do their utmost to change their circumstances”. Islam, nationalism and socialism were compatible. Reference was made to the ancient states of Ghana, Mali and Songhay which had been ruled by Muslims. Arabic, Hausa and Swahili names were adopted, and an emphasis placed on learning Arabic.

His ideas became the foundation on which Warith Deen Muhammad was to build after 1975. Thus he discarded the belief in the divinity of Wallace D. Fard, the apostleship of his father, describing him as a social reformer, the evil nature of European-Americans and the superiority of one people over another. The former hostile position of the Black Muslims towards the government of the United States, Christian and Jewish groups, has given way to a conciliatory attitude. Warithuddin Muhammad has participated in several dialogue encounters between Christians, Jews and Muslims. He is opposed to any representation of God. He denounces the Christian Caucasian image of God because of its undertones of racism. In spite of the rapprochement to Islamic orthodoxy, the community has retained its distinctiveness vis-à-vis immigrant Muslim communities.

Katabanian inscriptions used the term *msnad* for an inscribed bronze plaque affixed (musnad) to the wall of a temple; by the 5th-6th centuries AD it came to be applied to inscriptions engraved directly on a rock face. In early Islamic times, *musnad* designated any inscription in the pre-Islamic South Arabian alphabet, the earliest examples of which date back to the first half of the first millennium BC. This has close affinities both with the scripts used by the pre-Islamic North Arabian bedouin and with the Ethiopic alphabet. This South Semitic group of scripts has a common origin, albeit at a very remote date, with the Northwest Semitic group to which the Arabic alphabet belongs, but the two groups have diverged very substantially. The folktales of the “letter of Al-Mutalammis” [see AL-MUTALAMMIS] have often been understood as showing that the poet was illiterate; but it could perhaps imply that the poet was able to read only the bedouin (South Semitic) script, while the letter of the king of al-Hira would have been written in early Arabic script.

Old South Arabian script has 29 letters, requiring no diacritics for distinguishing them (as was the case when the Northwest Semitic 22-letter alphabet was adapted for expressing Arabic); it also distinguishes three sibilants, commonly noted as its having etymological cognates with Hebrew *sin*, Mahri *sin*, Arabic *sin*; *s* with Hebrew sameh, Mahri *s*, Arabic *sin*.

Early Islamic scholars had little or no knowledge of the languages of the *musnad* inscriptions; and what they give as the content of them is imaginary, with no resemblance to their real contents; but the scholars preserved a knowledge of the letter-values of the *musnad* script. In the 10th volume of al-Hamdānī’s *Kitāb al-dīn al-dīnārī* (ed. N.A. Faris, Princeton 1940, 123) a list of the letters is given, with their Arabic equivalents; in the extant ms., of the work, however, the forms have become considerably distorted by copyists who had never seen the real inscriptions. In the latter, the letter-forms are upright, geometrically angular, and unligatured, having considerable resemblance to fine Coptic script. For the basic forms, see A.F.L. Beeston, *Sabaic grammar*, Manchester 1984, pp. [vii], 4. There was a conventional alphabetic order, which seems to have been: *h*, *l*, *b*, *m*, *q*, *w*, *s*, *t*, *k*, *n*, *b*, *s*, *s*, *d*, *g*, *d*, *g*, *t*, *z*, *d*, *y*, *l*, *z*. Al-Hamdānī was further aware of some of the orthographic rules of the *musnad* script, such as the fact that long *a* is not written with *alif*, so that Hamdānī’s *Riyām* are written *bymn*, *ymn*. Bibliography: given in the article.

**A.F.L. Beeston**

2. As a term in Arabic grammar. Later classical Arabic grammarians define *musnad* as “that which is leaned upon or propped against” (the headword or subject), is supported by (it)’”. They define *musnad* *layḥi* as “that which supports”, i.e. the headword or subject. The relationship between them is termed *iänd* “the act of leaning (one thing against another)”*, the relationship of attribution or predication”. However, the terms have a different, almost reversed, meaning in *Sibawaih*, as pointed out by Ulrike Mosel, *Die syntaktische Terminologie bei Sibawaih*, diss. Munich 1975, unpubl., i, 221-3 and n. 223, and by A. Levin, *The grammatical terms al-musnad, al-musnad-īlayḥi and al-īsīnad*, in: *AJOS*, cl, 1981, 145-59. Bibliography: See also Wright, *Arabic grammar*, ii, 250; Reckendorf, *Arabische Syntax*, 1, (Ed.)

3. As a term in the science of hadith. Here it is applied to an *iänd* that goes back all the way to the Prophet without a link missing. Al-Khārijī al-Baghdādī (al-Kifāya fi *tim al-isnād*, Haydarābād 1357, 21) mentions that some scholars equate *musnad* with *marfu* “raised to the level of a Prophetic tradition”, but most Muslim *hadith* scholars hold that a *marfu* *iänd* need not necessarily be uninterrupted (*mutattāsr*), whereas in their definition a *musnad iänd* must be at the same time *mutattās*. The debate is expertly summarised in Subh al-Salībī, *Ulum al-hadith ва maṣūjudahahu, Damascus 1959, 226-31. (That *marfu* *iändas* need not be *mutattās* in practice is amply attested in the *Lisan al-mizān*, Ibn Hadjar’s lexicon comprising biographies of mostly unreliable transmitters, which contains hundreds of traditions explicitly labeled *marfu* that are added as examples of traditions not to be relied upon.)

An early use of the term *musnad* can be discerned in a report of the *awā’il* genre (q. v.) about al-Zahri (30-124/670-742) ([q. v.]) which has it that he was the first man annāda al-hadīth (Ibn Abī Hātim, *Tadkālam al-maṣāria li-kātib al-Dārūr wa l-ta’dil*, Haydarābād 1952, 20), which probably means in this context that he was allegedly the first to make consistent use of *insād* (see G.H.A. Juynboll, *Muslim tradition. Studies in chronology, provenance and authorship of early hadīth*, Cambridge 1983, 18 f.).

*Musnad* (plural *masnād*) as technical term in *hadith* literature. Furthermore, used to describe a tradition collection organised on the basis of the first authority in the *insād* collection above the Prophet, that is, the Companion. A *musnad* collection may comprise either the *musnad* of one, a few, or all Companions. In this last type of collection, the order in which the different *masnād* is presented underlies mostly the individual prestige of each Companion, based upon age and alleged date of conversion to Islam, but alphabetically arranged *musnads* are also found (e.g. the *Tahfīl al-aghrīf* of al-Mizān [q. v.]). In both, woman Companions are mostly listed only after the men. *Musnads* are by no means the oldest tradition collections. There are a few dozen or so collections, often called simply *dīj*, *hadīth* or *aḥādīth*, which lack as yet any structured arrangement such as the personal *jahās* listed in *Gās*, i, 84 ff., whose ascription to their alleged author is in most cases no more than an alleged date of conversion to Islam, but alphabetically arranged *musnads* are also found (e.g. the *Tahfīl al-aghrīf* of al-Mizān [q. v.]). These compilations either preceded by a few decades or originated at the same time as the first *musnads*. There are also the *musāannafs* [q. v.], collections arranged in chapters on the basis of subject matter, such as the *Musawwat* of Mālik (d. 179/795 [q. v.]) or the *Musannaf* of Abd al-Razzāk b. Hammām (d. 203/818), which probably means in this context that he was allegedly the first to make consistent use of *insād* (see ibn Taysīr al-Zuhri, *al-Mizān*, i, 130-76), and what is referred isom. *Insād* and *Musnad*. These compilations either preceded by a few decades or originated at the same time as the first *musnads*. There are also the *musāannafs* [q. v.], collections arranged in chapters on the basis of subject matter, such as the *Musawwat* of Mālik (d. 179/795 [q. v.]) or the *Musannaf* of Abd al-Razzāk b. Hammām (d. 203/818), which probably means in this context that he was allegedly the first to make consistent use of *insād* (see ibn Taysīr al-Zuhri, *al-Mizān*, i, 130-76). Haydarābād 1332, and many others; cf. also Goldzīher, *Muḥaμmedāniṣe Studien*, ii, 227 ff.).
Other collections are known by two appellatives e.g. the Sunan or Musnad of 'Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Dārimī (d. 258/872), or the Musnad, also called Misnad, of Ibn Abī Shayba (d. 235/849); both are arranged as musannafs. This seems to indicate that the identification of tradition collections as belonging to one type or the other was in the early days somewhat loose. This looseness is aptly exemplified in a statement ascribed to the tradition collector Muslim b. al-Hadžadj (d. 261/875 [q.v.]), who is once reported to have said (cf. al-Nawawī in his preface to his commentary on Muslim's Sahih, ed. Cairo 1349, i, 15): "sannafs hātūs al-musnad al-sāhīth min thalāthīmātī alfi hadithin masma'ūtin, i.e. "I composed this sound musnad of mine (which is a musannaf-type work, later called al-Dārimī al-sāhīth, or simply Sahīth Muslim) out of 300,000 traditions I heard"; besides, the term musnad in Muslim's statement is surely to be taken as a double entendre, also conveying the idea of a collection supported by musnad tinādī, i.e. going back to the Prophet. Another type of musnad is the misnad (i.e. "stopping" at the level of the ināds), a collection supported by ināds. This seems to be held responsible for its proliferation, all this on the basis of considerably older origin than the traditions going back via interrupted ināds. Of these collections are nonetheless indispensable tools in inād analysis, and this is also true for early musnads. Inād analysis seeks to determine when and where a tradition originated and who may be held responsible for its proliferation, all this on the basis of its inād. The earliest the collections, the more often can historically relevant inād data be distilled from them in order to shore up, or, the case being, undermine, the historicity of the transmission position of some of Islam's most important and prolific "common links", i.e. the originators of the most ancient and authoritative traditions in the entire literature.

Bibliography: Shāfi'ī, Tartīb musnad al-Shafī'ī, ed. Y. 'Alī al-Zawāwī and 'Izzāt al-Aṭṭār, Cairo 1950-1, 2 vols; Abū Dāwūd al-Taḥāwī, Musnad, Haydarābād 1321; 'Abd Allāh b. Abī Shayba, Ibn Hanbal, ed. Aḥmad Muhammad Shākir, repr. Beirut-Cairo 1380-2, 2 vols; Ahmad b. 'Alī al-Marwāzī, Musnad Abī Bakr al-Siddīk, ed. Shu'ayb al- Ārnū, Beirut 1390, 1393 etc; Ibn al-Baghdādī, Musnad 'Umar b. 'Abd al- Razzāk, Ibn Abī Shayba, Ibn Hanbal, Abī Naṣ'ām's Ḥiyā, Ibn Hibbān's Sahīth, that the tradition which is sought first to reduced its taraf, a technical term for the gist, or most salient feature, of a tradition. It is these tarafs which are alphabetically arranged in those index volumes, but attempts to arrive at the correct taraf of a given tradition for tracing purposes often lead nowhere. On the other hand, although Ibn Hanbal's Musnad is the most famous of the canonical collections, it is incorporated in Concords etc. While al-Tāyālī's was drawn upon in Wensinck's Handbook of early Muhammadan tradition, albeit not satisfactorily. When that manual is consulted in vain, al-Tāyālī's index of Collections—a typical feature of several ancient musnads lacking in musannafs—often comes in handy.

Although tracing traditions to these early musnads which pre-date the canonical collections may cause problems, these collections are nonetheless indispensable tools in inād analysis, and this is also true for early musnads. Inād analysis seeks to determine when and where a tradition originated and who may be held responsible for its proliferation, all this on the basis of its inād. The earlier the collections, the more often can historically relevant inād data be distilled from them in order to shore up, or, the case being, undermine, the historicity of the transmission position of some of Islam's most important and prolific "common links", i.e. the originators of the most ancient and authoritative traditions in the entire literature.

For its misnad, inād analysis seeks to determine when and where a tradition originated and who may be held responsible for its proliferation, all this on the basis of its inād. The earlier the collections, the more often can historically relevant inād data be distilled from them in order to shore up, or, the case being, undermine, the historicity of the transmission position of some of Islam's most important and prolific "common links", i.e. the originators of the most ancient and authoritative traditions in the entire literature.
MUSNAD — MUSTAFA


(G.H.A. JUVINBOLL)

AL-MUSTADJAB BI-AMERA B. MUHAMMAD AL-ḤASAN, ʿAbbās al-ṣalih (566-7/1170-80), born on 23 Shaʿbān 566/1 May 1170, al-Mustadjid succeeded him, and at the beginning of the following year was formally recognised as caliph in Egypt also, which passed into the hands of the Ayyūbids at this time (see fatīmis). The assassins of al-Mustadjid soon quarrelled among themselves. ʿAdud al-Dīn [q.v.], whom al-Mustadjīd had been forced to make vizier, was dismissed by 567/1171-2 at the instigation of the amir Kaymaz. In Dhuʾl-Kaʿd 1 570/May 1175, Kaymaz was about to attack the treasurer Zāhir al-Dīn b. al-ʿAṯṭār, but the latter fled to the caliph, whereupon Kaymaz began to besiege the palace of the latter. Al-Mustadjid appealed to the people to help him; the house of Kaymaz was pillaged, and he himself fled but died soon afterwards, and ʿAdud al-Dīn again became vizier. Al-Mustadjid already had quarrelled with Shumla, lord of Khuzistan. In 569/1173-4 a war broke out between the latter's nephew Ibn Shanka and al-Mustadji; Ibn Shanka was soon taken prisoner by Ch. Elliott, Gulistān-i Rahmat Khan, who was an Afghan of the tribe Ḥafiz Ruhmat Khan, who was an Afghan of the tribe Yūsufzay by descent, had been since 1161-1748 a chief in Rohilkhand (Kafahr) and throughout his life waged a bitter warfare with the Marāfīs. He fell in 1188/1774 in a fight at Mirānpur Katra where he was fighting against the combined forces of the Nawwāb of Oudh (Awadh [q.v.]) Shudža al-Mulk and the English. Warren Hastings' action in supporting the Nawwāb with English troops became the subject of a judicial investigation in the English Parliament. Mustadjīd Khan's book describes Ḥafiz Rahmat Khan as a fine representative of Afghān chivalry and contains much of value for studying the relations between the individual Afghān tribes.


MUSTAFA I, the fifteenth Ottoman sultan (1026/1617-18 and 1031-2/1622-3), was born in the year 1000/1591 as son of Mehemmed III [q.v.]. He owed his life to the relaxation of the kānīn authorising the killing of all the brothers of a new sultan, and was called to succeed his brother Ahmed I [q.v.] at the latter's death on 23 Dhuʾl-Kaʿdā 1026/22 November 1617. But his weakmindedness—which is said to have him made escape death on account of superstitious fear of Ahmed—made him absolutely incapable of ruling. Ahmed's son ʿOthmān [q.v.] who had himself endured the succession, had little difficulty in procuring Mustafia's deposition in a meeting in the Imperial Diwan, by the kütār eghrā, the musti, and the kāw-makām, the grandvizier Ḥafīz Paša [q.v.] being absent. This happened on 1 Rabīʿ I 1027/26 February 1618.

Unexpectedly, Mustafia I was again called to the throne when, on 8 Rajab 1031/19 May 1622, the rebellion of the Janissaries broke out against ʿOthmān II [q.v.]. He was taken by force from his seclusion in the harem and the Janissaries forced the 'ulamāʾ to acknowledge him as sultan. The next day ʿOthmān was killed and until June the grand vizier Dāwūd Paša, the man responsible for the murder, remained in power. Then he was deposed by the walīde. The real masters were the Janissaries and Śipālīs; several grand viziers were nominated and deposed again at their pleasure. The Śipāǰi party began, after some time, to exact vengeance for ʿOthmān and in January 1623, when Gūrdu Paša [q.v.], who was grand vizier, Dāwūd Paša was killed. Soon the Janissary party came again to influence under the grand vizier Merce Huseyn Paša (3 Rabīʿ 1032/3 February 1623). The latter succeeded in maintaining himself until 29 Shawwāl/20 August; then the general feeling amongst the 'ulamāʾ and the people, combined with the steadily growing opposition in the provinces against the tyranny of the military in the capital, as manifested by the action of Sayf al-Dīn-oghlu in Tripoli and still more by the revolt of Abaza Paša [q.v.], with Erzerum, brought about Mere Huseyn's deposition. The next grand vizier, Kermāneš ʿAli Paša [q.v.], together with the musti, deposed the sultan on 15 Dhuʾl-Kaʿdā 1032/10 February 1623 and called Ahmed's son Murād to the throne as Murād IV [q.v.].

During all his reign, Mustafia had continued to give signs of his complete mental aberration; he died in 1638 and was buried in the Ayā Sofya. The only important international act that took place during his reign was the peace concluded with Poland in February 1625.

Bibliography: The Turkish sources for this period are the historical works of Naʿīmna, Ḥadīẓ Khāliḥa (Feddeke), Pečewi, Ḥasan Bey-żāde and Tūgī. Contemporary reports in the Memoirs of the English envoy Sir Thomas Roe. See further the general historical works of von Hammer, Zinkeisen and Jorga; A.D. Alderson, The structure of the Ottoman dynasty, Oxford 1956, index s.v.; S. J. Shaw, History of the Ottoman empire and modern Turkey, i, Cambridge 1976, 190-1, 193-4; R. Mantran (ed.), Histoire de l'empire ottoman, Paris 1989, index s.v.; IA, art. s.v. (A. Münir Aktepe).

( J. H. KRAMERS)

MUSTĀFĀ II, the twenty-second Ottoman sultan (1106-15/1695-1703), was a son of Mehmed IV [q.v.]. Born in 1664, he succeeded to his uncle Ahmed II on 3 Dhul-Qa’dā 1106/20 February 1695, at a time when the empire was at war with Austria, Poland, Russia and Venice. The new sultan in a remarkable khatt-i gerif proclaimed a Holy War and carried out, against
the decision of the Diwan, his desire to take part in the campaign against Austria. Before his departure a mutiny of the Janissaries had cost the grand vizier Defterdar 'Ali Pasha his life (24 April 1695), and the campaign was led by the new grand vizier Elms Mehmed Pasha [q.v.]. The Turkish army operated not without success in the region of Temesvár, taking Lippa, Lugos and Sebes. The Venetians had been beaten again in September. In October, Azov was delivered from the Russian siege. Next year, the sultan and his army were again successful in raising the siege of Temesvár, but no part of the lost territory could be recovered from the Austrians. That year, however, the Russians took Azov. The campaign of 1696 is memorable for the heavy defeat inflicted on the Turks near Zenta on the Theiss (13 Safar 1108/11 September 1696) where Elms Mehmed lost his life, while the sultan, who had already crossed the river, had to fly to Temesvár. The imperial seal fell into the hands of the Austrians. From Temesvár, Mustafá nominated 'Amuğá-záde Huseyn [q.v.], of the Köprülü family, as his grand vizier. Under this very able statesman, peace was at last concluded. In 1698 the grand vizier went to the frontier, while the sultan stayed at Edirne, but the peace negotiations were pursued more earnestly than the war. In October of that year began the peace negotiations at Carhbitz (Turk. Károlyfca) (see the Dáhá), where on 25 Şabáni 1110/26 February 1699 peace was concluded with Austria, Poland and Venice. With Russia, only an armistice was concluded, to be followed in 1700 by a definite peace. The English and Dutch ministers took part in the negotiations as intermediaries. The peace treaty meant the loss of Hungary and Transylvania, with the exception of the district of Temesvár; Poland recovered Kameniecz, while Venice had to cede Lepanto and some other towns in the Morea. With Russia, the Dniestr became the frontier. The peace enabled the grand vizier to bring order into the affairs of state, which had suffered by the long and disastrous war. The Reis Effendi Rámi and the mutafí Fayd Alláh, who had great influence with the sultan, were his collaborators. Some interior troubles were easily appeased, only in 1701, when the campaign in 'Irák was needed to take Başra from the hands of a local party that had submitted to Persia. Fortresses were put in a better state of defence and a new takhallus was issued for the fleet. Huseyn Pasha resigned his offices in September 1702 and died soon after. His deposition was partly the work of the mutafí, who made the sultan appoint in his place Dáltañ-báñeh Mehemmed Pashá. When the latter showed himself of too warlike a disposition and caused at the same time unrest in the capital by favouring the claims of the Tatar îkhi, the influence of the mutafí caused his deposition and execution (Ramadán 1114/January 1703). Rámi Pashá [q.v.] became grand vizier. Rámi's measures to enforce the authority of the central government were salutary but made him many enemies; moreover, the Janissaries were not contented with a grand vizier who was not a military man. The general unrest was increased by the permanent residence of Mustafá in Edirne. All these circumstances brought about in July 1703 a Janissary revolt in Istanbul, directed at first against Rámi Pashá and against the mutafí. The latter's deposition was obtained without much difficulty, but the rebellion continued under the leadership and organisation of a certain Halef Ağá. A deposition on the sultan's behalf was imprisoned and treated harshly. Too late, the sultan promised to come himself to give a fattávi authorising the sultan's deposition. In August 1703 a rebel army went on its way to Edirne, after having agreed on Mustafá's brother Ahmed as successor to the throne. When Mustafá saw himself at last abandoned by his own Janissaries, he abdicated on 22 Şabáni 1115/21 August 1703. He died soon afterwards on 8 Rabí' II 1115/31 December 1703, and was buried in the Aya Sofía. He is rightly considered as a wise and good ruler, as is proved by his careful choice of able statesmen. He wrote poems under the takhallus of Meftüñ and Ínkâli. Under him, the imperial tughra [q.v.] appeared for the first time on the Ottoman coins.

Bibliography: The chief source is the Ta'rif of Rághib, besides an anonymous historical work, used by von Hammer and only mentioned in a note by Babinger, GOW, 247 and 248. Useful information also in the history of the Crimea by Mehmed Girây (GOW, 235) and Sayyid Mehméd Rádâ (GOW, 281). The Ingâli of the grand-vizier Rámi Pashá (not mentioned in GOW) has importance as containing contemporary documents. See further the general histories of von Hammer, Zinkeisen and Jorga; A. D. Alderson, The structure of the Ottoman empire, Oxford 1956, index s.v.; S. J. Shaw, History of the Ottoman empire and modern Turkey, i, Cambridge 1976, 223-8; R. Mantran (ed.), Histoire de l'Empire ottoman, Paris 1989, index s.v.; F. A. H., art. s.v. (Cengiz Orhonlu). (J-H. KRAMERS)
the Polish Confederates urgently appealed for the intervention of the Porte against the aggression of Catherine's government on Polish liberty. In these circumstances, the Porte had no more interest in seeking the alliance of Prussia, where, in 1764, Ahmed Rasi Efendi had gone as envoy, of which embassy he afterwards wrote his well-known Safaret-name. The Sultan himself was decidedly anti-Russian, but the diplomacy of the Russian minister Obreskov and the pacification of the 'udama' delayed the war, until, in August 1768, Mustafa obtained from the then mufti Welli al-Din a fatwa authorising the war with Russia. War was declared only on 6 October, after the dismissal of the grand vizier Muhsin-zade, who had advised delay until the spring. Obreskov was imprisoned in Yedi Kule.

The war began in January with destructive raids of the Crimean Tatars in southern Russia under their newly appointed Khans Khrim Giray; at that time, de Tott was an eye-witness with the Tatar army. In Dhu '1-Ka'da 1182/March 1769, the then grand vizier Mehmed Emin Pasha left Istanbul with the Holy Banner; on this occasion there was an outburst of Muslim fanaticism against the Austrian interminuto and his party, who had come to witness the procession. While the grand vizier went to the Dobrudja, the Russians passed through Chotin (Turk. Khocin), but were not able to take only in August. In the meantime, the grand vizier had been deposed and executed; his place was taken by Moldowandji Ali Pasha, who fought with the Russians on both sides of the Dniestr. Other Russian armies took Jassy and Bucharest and advanced into Transcaucasia. The year 1184/1770 was still more disastrous for Turkey. The Russians received, through a certain Chokri, the ban of the Sefidret-name.

On 6 October, 1769, Mustafa was proclaimed sultan. Immediately afterwards, the nizam-i adilijedid [q.v.] on 21 Rabii I 1222/29 May 1807, Mustafa was proclaimed sultan. Immediately afterwards, the nizam-i adilijedid was replaced by the Laleli Djami, which he had begun to build in 1759 (Hodiikat ad-djawami', i, 23). Mustafa III is praised in the Turkish sources as a good ruler. He had a special liking for religious disputations held in his presence and was particularly interested in astrological calculations. He took an interest in the least important affairs, and this prevented him from such a real statesmanlike insight as was needed by a sovereign who yielded to his rage.

In his way, he was an "enlightened despot". But even a more able ruler would probably have failed to save Turkey from her military inferiority against the Russian armies; measures of military organisation were taken with the aid of de Tott, but this could not prevent the desertion of the troops from assuming disastrous proportions during certain episodes of the Russo-Turkish war. Besides the Laleli Djami, Mustafa built the Ayazma Djami; at Scutari for his mother; and he caused a new suburb of Istanbul to be built outside the Yenicapi. His reign is further marked by the extremely severe earthquake that laid large parts of the capital in ruins in 1766.
The date of birth of Mustafa, a son of the Ottoman sultan Bayezid I [q.v.], is unknown. Şükür Allâh (ed. Ataç, 58), lists Mustafa as the last of his six [male] children, all of whom were born of slave-women (dâzme). It is probable that Bayezid had appointed Mustafa governor of Hamidi and Tekke [q.v.]; indubitably it was at the head of troops from these provinces that he fought alongside his father at the battle of Ankara (16 Dhu 'l-Hijjâ 804/28 July 1402). Thereafter the fog of uncertainty descends on the career of Mustafa—or of the resourceful and plausible pretender who later took his name.

Şükür Allâh (loc. cit.) states simply that Mustafa was taken prisoner with his father and was never seen again. The general view is that he was taken by Timûr into captivity in Central Asia, but a reading of Ibn ʿArabîgah (Caïro, 1310, 133; tr. Sanders, 187) would seem to suggest that Timûrîd agents, having failed to locate him after the battle, contented themselves with putting to death a large number ("nearly thirty") of his namesakes. Some Ottoman sources, however, indicate clearly that Mustafa was taken captive by Timûr, returning home after "some years" (Enverî, Dîstûrînâmé, ed. Yînanî, 91; cf. Medhal, 97); he may have been liberated, together with other princely hostages, after the defeat of Timûr (Feb. 1405).

Thus at least three major historical problems must be faced by a pretender treatment of Mustafa in order to preserve the authenticity of his claim to be a son of Bayezid I; his whereabouts during the years following 1402, if, as seems almost certain, he was a son of Bayezid, or, alternatively, the origins of the pretender ("dâzme"); and, finally, the serious discrepancies which exist between the Byzantine, Ottoman and Latin sources concerning the real or pretended Mustafa's activities. None of these problems has yet been provided with a totally watertight solution.

The Ottoman view, that the post-1415 Mustafa was an impostor, may be traced back to the remark—possibly apocryphal—attributed to Mehemmed I in the context of the events of 1415-16, that the real Mustafa had died in childhood (Chalcocondyles, tr. B. de Vigenère, Paris 1662, 97). The earliest Ottoman literature to mention Mustafa is, to take an example from the books published by Turan, in Enverî and, (probably as a consequence) in the compilation of ʿÂşıkpaşazâde and the Anonymous Ammonymous work by NîhÎrî, the authenticity of Mustafa is recognised (cf. M. H. Yînanî, Medhal, 96; V. L. Ménage, Beginnings of Ottoman historiography, 175-6). The reappearance of Mustafa in 1415 is also historically problematical. On the one hand, Venetian sources report the arrival there in January 1415 of a galley from Trebizond, bearing a "Turkish" agent charged with negotiations "with the basileus" on behalf of Mustafa. This may also be connected with a report (Chalcocondyles, loc. cit.) that he had taken refuge at Sinop in the territory of the Isfendiyâr-oghullar [q.v.], and with further Venetian reports that Mustafa was "in Asia", looking for a galley to transport him to Europe, where he claimed to have been the generally adopted sobriquet of ʿâşıkpaşazâde and the Anonymous work by NîhÎrî, the authenticity of Mustafa is recognised (cf. M. H. Yînanî, Medhal, 96; V. L. Ménage, Beginnings of Ottoman historiography, 175-6).
The sequence of events concerning Mustafa's campaign in Rumelia in 824/1421-2 has been fairly satisfactorily established by recent research (cf., for a clear account, C. Imber, The Ottoman Empire, 1300-1481, Istanbul, 1990, 91-4). Mehemmed I died at Edirne in the spring of 824/1421 (for the exact date—May 21, Ind. 14. A.M. 6729—see S. Kuğées, Notizbuch eines Beamten der Metropolis in Thessalonike aus dem Anfang des XV. Jahrhunderts, in BZ, xxiii [1914], 143-63, no. 80, pp. 151-2; cf. Schreiner, CBB, ii, 412, no. 67). Mehemmed's death was said to have been concealed for 41 days (= until 1 July) until his son Mustafa could reach Bursa and ascend the throne (İnalçı, in IA, s.v. Murad II: on 25 June). "Ağlıkpaşa" also states that once Mehemmed's death was known, there was an outbreak of "fitre", all of which may conceal a more complex situation, alluded to by Ducas and Chalcocondyles. This involved the rejection by Murad and his chief adviser, the beglerbegi of Rumeli, Bâyezîd Paşa, of Mehemmed's testamentary disposition, bequeathing Rumeli to Murad and Anatolia to his second son "Kuçük" Mustafa [q.v.], while leaving his other two sons, Yüsuf and Mahmûd, to the protection of the Byzantine emperor.

The Byzantines, in retaliation for Bâyezîd Paşa's refusal to surrender Yüsuf and Mahmûd, brought the elder Mustafa into play, seeing him as a suitable figurehead for a Byzantine client régime in Rumeli, from which, in exchange for support, valuable territorial concessions could be extorted. A Byzantine flotilla under the command of Demetrios Leontarios transported Mustafa from Limnos and landed him without hindrance on the Gallipoli peninsula on 15 August 1421 (Kuğées; İnalçı, loc. cit.: "September"). From there—or, as most of the Ottoman sources state, from Thessaloniki (but cf. pseudo-Rûhû, Bodl. ms. Marsh 313, 106a-b: Gallipoli)—Mustafa marched on Edirne, taking possession of Yeniçêr Vardar and Serez. There he struck what is probably his first, pre-Edirne, coinage. At Gallipoli or en route he received the homage of the cabinet and sipahi of Rûmelî and of the foremost Rûmelî ud-î begis, including Turhan Beg, the Evronos-zâdes [q.v.] and the Gümülü-oghlu; according to the pseudo-Rûhû, he "went to the Rûmelî forces and showed his scars [sc. of the wounds received at Ankara]; all Rûmeîî followed him." At Szafi-dere, near Edirne, Mustafa and Dûnayd encountered Bâyezîd Paşa, sent from Bursa via "the upper straits" with an army to hold Edirne, Bâyezîd Paşa's troops defected to Mustafa after he had again demonstrated his battle-scars; Bâyezîd himself was seized and executed. Mustafa entered Edirne; later, in defiance of his agreement with Byzantium, he took possession of Gallipoli, refusing to surrender it to Leontarios.

Late in 1421 Mustafa crossed the Dardanelles at Gallipoli, followed by Murad, who was able to draw on the assistance of Giovanni Adorno, the Genoese podestà of New Phocaia, in transporting his troops across the Straits (15 January 1422). Mustafa retreated to Edirne, where he found his authority was no longer recognised. According to most accounts, while attempting, most probably, to gain sanctuary in Wallachia, he was seized at Yeniçêr Kazî Ağaç by Murad's agents, brought back to Edirne, and hanged. It is possible, however, that he may have succeeded in escaping to Wallachia and thence from there to Constantinople (Kâfel [q.v.]), from where he came to Thessaloniki (cf. Takwîmler, ed. Turan, 60). From there he maintained his struggle until the town fell into Ottoman hands in 1430 (cf. the important and otherwise inexplicable Venetian notices, Thirit, Rêjestes, ii, nos. 2132, 2134).

What can be said concerning the régime of "Düzme" Mustafa? In his granting privileges to the şâhês and the şâhs, he seems to have continued the policies of Mûsâ. On the other hand, he followed a pacific policy towards Byzantium, and did not imitate Mûsâ by a widespread reintroduction of akhîn; in this aspect of his policies, insofar as we may speak of them with certainty, he resembles Sîleyman. Were the uğiók sîhî who supported him, then, no more than opportunists, as was the case with Dûnayd and Mircea of Wallachia, for whom Mûsâ, like Mûsâ and Şaykh Bedr el-Dîn, served merely as a tool for their anti-Ottoman policies?

Mustafa's actions during his short-lived régime seem to be a combination of the astute and the opportunistic. He went back on his promise to restore Gallipoli to Byzantium, an act which can be regarded either as folly, alienating an important ally, or as a political stroke aimed at satisfying his followers and establishing his credentials as an Ottoman ruler. His generous accession donative to the lower paid troops in the end failed to ensure their loyalty at Ulubâd.
The Rumelian udżbegs, likewise, abandoned him in the face of clever propaganda for the cause of Murad. Certainly Muştafa showed himself to be an incompetent military leader, when faced with Murad at Ulubâd—he was a bad strategist and a bad psychologist.

Muştafa's ostensible end—hanging, the fate of a common criminal (cf. Cantemir, History of the growth and decay of the Ottoman Empire, tr. N. Tindal, London, 1739, 44, n. 28)—was ignominious, Murad had to be seen to disassociate him from the Ottoman house; the final piece of evidence, perhaps, that "Düzme" Muştafa was indeed no impostor. It is not known what happened to the body, except that it was not accorded a royal burial. The present scarcity of Muştafa's coinage almost certainly indicates that it was suppressed immediately after the violent end of his counter-sultanate. All indications thus point to the need to consider to what extent there existed in early 9th/15th-century Ottoman society an element which wished to establish an "independent" beylik in Rümelî. In that sense, the failure of Muştafa, as of his brothers Süleyman and Mûsâ, to establish a durable regime in Rümelî underlines the fact that in the first half of the 9th/15th century the preponderance of Ottoman political power still resided on the Anatolian side of the Straits.

The coinage of Muştafa b. Bâyezîd is of great interest and, hitherto, of considerable rarity. Muştafa, like Süleyman and Mûsâ—and like Mehmed I—before him, made an issue of silver akât at Edirne. He also struck akâtes—in very limited numbers—at Serez (Serres). A so far unique copper manger is also known to exist. The riddling nature of the date on some of the Edirne coins has long perplexed historians. Some bear the expected higher date 824; others carry the legend "8224" (cf. C. Öçer, Yıldırım Bâyesîn' in oğullarına ait ake ve mangered, [Istanbul, ca. 1970?], 97, ff.). The theory has been advanced that this should be read as "A. H. 822, 4th year of Muştafa's", and that the "8224" coins represent evidence for a hypothetical 'second revolt' by Muştafa. If 819/1416, the year which witnessed the outbreak of failure of Muştafa's first attempt to gain the sultanate, is taken as year 1, year "4" falls indeed in 822 (28.1.1419-16.1.1420). But at this time Muştafa was still in Byzantine hands, while Mehmed I himself struck an extensive coinage, the last issue of his reign, at Edirne (and elsewhere) in 822. Clearly, there was no "second revolt". The legend itself, while defying explanation, can now be accounted for. A study of the coinage of Muştafa, based on a hoard of more than one hundred coins, has demonstrated conclusively that multiple die-linkages connect in parallel the various sub-types of the 824 and "8224" coins and that the whole Edirne issue of Muştafa—along with (on stylistic grounds) the much smaller emission from Serez—must have been struck in the last quarter of 824 or very early in 825 (sc. Aug./Sept. 1421-Jan. 1422).

Bibliography (expanding that in the text): Osman Tunur (ed.), Istanbul'un fethinden önce yazalımsî tarhi takvimi, Ankara 1954; Şükür Allah, Bahâdet al-tawâwîrîk, tr. and ed. Ç. N. Atnaz, Ormanlar tarhiileri, i, Istanbul n.d., 58; Enweri, Dîstânîname, ed. Mukrîmin Halîl [Yinanç], Istanbul 1929, 91-2 (cf. Mesâhîl (sep. pagination and title page, 97); Aşkîpaşaçaâzade, Tawâwîrîk-i âîlî šâhîmânîân, ed. Fr. Giese, Leipzig 1929, 70 ff.; [Anonymous], Tawâwîrîk-i âîlî šâhîmânîân, ed. Giese, Der auslänischen Chroniken, i, Breslau 1922, 56 ff.; Mehmed Nebrî, Dîjhân-namâ, ed. Taeschner, Leipzig 1951, i, 125 ff.; Orudj, Tawâwîrîk-i âîlî šâhîmânîân, ed. Fr. Bağ Bürogh, Hanover 1925, 46, 112-3; cf. the concordance in V.L. Menâge, Nâzûhâtûnî of the Ottomans: the sources and development of the text, London 1964, 65-6; J.W. Barker, Manuel II Palæologus (1391-1423), New Brunswick 1969, 34-4, 355-9, with references to the Byzantine sources; further, IA, sv, Muştafa. i (M.C. Şehâbetîn Tekindâ), with references to Ottoman manuscript sources. The above article is a résumé of two forthcoming studies by C.J. Heywood, dealing respectively with Muştafa's regime and his coinage, where more extensive general and numismatic bibliographies will be supplied. (C.J. HEYWOOD)

2. Muştafa Çelebi, Kûçûk Muştafa, son of Mehmed I [q.v.] and counter-sultan [ca. 810-11/1408-9/825/1423]. Mehmed I had five sons: Murad (i.e. Murad II [q.v.]); Muştafa, who received the nickname Kûçûk ("Young") to distinguish him from his uncle. Düzme Muştafa b. Bâyezîd (see 1 above); Ahmed, who had died in the lifetime of his father; Yusuf and Mâhîmûd. There is evidence from Byzantine sources (Ducas; Chalcocondyles) that Mehmed's testamentary disposition may have envisaged a partition of the Ottoman state on his death, with Muştafa receiving its Anatolian possessions (The two youngest sons were to be kept in protective custody at the Byzantine court). Thus the twin evils of civil war and fratricide would be obviated. In the event, on his father's death (25 June 1421), Murad, whom the Ottoman chronicle sources (Aşkîpaşaçaâzade, the Anonymous chronicles, Orudj) clearly regard as Mehmed's designated wa'fî-âlîh, was aided by the late sultan's chief advisors to ascend the throne (at Bursa, 25 June 1421—cf. IA, sv. Murad II [H. Iânầiç]; Mehmed's two youngest sons were put to death there (Şükür Allah, 62)).

Muştafa, who was twelve years on age of death of his father, had been appointed by him sandığâr-begi of Hamîd [q.v.]. He was taken under the protection of Ya'yûb Beg of Germîyân, who "adopted him as a son" (Aşkîpaşaçaâzade) and refused to recognise Murad as sultan. Muştafa, who received the nickname Bâyezîd (and counter-sultan) was occupied by the Kâramâniids. Muştafa seems to have played little part in the immediate aftermath of Mehmed's death, when Murâd was faced with the simultaneous general uprising against Ottoman rule in Anatolia and the attempt by Düzme Muştafa to gain the sultanate, as well as the open hostility of Byzantium (summer 1421-spring 1422); it is possible that he may have been residing in Kâramân (Chalcocondyles), or placed by a certain Kara Tâjd al-Dîn-âlîg Hollû under the tutelage of one Shâhâdâr Ilyâs in Kastamonu (Ducas). Thereafter, with these threats overcome, Murad turned against Byzantium (sieges of Constantinople and Thessaloniki, June 1422). At this point Kûçûk Muştafa reappeared and, most probably with Byzantine money (channelled via Shâhâdâr Ilyâs, who, together with Kara Tâjd al-Dîn-âlîg Hollû, appears throughout to have played the role of kingmaker to the young prince), together with military support from Kâramân and Germîyân—apparently including Turkomans from the Turghud tribes—was enabled to raise up a strong army which besieged Bursa (late August 1422). Murâd, abandoning the siege of Constantinople (final, unsuccessful assault on 24 August; departure of Murad on 6 September), retired to Edirne. From there he sent an army under Mâhîmûd against Muştafa, who fled to Constantinople (30 September 1422). Muştafa established
a short-lived base at Selendria (Silivri) on the north coast of the Sea of Marmara, but was attacked by the troops of Rūmeli and forced to cross over to a small island called "again" and set up his residence in Koja-eli, on the Asian shore of the Bosphorus, where he was recognised by the population and troops as sultan (Takimek, ed. Turan, 60; Chalcocondyles, tr. B. de Vigenère, 110). From Koja-eli Muştafa advanced on Iznik, which opened its gates to him. He also gained control over "part of the region of Bursa" (Takimek, 60), and seems at this time to have been recognised as sultan over much of Anatolia. The population of Bursa, however, remained loyal to Murad, requesting Muştafa not to besiege the town, Murad, counselled by his īdār Yorgūq Paşa, and preceded by Miḥkāl Beg, crossed over to Anatolia (24 January 1422). Murad won over Ilyās Paşa, Muştafa's chief advisor, and advanced on Iznik, which declared itself for him. After violent fighting, in which both Miḥkāl Beg and Kara Tādż al-Din-oğlu lost their lives, Iznik was taken by Murad. Muştafa was handed over by Ilyās Paşa to Murad, who caused him to be strangled outside Iznik (20 February (?) 1423). His corpse was sent to Bursa, where it was buried beside his father. Bibliography: See that for 1., above; cf. also IA, s.v. Muştafa Çelebi (2) (M.C. Şehabettin Tekindağ).

3. Muştafa, son of Süleyman Kârımdî [q.v.] (921-61/1515-53). A favourite of Süleyman’s mother, Hafṣa Şuftsun, he was brought to Istanbul with his mother Mahıdevran (also known in the sources as Gülbahâr) in 926/1520 when Süleyman ascended the throne. When Hafṣa died in 939/1533, Muştafa was sent with his mother to serve as governor of Şarûkîn in Mâ’nîsîa where he had been born. Muştafa exhibited political ambition and was a confidant of the Grand Vizier İbrahim Paşa until the latter’s execution in 942/1536. Opponents of Muştafa (led by Kührrem Şuftsun and Rüstem Paşa [q.v.]) spread rumours in 945/1538 and again in 948/1541 that he planned to rebel against his father. In 948/1541 he was re-assigned further away from the capital as governor of Amasya. Here he served until 961/1553, when he was excused and went to Lyons at the orders of his father Sultan Süleyman. The sources are unclear about the circumstances surrounding this event. Süleyman was convinced that Muştafa intended to stage a coup d’état, and he received reports that Muştafa had aroused the Janissaries by charging that his father was too ill and old to lead the army and the state. The Grand Vizier Rüstem Paşa, who had pressed for Muştafa’s execution, was himself dismissed to appease the Janissaries.

Muştafa’s death was mourned by poets and scholars, a number of whom wrote elegies for the dead şehzade; best known is the merjiye of Yahyâ Bey. Muştafa himself wrote poetry under the sâkhâltas of Muḥkîsî.


Muştafa ʿAbd al-Râzîk, Egyptian journalist who became Rector of al-Azhar [q.v.].

Born in Egypt in 1882 (according to V. A. Dâhir, Maṣâdîr) or in 1885 (al-Zirikli, A’dâm) and dying in 1946 or 1947, ʿAbd al-Râzîk is a short-lived figure in his own family. He was the son of Hasan Paşa ʿAbd al-Râzîk and the brother of ʿAli ʿAbd al-Râzîk, his junior by several years and famed for the "scanda" raised by his book al-Īlâm wa-ṣulûk al-hukm in 1925, a little before the one which Tâhâ Husayn provoked with his al-Shâr’ al-düʾâli. Despite being on a very different social level, Muştafa ʿAbd al-Râzîk followed an education which recalls that of Tâhâ Husayn for a rich and serious family younger than him. After having studied the Kurân in the kutâb [q.v.] of his village, he pursued his studies at al-Azhar where, contrary to Tâhâ Husayn, he obtained his diploma. He was unable to enter Cairo University, which was only to open its doors after his departure for Paris, in 1909. He followed Durckheim’s courses at the Sorbonne, and specialised in Islamic philosophy. Having become Doctorès-Lettres, he returned to Egypt in 1915 to fill several posts and to follow a less dramatic career than those of his father and brother: as secretary-general of the Council of al-Azhar, inspector of the religious courts, professor of Islamic philosophy, in 1927, at the secular University of Cairo, minister of awâkîf in 1938, and supreme Şâhîkh of al-Azhâr from 1945 till his death. He went on as a specialist of Muḥtarrîm [q.v.], whose courses he had followed at al-Azhar; he became his friend and one of the main sources for his biography. He first of all collaborated on the daily al-Dîjarîda (founded in 1908 at Cairo, and edited by Ahmad Lüftî al-Sayyûd), where he became friendly with the leading lights of modern Arab thought, including ʿAkkâd, M. H. Haykal, Salâma Mûštûd, Sâdîk al-Râfî and Tâhâ Husayn. Then he worked on al-Siyasa, founded in 1922, with Muhammad Huseyn Haykal as editor-in-chief. This daily newspaper was at the time the mouthpiece of the dissident party from the Wâlîf, al-Ābrâr al-Dustûriyyûn, whose founder ʿAlî Yakân had become the rival of Saʿd Zâghlûl [q.v.]. The masses, fervent worshippers of the latter, stoned the premises of the newspaper, and the two other of whose members were even murdered, one of these being Muştafa ʿAbd al-Râzîk. In 1938, after the death of Hasan Paşa, al-Siyasa defended freedom of expression for the intellec
tuals persecuted by the malévolence of al-Azhâr, Tâhâ Husayn for his al-Shâr’ al-düʾâli (in 1926) and ʿAli ʿAbd al-Râzîk for the book mentioned above, which prepared the separation of religion and the state.

At Lyons, Muştafa ʿAbd al-Râzîk presented his thesis on the İmâm al-Ṣâlihî, published at Cairo in 1944. Tâhâ Husayn said of him in his obituary notice: "he was a man of letters, a scholar who produced little (adīb âlim muktîl), but this little was of greater value than much else" (cited by al-Zirikli, A’dâm, 131-2). Towards the end of his life, he published al-Sûfya wa l-firâl al-isldmiyya (Cairo 1938), an introduction to Islamic philosophy (Cairo 1944), and studies on al-Kindî and al-Fârâbî, Fâyihsîsî wa l-umar va l-μαύλιν al-ālim (Cairo 1945). Above all, he wrote authoritatively on ʿAbduh (Cairo 1946) and published his "memoirs" (Mudhakkirdt) in the press. At his death, numerous articles were written about him, including by Tâhâ Husayn (al-Kûtîb al-Misîri, 1947, no. 5), by ʿAkâd (al-Risâîal, 1947, no. xv) and many others (al-Thâkafa, 1947, nos. 429, 431, 481).

Bibliography: Yaṣūf As’ād Dâhir, Maṣâdîr al-dirâsâ al-adabîyya, i/v, al-Râhîtân (1900-1955), Beirût, Own edition; Bâza’sî, A’dâm, 3rd ed., Cairo n.d., vii, 131-2; Broekelman, T., III, 329-30. See also the preface to Muḥammad ʿAbduh’s Risâlât al-Tâwîdîh, tr. Muştafa ʿAbd al-Râzîk and B. Michel, Paris 1965; G.C. Anawati, Une figure de proue: le...
MUSTAFA 'ABD AL-RAZIK — MUSTAFA BARZANI

MUSTAFA BARZANI. Mullah, probably the best-known Kurdish leader of his generation (1902-79), was born in Barzan [q.v.] (now in the province of Duhuk), northern Iraq, into a family of Nakhabandi [see NAKHBANDIYYA] sheikhs. His father, Shaykh 'Abd al-Salam, sent a petition to the Young Turk government in 1908 asking for Kurdish officials to be employed in the Kurdish areas, and for Kurdish to be an official language of the region; he was subsequently hanged in Mawil in 1915 for his defiance of the Ottoman state. 'Abd al-Salam was succeeded as head of the order and leader of the tribe by his son Shaykh Ahmad, Mulla Mustafa's elder brother; in the late 1920s, Ahmad briefly declared himself Jesus Christ, enjoining his followers to eat pork and drink wine, which caused some concern to the authorities in Baghdad. In 1930-2 police posts were established in the Barzan area and the 'Iraki Army was sent in to incorporate the area fully into the state administration. Ahmad put up considerable resistance, but was eventually defeated with the help of the British R.A.F.; he was subsequently exiled to Turkey and imprisoned there, while Mulla Mustafa took over the effective leadership of the Barzan tribe and, in time, of the Kurdish movement as a whole.

By 1936 Ahmad had returned from Turkey, and both the Barzani brothers were living in Sulaymaniyya under house arrest. Mullah Mustafa escaped in 1943 and returned to Barzan, where he raised a revolt and attempted, unsuccessfully, to persuade the British authorities to convince the 'Iraki government to support Kurdish autonomy. In mid-1945, some 14,000 'Iraki troops were sent to Barzan, and succeeded in expelling Mullah Mustafa and some 1,200 Barzani tribesmen from 'Irak into Persia, that October. Their arrival in Persia coincided with one of the principal events in contemporary Kurdish history, the foundation of the Kurdistan Democratic Party (KDP) in Mahabad [q.v.] and subsequently the proclamations of support for Kurdish autonomy. In January 1946, the Barzani came to form the core of the Republic's army, and remained there until the overthrow of Mhâhâbî in the spring of 1947; at this point they were chased back into 'Irak, and in May 1947 Mullah Mustafa and 600 followers escaped to the Soviet Union, where they stayed until 1958. In Mullah Mustafa's absence the KDP ('Irak) was led by Ibrahim Ahmad, under whom it gradually developed into a political as distinct from a nationalist party; the uneasy coexistence of these two tendencies, and Barzani's autocratic style as a traditional tribal leader, was to be the cause of major rifts in the Kurdish movement in later years.

After the Revolution of 1958, 'Abd al-Karim Kasim [q.v.] and the Free Officers invited Mullah Mustafa to return to 'Irak, and it seemed that a new era in Kurdish-'Iraki' government relations had begun. Unfortunately, however, although Kasim himself seems to have supported the idea of some form of autonomy for the Kurds, other Free Officers, especially those who were keen supporters of Arab unity, were less enthusiastic about making concessions in that direction. As a result, the position of Mullah Mustafa and the KDP was generally close to that of the 'Iraki Communist Party, which was also profoundly suspicious of the 'Iraki' nationalism of the neo-nationalists' professed goal of merging 'Irak with the United Arab Republic of Egypt and Syria. By 1961 relations between the government and Mulla Mustafa had greatly deteriorated; Barzani forces occupied Zakho in September and the government retaliated by bombing Barzan village, causing considerable loss of life.

The fighting which began in 1961 continued interminably until Mullah Mustafa and the Kurdish movement generally were defeated in March 1975. Broadly speaking, the 'Iraki Kurds wanted a form of meaningful autonomy within 'Irak, which most 'Iraki' governments of the period were unwilling to consider, since they considered that such autonomy would amount to a derogation of national sovereignty. In addition, many government ministers were either serving or former military officers, who had seen active service against the Kurds in northern 'Irak. In the course of the 1960s, a split, partly a clash of personalities and partly a difference of principle, occurred between Mullah Mustafa and the KDP (in the persons of Ibrahim Ahmad and his son-in-law Dalail Talabani), to the point where KDP units were fighting alongside government troops against the Barzanis. In addition, Mullah Mustafa maintained cordial contacts with the Shâh of Persia for most of the period, an association which was much criticised both by his Kurdish opponents and by successive 'Iraki governments.

When the Ba'ath government came to power in 1968, it began by making overtures to Mullah Mustafa's Kurdish opponents, but soon realised that although they might be more congenial ideologically, the Ahmad-Talabani group had little support on the ground in Kurdistan. Accordingly, negotiations between Mullah Mustafa and the Ba'ath began at the end of 1969, and in March 1970 a programme for Kurdish autonomy was announced which was to be put in place by March 1974. If implemented, the Manifesto would have been a major step forward, but in fact its main function was to enable the Ba'ath to gain time and to establish itself sufficiently to be able to recast its Kurdish policy more to its own advantage at a later date, a purpose which it succeeded in serving for at least two years. Cracks soon began to appear in the facade especially over the Ba'ath's concern to avoid taking a census of the area, since this would have shown that the majority of the population around the Kirkûk oilfields, over which the Ba'ath wanted to retain its control, was Kurdish, and over the expulsion of many thousands of Shî Kurds to Persia in 1971 and 1972. There were also several attempts to assassinate Mullah Mustafa and his sons in the early 1970s.

By 1973, Mullah Mustafa had come to the conclusion that the Ba'ath did not have any serious intention of implementing the Manifesto. He had already resumed his relations with Persia, and, for the first time, began a serious dialogue with the United States. In an interview in the Washington Post in June 1973 he declared that the Kirkûk oilfields were the inalienable property of the Kurds, and offered the United States participation in "Kurdish oil" if it would only send its forces to assist him in his struggle against the "wolves" in Baghdad. Thus when fighting between the government and Kurds finally broke out in 1974, it was easy for the Ba'ath and its Communist supporters to criticise the Kurds for their alliance with the forces of "reaction and imperialism." Mhâhâbî became the headquarters of the 'Iraki Kurdish forces, and there were some 50-40,000 Kurdish refugees in or near the city. The situation of 1975 was much worse and escalated to such a point that an all-out war between Persia and 'Irak looked likely.
Mulla Mustafa's miscalculation was to rely too heavily on Persia and the European states, especially as the Shah had no intention of allowing the Kurds to dissociate themselves from Baghdad. While his pragmatic considerations prevailed, and in March 1975 Saddam Hussein and Muhammad Ridâ Shah [q. v.] signed the Algiers Agreement, which effectively ended Persian support to the Kurds in return for various border and other rectifications in Persia's favour. For the time being, the Kurdish resistance was at an end, and 100,000 Kurdish refugees fled to Persia.

Mulla Mustafa went into exile in Tehran, and eventually died in the United States in 1979. The leadership of the KDP passed to his son Mas'ûd, and Djâlal Talâbânî left the party to form his own movement, the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan, in 1975. In general, Mulla Mustafa was a charismatic leader but far less competent as a politician; he was unable to adjust to the new socio-political realities experienced by many of his people, and too prepared to take undertakings on trust from Saddam Hussein and Muhammad Ridâ Shah. In his lifetime, however, no other Kurdish leader wielded anything approaching his influence.


**AL-MUSTAFA AL-DIN ALLAH [see nizâr b. al-mustansîr].**

**MUŞTAFA EFENDI** [see Suppl.].

**MUŞTAFA KÂMİL PASHA**, leader of the second nationalist movement in Egypt (on the first see bâbî PASHA and Mîbî 2.7). The son of an Egyptian army engineer, he was born in Cairo on 1 Radjab 1291/14 August 1874, studied at the Khedivial school of law there and after taking his examination went to study in Toulouse, where in 1894 he took his licence en droit. When still a student of 18 he began his political activity and entered into personal relations with the Khedive 'Abbâs II [q. v.]. On his return from France, he founded in 1894 the second Egyptian national party (al-hizb al-watanî) with the object of inducing Britain by appeals to justice to abandon the occupation and restore the complete independence of Egypt. Later, he also aimed at getting the Sûûdân [q. v.] handed back to Egypt and tried to prepare the Egyptians by modern education for parliamentary government. As the representative of his party, he spent each year a considerable time in Europe, especially France where he associated with politicians and journalists and conducted a vigorous propaganda for his object. All his life he was very friendly with the journalist Juliette Adam; he had dealings with Rochefort, Drumont, Col. Marchand, Pierre Loti, and in 1896 had some correspondence with Gladstone. Later, he visited Berlin, London, Vienna, Budapest, Geneva and Istanbul, where he was often an honoured guest, praised the sultan's suzerainty over Egypt; 'Abd al-Hamîd II [q. v.] gave him in 1904 the title of Paşa. In Cairo, he founded in 1896 a school for training the youth in nationalist ideas, and in 1899 started the nationalist weekly al-Liwdâ'. The newspaper, which appeared early in 1900, had a great influence. It was suppressed by France in 1900 and also in English and French editions. From 1902 onwards, he published the nationalist quarterly Madâ'ât al-Liwdâ'. In his speeches and articles, he emphasised his aims with fiery eloquence; at the same time, he expressed his approval of the building of the strategic Hîgâz railway by the Ottomans and his sympathy with the Japanese in their war with Russia (1904-5). Muştafa Kâmil also regularly emphasised the privileged position of Muslims as belonging to the state religion, and he recognised the sultan as caliph and head of Islam and thus contributed to the pan-Islamic movement which began early in the 20th century.

The 'Entente Cordiale' concluded on 8 April 1904 between Britain and France was a severe blow to him and the nationalist party; by it France, in return for a free hand in Morocco, dropped its objections to the British occupation of Egypt. The Egyptian nationalists thus lost all hope of open or secret support from the French government and were thrown back upon their own resources. This situation caused Muştafa Kâmil to redouble his energy, and in vigorous speeches and writings against France and Britain, in preparing the ground among the Kurds of different lands, he endeavoured to make Egypt's point of view clear. As a result of the intensity of his agitation, there was a breach between him and the Khedive 'Abbâs II (October 1904); on the other hand, his following in Egypt rapidly increased and began to be troublesome to Lord Cromer, who had so far treated the new nationalism created by Muştafa Kâmil as a "quantité négligeable". The Dîngawî (a village near Tûnî in the Delta) affair gave the nationalists a great stimulus; on 13 June 1906, some British officers out shooting were said to have wounded an Egyptian woman and were attacked by fîlîdhîn with clubs and one of the officers was killed. At the instigation of the British government and under the presidency of the Egyptian Minister of Justice, the Copt Butrus Ghalli, a special court was set up, and this sentence of death and 17 to prison or flogging, and the sentence was carried out next day. The indignation in Egypt and Europe rose to great heights, and even in the British House of Commons the authorities were criticised. Muştafa Kâmil hurried to London and discussed the matter with the Prime Minister, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, whom he endeavoured to convince of the necessity of recalling Lord Cromer and giving greater freedom to Egyptians. On this occasion, he mentioned as suitable representatives in a parliamentary system of government all those Egyptians who in the later political movement after the First World War played important parts. In his return to Egypt, through the press and mass meetings in which he urged Egyptians to unite against Britain, he gave a great stimulus to the nationalistic movement and soon had the satisfaction of seeing Lord Cromer resign (in April 1907)—although he was by no means the only cause of this—and replaced by Sir Eldon Gorst. The latter adopted a milder tone with the Egyptians, was on good terms with the Khedive and endeavoured to support him with a newly-founded party. Muştafa Kâmil attacked this representative of Britain vigorously also, in October 1907 put his National Party on a broader base and increased it to the extent which met on 7 December of the same year in Cairo; 1,017 delegates from all over Egypt appeared, and
after a speech by Mustafa Kamil which carried them away, the latter was elected life-President of the party. This was however his swan-song. He had been ill since the summer of 1906; he died on 10 February 1908 (8 Muḥarram 1326) at the age of 34 of a slow internal trouble (intestinal tuberculosis). The rumour inevitably spread that he had been poisoned at British instigation. His funeral was an impressive expression of the national grief. Mustafa’s creations did not long remain within the restricted scope of an Ilmiyye [q. v.], the orator whose ideas he punctuated. In many ways he was a spiritual descendant of Dżamál al-Din al-Ąfghāni [q. v.], whose ideas he knew through ‘Abd Allāh al-Naḍim [q. v.], the orator and supporter of the ‘Urbāb movement of the 1880s (although he disliked al-Ąfghāni’s chief disciple in Egypt, Muhammad ‘Abdūh [q. v.]), but nevertheless seems to have viewed Islamic religion primarily as a method for the advancement of Egyptian nationalism, and some observers thought him basically irreligious. His Egyptian patriotism was nevertheless fundamental and genuine, and the interests of what he called the umma misrī were always the mainsprings of his policies, amply warranting the adoration of the Egyptians. He stressed the solidarity of Muslims and Copts, as being each component of the Egyptian nation, although in practice, this solidarity was largely a myth; and the more strident of his nationalist supporters after his death, such as his successor as leader of the nationalist party Muhammad Farīd Bey [q. v.], and, above all, his successor as editor of al-Liṣāb, the Tunișian ‘Abd al-Ązīz al-Shawāhī or al-Djawīdī, that much to exacerbate Muslim-Copt relations in the years before the First World War. Mustafa Khayri’s marriage, his residence in the Syri-Armenian quarter of the city, and his studies in Arabic, Persian and Turkish locally, had been more strident of his nationalist supporters after his death, such as his successor as leader of the nationalist party Muhammad Farīd Bey [q. v.], and, above all, his successor as editor of al-Liṣāb, the Tunișian ‘Abd al-Ązīz al-Shawāhī or al-Djawīdī, that much to exacerbate Muslim-Copt relations in the years before the First World War. Mustafa Khayri’s marriage, his residence in the Syri-Armenian quarter of the city, and his studies in Arabic, Persian and Turkish locally, had been a spiritual descendant of the Syri-Armenian and Coptic populations in Egypt with suspicion, as intruders (dākhilī), seeing in them competitors in the professions and supporters of the British occupation, but he had to be more wary in his public attitude towards the European residents (al-nuṣūlāt al-Urduyyān), as representatives of powers which needed to be placated if Egypt was to achieve independence. Of Mustafa Kamil’s numerous writings, the only important can be mentioned; many of them were only printed after his death, some in the great (!_Ilmiyye [q. v.]) biographies by his brother ‘Alī Bey Fahmi Kamīl, al-Mas‘ūda l-ṣāḥiḥiyāt (1898, 1909); Misr wa l-thilāl al-inḍiqlī (collection of speeches and essays, Cairo 1313); Dфиā al-mişrī ‘an dunyāti, Cairo 1324/1906; al-Σuṃs al-muḥābrā (Cairo 1904, on the Russo-Japanese war); Lettres françaises-égyptiennes (Cairo 1909; also in Arabic and Eng. tr., his letters to Juliette Adam); Ejątıni̇s et Anglīs, Paris 1906 (speech of 4 July 1895 in Toulouse); Le péril anglais, Paris 1899; What the National Party wants (Cairo 1907, speech of 22 Oct. 1907). See further on his writings, Sarkis, Muṣṣam al-malāhī, ii, cols. 1754-5. 


(M. Meyerhoff)
MUSTAFA KHAYRI EFENDI — MUSTAFA KHAZNADAR

[see MÜSLİM. 4. A. (i)] he took up a professorship in the Medreset al-Kudt ("Cadis' Training College"), one of the modern teaching establishments of the lımıyeye. In 1910 Khayri Bey became Minister of Ewañ [see WAKF]. In the absence of his colleague, he also acted as Minister of the Interior. During the next cabinet of the government led by Külek Sa'îd Paşa [q.v.], he was President of the Council of State and acting Minister of Education. In 1913 he was re-elected for the third time as member of parliament for Niğde. He became again Minister of Ewañef during this time he actively occupied himself with the reorganisation along modern lines of the educational institutions of the lımıyeye and the administration of the Ewañef Ministry.

On 16 March 1914 (Rabî' 2 1332), Khayri Bey/Elendi also became şeyk al-Islâm in the cabinet of the Grand Vizier Sa'îd Hâlim Paşa (1913-17). Thus it fell to him to issue the ill-famed fatwa sanctioning the dhâhârā-ı ehber (the "Great Holy War")—made in Germany according to the Dutch Islamologist C. Snouck Hurgronje) against Russia, Great Britain, France and their allies (14 November 1914/25 Dhu'1-Hijja 1332) (photograph in Müfassal Osmanî tarihi, vi, 3522, Istanbul 1963; text in transcript in Altunsu, 245 f.). On 25 April 1916/20 Dümânâd 1334, he resigned, according to some because of the lavish style of life; he wished to follow the example of other members of parliament suffering the hardships of war. Khayri Efendi now became a member of the Ottoman Senate.

At the end of the war, he became Minister of Justice in the government formed by Ahmed ʻizzet Paşa [see ʻIZZET PAŞA (Furqan)]. Together with other leading Unionists, such as Djâwid [q.v.] Bey and Fethi Bey [see OKYAR, Sâli Fethî], he had to resign on 19 November 1918. On 4 March 1919, together with many politicians of the Unionist régime, he was arrested. Before a court-martial was held, he and other members of parliament were deported by the British authorities to Malta. Because of ill health he was released early and transported to Rome for treatment. From his letters together with Hiseyin Râghi (Baydur), he went on to Antalya whence Şeykh Ahmad al-Sanûsî was to bring him to Ürgüp. However, Mustafa Kemal Paşa (Atatürk [q.v.]) invited him to Ankara to take a seat in the Grand National Assembly. Khayri Efendi excused himself with the argument that his links with the former Unionist leaders would be an embarrassment for the Ankara government. However, he expressed his loyalty to the nationalists' cause and promised to support Mustafa Kemal's struggle. Thereupon Khayri Efendi retired from public life and settled down in the town of his ancestors. He died at Ürgüp on 1 Dhul-Qa'da 1339/7 July 1921. He lies buried there next to the Great Mosque (Karamânügli İbrahim Djâmiî). His son Suâr Hayrî Ürgûpî (b. Damascus, 1903, d. Istanbul, 1981), a prominent lawyer and politician, was a member of parliament, government minister, ambassador and Prime Minister of Turkey 1965-6 and again in 1972.


**MUSTAFA KHAZNADAR** (1871-78), Tunisian official. A mantûlîk of Greek origin originally called George Kalkias Stravelakis, he became a convert to Islam. He was born at Kardamila in the island of Chios, where his father Stephanus had been killed in the massacres of 1821, taken as a slave at an unknown date and brought to Tunis, where he was brought to the court during the reign of Hussein Bey (1818-35). He was brought up the young mantûlîk in the circle of his own nephew Ahmad (b. 1806), and links which were almost brotherly grew up between the two. The prince appointed for him two tutors, the şeykşüs Ablâ Zayed ʻAbd al-Rahmân al-Kâmil, a Mâliki, and Mustafa Bû Ǧâdî, a Hanâfi, who taught him Arabic and inculcated the bases of Islamic culture (cf. Ibn ʻAbî ʻI- Diyâvî, ʻIhâf., vi, 179). Although he retained memories of his Greek origin, Mustafa had completely forgotten his native language; but he understood Italian, which was currently spoken at the Hûsaynîd court of Bardo.

Mustafa was an intelligent, open-minded person and remarkably adaptable to circumstances, hence by the age of 20 succeeded in raising himself to the highest rank in the state; he was to retain power for 36 years. A master of political calculation, he found it morally unacceptable at the time when the majority of the Sultan's subjects were suffering the hardships of war. Khayri Efendi now became a member of the Ottoman Senate.

From the outset, Ahmad Bey selected him to be his personal secretary and adviser, and promoted him to be treasurer of the state finances (khaznâdâr)—this last position not being a surprising one, since he was already in charge of the prince's personal finances before his investiture. He took up office on 10 Radjab 1253/10 October 1837, and speedily assumed the title of prime minister, holding this till the Bey's death on 4 Ramadan 1271/30 May 1855. For these 18 years, he strove to raise his office in importance, without however making any apparent change in the governmental system. At the time of the first regulation of the currency in 1847, his signature appears on the notes issued then at the side of the Bey's, as if they were co-rulers. Also, he had enough influence over the Bey to dissuade him from condemning a provincial deputy-governor to death. It is true that his marriage to the Bey's sister Kûlûhüm brought with it family connections which favoured his interventions.

The case of Mûmûmad Bey brings with it differing change modes of action. To begin with, Mustafa Khaznâdar's position suffered an eclipse, but the buying over with gold of the Bey's old retainers and his skill in apparently adapting himself to the new sovereign's ways allowed him to remain in power. Nevertheless, the tone of their mutual relations was very different from the one prevailing during the previous reign. It is true that when he threw himself at the Bey's feet to seek pardon for his condemned to death without a trial for immorality, Mûmûmad Bey brusquely repelled him: "A man of this low breed should..."
not have pardon sought for him by someone of your rank)" (cf. Ibn Abi '1-Diyaf, Ithdf, vii, 197). It seems that he was conscious of suffering to a certain extent from his lack of real lineage (nasab), and the episode of the decoration (ibid., vii, 219-20) throws a vivid light on this aspect of his psychology.

Moreover, when M'hammad Bey issued a new gold coinage, the name of his Khaznadar was no longer associated with his own (ibid., vii, 201); hence it is not surprising that shortly before his death on 24 Safar 1276/22 September 1859, M'hammad had ceased to require tribute from the cedars.

The case of Muhammed al-Sâdik Bey is much clearer. Confidence may be placed in pieces of evidence which assert that Mustafa Khaznadar secured a kind of magical ascendancy over the Bey. His tactics are defined as follows: he flattered the ruler and encouraged him in his vices in order to divert him from the reality of power and to leave him the mere shadow of his title, and he organised a network of acts of collusion among his entourage. Duchesne de Bellecourt, the French Consul-General at Tunis, saw in Mustafa Khaznadar, in September 1865, the real absolute ruler of the land. How could one doubt this, when it was averred that he had been able to organise a minor palace revolution in order to place his partisans and confidants in positions of power—the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, of Finance, and of War—within a few days? He had personally, in addition to his post as prime minister, two ministries, sc. Foreign Affairs and Finance (cf. J. Ganiage, Les origines du Protectorat, 280).

In regard to foreign policy, it may be noted that in general, he followed a seesaw policy balanced between the consuls of France and Britain, justifiable for the maintenance of his country's independence, and his enmity to the Egyptians. Desfosses' arguments seem highly inconsistent. The difficulty of making an impartial judgment here, given the extensive camouflage over the numerous financial speculations, remains great, but it seems impossible to exculpate the prime minister. Desfosses' arguments seem highly inconsistent. Nevertheless, it would be hazardous to place the entire blame on Mustafa Khaznadar and to exempt from censure the three Beys and all the high officials in the government, those involved in or associated with the abuses in some degree or other. On 21 October 1873 Mustafa Khaznadar suffered a complete disgracing: he was deprived of all his offices and dignities and was arrested and confined in his palace at Tunis on the accusation of malversation of 80 million francs of state funds.

The ultimate appreciation of Mustafa Khaznadar's career must be that he used his subtle intelligence to secure such an ascendancy over three Beys of Tunisia in the 19th century and that his suppleness in
adapting himself to the shifting realities of the period allowed him to keep himself in power, whilst at the same time concealing from superficial observers the real meaning of his behaviour, as we have seen. 


MUSTAFA PASHA, BAYRAKDAR, or 'ÂLEMÎDAR, Ottoman Turkish grand vizier in 1808, was the son of a wealthy Janissary at Ruseğûk, born about 1750. He distinguished himself in the war with Russia under Muştafa III, and acquired in these years the surname of bayrâkdar ‘standard-bearer’. After the war he lived on his estates near Ruseğûk, and acquired the title of ‘aydn [q.v.] and later of Ruseğûk. With other ‘âydn he took part in the onion action against the government at Edirne, but became finally a reliable supporter of the government. Having already received the honorary offices of kapîdji [q.v.] and of mir akkr, he was, in 1806, promoted to the rank of Pasha of Silistria and at the same time was appointed servâser of the Danube frontier against the advancing Russian army. This made him one of the most influential men in Rûm-îli. He had become a zealous supporter of Selim III’s reform policy and, after that sultan’s deposition, it was to him that the enemies of the new reactionary government turned. 

In June 1808 he was joined by the dismissed kâ‘m-makâm of the grand vizierate in Istanbul, Tayyîr Paşa; from Ruseğûk they went to Edirne, where they joined forces with the grand vizier 'âlebi Muştafa Paşa. So the entire Rumelian army marched against the capital, where they dictated their will to the sultan Muştafa IV (23 July). On 26 July Bayrâkdar was appointed commander in chief and on 28 July, after having taken by force the sultan’s seal from the weak grand vizier, he marched with his troops to the palace of the sultan, under the pretext of bringing back the holy standard of the prophet. At first he was allowed only to enter the first court of the seray, while Muştafa IV—who had been absent— returned in haste from the seaside. As Bayrâkdar had made known his intention of restoring Selim III to the throne, Muştafa had just time to have his predecessor killed. But immediately afterwards he was himself deposed and Bayrâkdar now recognised Mahmûd II [q.v.] as sultan. 

After this began the short personal régime of Bayrâkdar Muştafa Paşa as grand vizier. He had a number of the supporters of the former sultan executed, arranged a magnificent funeral for Selim III and began to form a corps of troops called this time nizâmî-î asker [see NIZÂM-Î LÊDEN]. At the same time he summoned a great imperial conference in the capital, to which all the high-placed officials of the empire were invited. Many of them answered the appeal and submitted their resignations to the new régime, but several of them made a solemn meeting in the first days of October and which was also approved of by a fatwa of the mufti. But the precipitation with which the new measures were taken in hand and the tactless procedure in the abolition of long-established customs made him ever more unpopular. The influential ‘ulamâ’ were also alienated by the exaggerated reforming zeal. His only support were his Rumelian troops and a small number of friends, such as Begdji Efendi and Râmîz Paşa, together with Kâdî Paşa of Kâraman, who had remained in the capital after the imperial conference. Matters turned on head on 14 November 1808, in the last days of Ramazân 1222, by a rebellion of the Janissaries. The night following that day they surrounded the grand vizier’s residence and set the quarter on fire. Bayrâkdar, surprised by the fire, saw no way of escape; he hid himself in a tower of his palace, where his body was found three days afterwards, after the fire was quenched. The rumour had been spread that Bayrâkdar had escaped, which had caused much uncertainty. 

The grand vizier was buried in the fortress of Yedi Kule, where his bones were dug up in 1911 during railway works; they were transported to the mosque of Zaynab Sultan. 

Although brief, Muştafa Paşa Bayrâkdar’s vizierate was important in that he revived aspects of the modernisation programme envisaged by Selim III, e.g. by reviving in effect the Nizâm-i Dżedid as the Segân-i Dżedid, by working towards removal of the abuses connected with the Janissaries and by confirming the rights and privileges of the ‘âydn and derebey [q.v.] classes in the provinces of the empire. A period of reaction followed, but over the next eighteen years, Mahmûd II was cautiously able to bring about the overthrow of the Janissaries in 1826 (the so-called askâ-yi khâyûrî or ‘auspicious event’) and the transformation of the army in the direction of a modern force. 


MUSTAFA PASHA, BUSHATLI (1797-1860), Ottoman statesman of Albanian origin, son of Mehmed Âsîf Paşa and nephew of the renowned Kara Mahmûd Paşa Iškodralî Bûshâtî [q.v.]; this last article will provide information on the controversies regarding the origin of this family. For the eminence of the Bûshâtî, at Iškodra, dating from the first half of the 12th/18th century and achieved through the efforts of Mehmed Paşa Bûshâtî and his successors, see ARAWUTLUK, at vol. i, 656a. 

Born on 27 Ramadân 1211/26 March 1797, Muştafa Paşa made rapid progress in his career: appointed to a post in the mutasarrîfîh of Iškodra in 1225/1810, he became wezîr in 1227/1812. His administrative and military career, and in particular the campaigns conducted on behalf of the Porte against ‘Ali Paşa Tepedelenî [q.v.] and against the Greek incursion in 1825, as well as his passive stance during the disastrous Turkish war of 1828-9, are surveyed at length by M. Cibay Baysun in his passages s.v. IA, viii, 727-30, usefully summarising passing
drawn from various Ottoman historians (Lufli, in particular).

Opposed to the reforms which sultan Mahmoud II intended to introduce (which threatened to deprive him of his hereditary privileges), and driven by personal ambitions, which Albanian historians now interpret as manifestations of Albanian nationalism (cf. S.N. Naçi, Pashalikhe i Shkodrës ne vjetet e para te shek. xix (1796-1831), Tirana 1896), he rebelled against the Ottoman power. He is known to have established "culpable" relations on the one hand with discontented Bosnian Muslims and the pasha of Egypt Muhammad 'Ali [q.v.], and on the other with the Serbian prince Miloš Obrenović (Drag. M. Pavlović, Pokret u Bosni i u Albaniji protiv reforma Mahmuda II, Belgrade 1913, chs. viii and ix; M. Gavrilošević, Miloš Obrenović, Belgrade 1908-12, iii, 91-6, 102-14, 124-6, 332-50, 361), and the prince-bishop of Montenegro, the distinguished poet Petar II Petrović Njegoš (these latter relations were however to be thwarted by the Russian consul in Dubrovnik, J. Gagić).

After initial successes (the temporary capture of Nīja, of Skoplje and of Sofia), the rebel troops of Muṣṭafa Paşa were defeated in April 1831, in the mountainous region of Babuna near Prilep, by Ottoman armies commanded by the grand vizier Muṣṭaфа Reğşī Paşa [q.v.] in person. Survived surrounded at Lezhë, Muṣṭaфа Paşa remained defiant for a few more months, but was eventually forced to surrender. He was taken to Istanbul, where he lived for a time in the vicinity of the Suleymaniye mosque, before being allowed to rejoin the Ottoman administration, under the reign of 'Abd al-Mejd I. He then served, from 1846 onwards, as governor (uṣūf) in various locations (Bolu, Kastamonu, Adana, Muṣṭafaq Konya, etc.) and even returned in 1853 to Rumelia as governor of Herzegovina. He died in Medina on 7 Dhū 'l-Ka'da 1276/27 May 1860, having been a member of the brotherhood dervish order of the Mewlewis (Mawlawiyya [q.v.]).

His property, which had been confiscated at the time of his defeat in 1831, was returned to his sons in 1885. One of the latter, a renowned poet and scholar, Hasan Hakki, was uṣūf of Aleppo; another, Muḥammad Paşa (1824-70) served in the Ottoman administration in Rumelia, in particular, at Novi Pazar and in Herzegovina.

It should be emphasised, in conclusion, that there exist at least three different approaches to the career and biography of Muṣṭaфа Paşa Buxhati: that of ancient and modern Turkish historians; that of the Yugoslav historians mentioned above (to which should be added the article MuṣṭaFa Pașa Buxhâtî by F. Bajraktarević in El'), and, finally, that of modern and contemporary Albanian historians. Regarding these last, it is a case of an increasingly "habitual" tendency, to which one should merely draw attention.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(A. POPOVIĆ)

MUSTAFA PASHA, KAPLAN [see KAPLAN MUSTAFA PASHA in Suppl.].

MUSTAFA PASHA, KARA ŞAHİN, Ottoman governor (beyleryi) of Yemen and Egypt in the mid-10th/16th century. A Bosnian recruited through the dewshirme [q.v.], Muṣṭaфа was trained in the inner palace (enderun [q.v.]) service and thereafter held a number of minor posts. Although he is said to have gained fame during the Persian campaigns, the date of his appointment by the author 'İbîhüddî-i 'Oğlumâni that he was beyleryi of Erzurum in 951/1544-5 and, four years later, of Diyar Bakr, and that he subsequently was tutor (lâlâ) to Prince Bâyezîd (d. 969/1561), appears uncorroborated and may be owing to that author's having confused him with Lâla Muṣṭaфа Paşa (d. 988/1580) [see MUSTAFA PASHA, LALA].

MuṣṭaFa was named to succeed the late MuṣṭaFa Paşa al-Nashâhî [q.v. as beyleryi of Yemen in early 963/1556 while serving as sandjak boyi of Ghażaza. Two of his sons, Rüdwan and Bahram, later were governors of Yemen too, and the latter accompanied his father on his campaign. MuṣṭaFa administered Yemen for four-and-a-half years; yet the sources report little about him there beyond mentioning his popularity. He was observed to have valued the company of religious scholars, and this may account for his having aroused Zâydi susceptibilities when in 964/1557 he attempted to have the Shī'ī formulâ 'aṣâr jâhîr al-amal deleted from the aṭâhî [q.v.]. The silence of the Arabic chroniclers suggests that MuṣṭaFa Paşa avoided all contact with al-Muṣṭâhâr [q.v.], the Zâydi leader.

Kara Şâhîn MuṣṭaFa Paşa was recalled to Istanbul in Radijah 967/1560. Documents show that he was considered for governorships of Aleppo and Rûm; but with the death of Khalîm 'Alî Paşa the governor of Egypt, MuṣṭaFa was appointed his successor on 1 Rabi‘ I 968/20 November 1560. Although he held this office until Dju‘mâdâ II 971/January 1564, the Egyptian chroniclers are silent on his activities except for the comment by one (al-Ḳhâlîakhir) that he was cruel and tyrannical. He apparently died shortly after this tenure.

Bibliography: See that for MUSTAFA PASHA AL-NASHHAH. (J.R. BLACKBURN)

MUSTAFA PASHA, KÖPRÜLU [see KÖPRÜLO].

MUSTAFA PASHA, LALA, famous Ottoman commander of the 10th/16th century, d. 988/1580. The date of his birth is not given.

He was a native of Sokol, and began his service in the imperial palace. He rose in rank under the grand vizier Ahmed (960-2/1553-5), but was not in favour with the latter's successor Rûstûm Paşa, who made him in 963/1556 lâlâ to prince Selim with the object of ruining him. The courtiers of this nomination were contrary of what was expected; MuṣṭaFa became the chief originator of the intrigues by which Selim came into conflict with his brother Bâyezîd and which ended with Bâyezîd's execution in Persia [see SELIM II]. After these events, Rûstûm Paşa managed to relegate the intriguer in administrative functions to different parts of the empire; for eight years he was uṣūf in Damascus. Now he preoccupied his compatriot from Bosnia, the grand vizier Sokollu Mehmed Paşa, favourably disposed to MuṣṭaFa, but in the beginning of 1569 Sultan Selim II called back his former lâlâ as kubre wâzîrî in the capital. Very soon afterwards, Sokollu appointed him serâs-asker in the Yemen; MuṣṭaFa went to Cairo to take charge of his command, but here he became involved in serious disputes with the uṣūf Sinan Paşa over the equipment of his army. The end was that Sinan was appointed in MuṣṭaFa's stead and the latter had to return to Istanbul. Sultan Selim's protection saved him from death, and in the beginning of the following year he was appointed again serâs-asker of the army destined for the conquest of the island of Cyprus. Lala MuṣṭaFa Paşa led this memorable campaign with complete success; Nicosia was taken in Şâfâr 970/July 1570, while Famagusta surrendered on 16 Ruma‘I 988/August 1571. With the surrender of this town is connected the brutal and cruel execution of the Venetian commander
Bragadin. After his return, he became a serious candidate for the grand vizierate, should Sokollu disappear from the scene. His only rival was Sinan Pasha. When in 985/1577 the war with Persia broke out [see Cq.v.], both were appointed serasker, but, on account of Sinan’s arrogant character, the latter’s appointment had to be withdrawn. In April, Lala Mustafa began his campaign in Georgia, fought the memorable victory of Callir (Qumadid II 986/August 1578) and took Tiflis besides a number of other towns. These military glories did not bring him to the ambition he sought. Sokollu’s assassination, Rüstem’s son-in-law Ahmed Paşa had been made grand vizier and, on the latter’s death in Rabî‘ I 988/May 1587, it was Sinan [q.v.] who got the sultan’s seal. Lala Mustafa died in Ramadan/October of the same year and was buried in the court of the mosque at Eyyüb.

Apart from the unquestionably important events in which he played a prominent part, Lala Mustafa Paşa has a particular importance in Ottoman historiography because the historian ʿAli [q.e.] had been attached to his person as scribe since the beginning of his career. Therefore his able, but intriguing, account of Sinan’s arrogant character, the latter’s disappearance, and the considerable experience which he gained in uneasy collaboration with Özdemir Paşa, the Ottoman governor (956–62/1549–54), recognition of Ottoman suzerainty by al-Mutahhar [q.v.], the Zaydi leader. His second term as beylerbeyi of Yemen began in early 962/late 1554, but was cut short by his death at zabîf five or six months later. Mustafa Paşa al-Nashshar appears best remembered as the beylerbeyi whose considerable experience as amir al-hajjis enabled the young Sultan Selim II, who at that time was excommunicated by the Pope, to institute the first annual pilgrims’ caravan to Mecca from Ottoman Yemen.

**Bibliography:** The most complete and accessible contemporary source is Küb al-Din al-Nahrawālī, al-Bark al-Yamāni – Ghazawat al-Djârida, ed. al-Djâsir, Riyād 1967, 88–9, 94–5, 107–18, 121–5. Three other chroniclers, those of Friz, Mustâfi‘ al-nishrān, Ibn Dârîn, al-ṭūlibbî, and Lâl b. Lutf Allâh, Rauch al-nîrîn, remain in ms., although the relevant contents of the latter are conveyed in Ottoman Turkish by Ahmed Râhidj, Târikh-i Yemen ve Şan‘û, İstanbul 1291/1874–5, i, 75, 80, 95–107, Additional early works are those of al-Mawza‘î, al-Īthân, ed. al-Hibbi, Şan‘a‘ n.d., 32–3, and Yahyâ b. al-Husayn, Ghâṣab al-umâni, ed. ʿAshūrj, Cairo 1968, 708–9. The most important work, however, apart from Peçevi, Târikh, İstanbul 1283/1866–7, i, 38, and Mûneddîm Baysh, iii, 213, 238 f., 241–3, in Turkish. Fairly accurate dates for al-Nashshar’s second term in Yemen and for Karâ Shahîn’s tenures in both Yemen and Egypt can be determined from existing Ottoman Mühimmeh documents. Two informative Egyptian chronicles (in Turkish) are al-Târikh-i Türkî, and Abîl-Karîm, Târikh-i Meşîr (both in ms. only).


**J. R. Blackburn**

**MUŞTAFA PASHA, RESHID** [see reşid].

**MUŞTAĞHÂNİM** (Mostaganem), a coastal town in Algeria, 8 miles E. of the mouth of the Shelîf (5° E. long. Greenwich). It does not occupy the site of any known ancient town. There is no natural harbour here; two capes, not particularly well marked (Kharûba and Salamander), leave vessels without protection against winds from the north and west. It is therefore not as a port that al-Bakrî (9th/11th century) mentions Mostaganem for the first time. He describes it as a town situated “not far from the sea” (it is less than a mile away) living on the products of its rich territory, notably the cotton plantations. For this time onwards it was surrounded by a wall which strengthened its natural defences. The old town occupies a triangular plateau formed by the sharp bend of the ‘Ayn Sefra, and the wall runs along the top of the ravine. On this point of this natural stronghold, the Almoravî Yusuf b. Ta‘shîfîn is said to have built in 475/1082 a fortress which was later called Burjî al-Maşālî, from the name of one of the tribes of the region. In the 12th century it won such a combination. Like the other towns of the coast, Nedroma or Algiers. Mostaganem was probably given a small Almoravî garrison. Thus strengthened, the town would serve as
a place of refuge against an attack from the sea and the Berber tribes of the hinterland, which belonged for the most part to the Maghārīqa [q.v.] confederation, could be kept at a distance. It must thus have developed to some extent. In the middle of the 6th/12th century, al-Ídrisī tells us that it had bazaars and baths; he emphasizes the abundance of the water which irrigated the gardens and orchards and drove the mills.

The name of Mostaganem does not figure in history throughout all this period when the Almohads in theory held the central Maghārīqī. The decline of the Almohads enabled the Maghārīqa [q.v.] to become complete masters of the country. In 665/1267 and 669/1271 the Zayyānī sultan of Tlemcen, Yaghmūrāsān, reduced these turbulent tribes and incorporated their lands in the empire which he had founded. In 680/1281 he entrusted the government of Mostaganem to one of his cousins, al-Zaʿīm b. Yahyā, a descendant of one of the collateral branches of the family of the Banū Zayyān, in spite of the lack of confidence he had in those relatives whom he had deprived of the throne. These fears proved well-founded. Al-Zaʿīm, having roused the Maghārīqa to rebel, declared himself independent. Yaghmūrāsān had to march on Mostaganem; he blockaded the town strictly and the rebel surrendered after obtaining permission to cross to Spain.

Like all the coast region, Mostaganem in 735 or 736/1335-6 passed to the Marinid Abu ʿl-Hasan, who was engaged in the siege of Tlemcen. In 742/1340 the victorious sultan built a mosque in Mostaganem. We have an inscription attesting this foundation of the interregnum of the Moroccan princes. Regained by the sultans of Tlemcen, the town suffered disastrously from their weakness. The Suwayd Arabs of the great Zughba confederation became undisputed masters of the whole district. Mostaganem led a precarious existence. Leo Africanus at the beginning of the 18th century speaks of the citadel (the Silo). In 922/1516 Khayr al-Dīn took Mostaganem to one of his cousins, al-Zaʿīm b. Tahir [q.v.], who supported al-Muqtaṣīr b. Tahir al-Muṣṭāfī, who supported al-Muqtaṣīr b. Tahir, who had been deprived of the throne. These fears proved well-founded. Al-Zaʿīm b. Tahir, born in 248-52/862-6, grandson of the caliph al-Muqtaṣīr b. Tahir, had roused the Maghārīqa to rebel, declared himself independent. Yaghmūrāsān had to march on Mostaganem; he blockaded the town strictly and the rebel surrendered after obtaining permission to cross to Spain.

In 736/1335-6 passed to the Marinid Abu ʿl-Hasan, who was engaged in the siege of Tlemcen. In 742/1340 the victorious sultan built a mosque in Mostaganem. We have an inscription attesting this foundation of the interregnum of the Moroccan princes. Regained by the sultans of Tlemcen, the town suffered disastrously from their weakness. The Suwayd Arabs of the great Zughba confederation became undisputed masters of the whole district. Mostaganem led a precarious existence. Leo Africanus at the beginning of the 18th century speaks of the citadel (the Silo). In 922/1516 Khayr al-Dīn took Mostaganem to one of his cousins, al-Zaʿīm b. Tahir [q.v.], who supported al-Muqtaṣīr b. Tahir al-Muṣṭāfī, who supported al-Muqtaṣīr b. Tahir, who had been deprived of the throne. These fears proved well-founded. Al-Zaʿīm b. Tahir, born in 248-52/862-6, grandson of the caliph al-Muqtaṣīr b. Tahir, had roused the Maghārīqa to rebel, declared himself independent. Yaghmūrāsān had to march on Mostaganem; he blockaded the town strictly and the rebel surrendered after obtaining permission to cross to Spain.

In the reign of Shāh ʿAlām Bahādur Shāh 1 (1116-24/1707-12 [q.v.]), he became the secretary of the emperor of Delhi and of Mirzā Shukr al-Dīn, son of Bahādur Shāh, and by his desire Mustaʿīd Khan composed the history of the reign of Awrangzīb entitled Maʿṣūmīr-ʾal ʾAmāgīrī [q.v.]. Part 1 is a mere abridgement of Mirzā Kāpīr ʾs history of the first ten years of the emperor’s reign; part 2 contains the history of the last forty years of ʿAmāgīrīr ʾs reign (edited in the Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta 1870-1; Eng. tr. Sir Jadunath Sarkar, Bib. Ind. Calcutta 1897).

He died at the age of seventy-five at Dihlī in 1136/1723.

Bibliography: Kāhīr Khan, Mutnātāh al-lubāb, ii, 211; Muʿṣāfīr-ʾal ʾAmāgīrī, 253, 255, 407, 462; Sir W. Ouseley, Critical essay, 42; C. Rieu, Cat. Br. Mus., 270a; H. Eithe, Ind. Office cat., no. 365; Elliot and Dowson, History of India, vii, 181; Storey, i, 592-4, 1318; (M. Hidayat Hosain)

AL-MUSTAʿĪN (I) bi ʿl-ʿĀbās AHMAD B. MUHAMMAD, ʿAbbāsid caliph, reigned 248-52/862-6, grandson of the caliph al-Muṭaṣīm [q.v.] and the son of a slave concubine of Saḵlābī origin named Muḥārīk. When his cousin al-Muṭaṣīm [q.v.] died, the Turkish commanders in Ṣaḥārā plucked the Muṭaṣīm from a life of obscurity (he is said to have made a living as a copyist of manuscripts) to become caliph (6 Rabiʿ II 248/9 June 862). The choice aroused discontent in Ṣaḥārā and unrest broke out among those who supported al-Muṭaʿāz [q.v.] which was only put down after much bloodshed and financial expenditure by the Turkish soldiers. When al-Muṭaṣīm was recognised as caliph, he confirmed the governor of ʿAḥbād, Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allāḥ b. Tahir [q.v.], in office. He bought all the property of al-Muṭaʿāz and his brother al-Muʿayyad and then had them arrested. The Turks wanted to put them to death, but they were protected by the secretary Ahmad b. al-Ḵaṣīb, who soon afterwards fell into disgrace and was banished to Crete. In 249/863 troublous broke out as a result of a defeat of the army by the Byzantines; the rebels were however scattered by the vizier ʿUṭamīsh and the two Turkish generals ʿAwṣīf and Būḥās al-Muṣṭāfī. ʿUṭamīsh was soon afterwards murdered at the instigation of the latter. As the caliph no longer felt safe in Ṣaḥārā, he went to Baghdād in Muharram 251/February 865. Al-Muṭaʿāz was then taken by his supporters out of his prison in Ṣaḥārā,
and a war broke out which ended in Dhu 'l-Hijja 251/January 866 in the abdication of al-Musta'in. By the arrangement made, the latter was to live in Medina in future; but he was detained in Wāsit and murdered at Sāmarrā on 3 Shawwāl 252/17 October 866 at the age of 35 and after a reign of three years and eight or nine months.

On the administrative level, al-Musta'in's initial choice of vizier, at the side of Ahmad b. al-Khasib, of Utāmil, a Turkish soldier who had taken part in the conspiracy which had in 247/861 led to the caliph al-Mutawakkil's [q. v.] death, is notable; in practice, day-to-day administration was probably carried on by his vizier, Ahmad b. al-Kasim, whilst Utāmil acted as virtual ruler of the caliph till Utāmil's murder in 249/863 (see above).

Enfeoffment at the centre of the caliphate had a predictable consequence in disturbance and revolts on the peripheries. During al-Musta'in's reign, there are recorded anti-government outbreaks in Syria and Jordan; 'Alīd revolts at Kūfa (248/862 and 252/866), and a war broke out which ended in Dhu 'l-Hijja 251/January 866 in the abdication of al-Musta'in. By the arrangement made, the latter was to live in Medina in future; but he was detained in Wāsit and murdered at Sāmarrā on 3 Shawwāl 252/17 October 866 at the age of 35 and after a reign of three years and eight or nine months. This indication of his intention to rule as caliph till Utāmil's murder in 249/863 (see above).

On the administrative level, al-Musta'in's initial choice of vizier, at the side of Ahmad b. al-Khasib, of Utāmil, a Turkish soldier who had taken part in the conspiracy which had in 247/861 led to the caliph al-Mutawakkil's [q. v.] death, is notable; in practice, day-to-day administration was probably carried on by his vizier, Ahmad b. al-Kasim, whilst Utāmil acted as virtual ruler of the caliph till Utāmil's murder in 249/863 (see above).

Enfeoffment at the centre of the caliphate had a predictable consequence in disturbance and revolts on the peripheries. During al-Musta'in's reign, there are recorded anti-government outbreaks in Syria and Jordan; 'Alīd revolts at Kūfa (248/862 and 251/865) and at Kāzīm (250/864); whilst Utāmil acted as virtual regent for the caliph till Utāmil's murder in 249/863 (see above).
instead of Al-Mustakfī the former caliph al-Muttaki. Al-Mustakfī may have been tempted to intrigue with other Daylamī commanders; this, at least, was the perception of his grandfather al-Mu'tadid [q.v.], who had links with the Baghdad Muktadir, now given the title of al-Muti* [q.v.].—is men-
cing that of his grandfather al-Mu'tadid [q.v.].


(C. E. Bosworth)

MUSTAHRIDI (a.), the active participle of the verb istikhāra in the sense of "to extract", used in the mediaeval Islamic terminology for the person responsible for collecting money, such as that of the ṣadaka or poor-tax (al-Tabarî, i, 2746) or of the ḥargādī or land-tax; thus in 'Abbāsid times he was an official of the Dīwan al-Kharḍājī charged with the latter task (ibid., iii, 1856, year 257/871, caliphate of al-Mu'tamid). In Muslim Spain, it seems to have been the original of the Latin term exceptor, the official who was responsible for collecting money, such as that of the Mozarabs [q.v.].

Often, however, istikhāra has the additional nuance of meaning of extracting money by force or violence, no doubt necessary at times when dealing with recalcitrant tax-payers, but also applied to the process of making a dismissed official disgorge his ill-gotten gains, here hence equivalent to musādâra [q.v.] or musāllâba (see al-Thā'labî, Lūṭa'î al-ma'ârif, ed. al-Abyârî and al-Sarâfî, 14-15, tr. Bosworth, The Book of curious and entertaining information, 45; Abu 'l-Fadl Bayhaki, Ta'rīkh al-Mustâdî, cited in Bosworth, The Chaznavi, 91.

Bibliography: Given in the article, but see also Dozy, Supplément, i, 359, and the Bibl. to musâdâra. 2.

MUSTAHRIDI-ZADE, SA'D AL-DIN SÜLEYMAN B. MEHMET EMİN (1719-88), Ottoman scholar and calligrapher. 1. Life. He was born in Radjâb 1131/May 1719 in Istanbul, and died there on 22 or 23 Shawwâl 1202/27 or 28 July 1788. He came from a well-known 'ulamâ family. His grandfather, Mehmed Mustakfī Efendi (d. 1124/1712), had occupied the post of kâdi of Damascus and Edirne, while his father, Mehmed Emin Efendi (d. 1164/1750), only rose to the rank of a mu'tadî of the Sayyid Hasan Pasha madrasa in Istanbul.

Mustakîm-zade has left an autobiographical note on his education which gives a good insight into the scope and routine of the madrasa instruction of the time (printed in Tuhfe-yi khaftānî, introd., 6-7). According to this document, Mustakîm-zade studied the traditional Islamic sciences under prominent scholars of the capital in order to qualify for a career in the ranks of the 'ulamâ, and at the same time was trained as a calligrapher. Both Mustakîm-zade's grandfather and father had studied under and established close links with the famous Syrian scholar and shaykh of the Kâdirî and Nakshbandî tarîqas, 'Abd al-Ghani al-Nâbulûsî (1050-1143/1641-1731) [q.v.]. Mustakîm-zade himself became deeply influenced by the latter's works and teachings, which is evident from his own writings. His marked inclination towards the religious orders finds its expression in his association, while still an adolescent, with the Kâdirîyya and Nakshbandiya, but particularly in his lifelong devotion to the Nakshbandî Shaykh Mehmend Emin al-Takâdi (d. 1158/1745; see A. Hilmi, Ziyârât-i enstâyi, 158-62), who passed on to Mustakîm-zade the direct line of shaykhs (wâliyât) going back to Shaykh Ahmad al-Fârâbî al-Sirkhî [q.v.].

The death of his pîr seems to have provoked a crisis in Mustakîm-zade's life, but he continued to study in preparation for the office of Great Molla, the highest rank within the Ottoman 'ulûmiyye hierarchy. The second turning point of his life however, his failure in the entrance examinations for the coveted career, determined Mustakîm-zade's life from the age of 69, as he began to work towards his ambitions to devote the rest of his life to private scholarship and contemplation. Until his death at the age of 69, he made a pitiful living on fees for his activities as an author and calligrapher, and on a small stipend (ma'tshet), a gift of the calligrapher and shaykh al-Islâm Sâlih-zade Mehmend Emin (in office 1189-90/1775-6). Mustakîm-zade never had a family of his own, and only a few disciples and patrons.

2. Works. His uneventful life gave Mustakîm-zade the opportunity to compose around 150 books and treatises—the exact number has not been established yet—which attest his eminence as the most productive and versatile Ottoman author of the 18th century. This work, most of it in Turkish, but some also in Arabic and Persian, is indebted to the traditional Islamic teaching and methods, and thus furnishes an exemplary presentation of 18th century Ottoman learning. Most of it deals with topics from the field of hadîth, tafsîr, fiqh and also of Süfi mystical themes; but his writings on history (particularly biography) and adab are in general more voluminous. His poetry is insignificant. Manuscripts of Mustakîm-zade's works can be found in most of the big manuscript collections. The Süleymaniye Küthûphanesi in Istanbul possesses the largest number of Mustakîm-zade mss., some of them unique or autograph copies.

The following works can today be considered as his most important ones:


(b) Biography. Mağdallât al-nizâdi fi nîsâb uwa 'l-ulânî wa 'l-ulûkî, in Arabic, finished in 1173/1761-2, a continuation of Kâthîb Celbî's [q.v.] Sulam al-asâslî ti' tahâki, some of which are autograph ms., Süleymaniye, Halet Ef. 628. Tuhfe-yi khaftânî, biographies of calligraphers, in Turkish, finished in 1173/1769-60; edition by


Throughout his reign, the actual power was entirely in the hands of al-Afdal. At first some successes were gained in Syria; Famiya (Apamea) made a voluntary submission in 489/1096, and Tyre was recovered from a rebel governor in 490/1097. A project of alliance with the Saljuq Rüdwán of Aleppo against Damascus in the same year for a time prospered, was overtaken by events, and the Crusaders in Syria (490/1097), an Egyptian embassy was sent to open negotiations with them, and in 491/July-August 1098 Jerusalem was recaptured from the Artukids Sukmán and Il-Ghází. The advance of the Crusaders in the following year took al-Afdal by surprise; Jerusalem was again lost, and the defeat of the Egyptian army near Askáhán (14 Ramadan 492/2 August 1099) define by establishing them in possession. Two years later (17 Safar 495/12 December 1101) al-Musta’il died and was succeeded by his son al-Mansúr (al-‘Amir bi-Ahkám Alláh [see al-‘Amír]).

The personal character of al-Musta’il is highly praised by his Sunni contemporary Ibn al-Kalání; later writers speak of him as a fanatical ‘Iltí. It would seem that the Fātimid organisation and propaganda was intensified in his reign. Idris refers especially to his close relations with the da’üwa in the Yaman, represented by al-Malika al-Hurra and her daughter Yahyá b. Lamak b. Málík al-Hammadí. In the capable hands of al-Afdal, order and good government were maintained, and Egypt continued to enjoy prosperity, except for a famine in 492/1093 or 493/1094. For the biographical writings, see Kellner-Heinkele in press.

Bibliography: The fullest sources are Ibn al-Kalání, ed. Amedroz, 128-41, and Ibn Taghribardí, ed. Popper, ii, 2, 298-325; the chronology of the latter is defective; Ibn al-‘Amir, x, 161-224, Djamál al-Dín al-Halabí, ms. B.L. Or. 3685, fols. 74b-77a; Ibn Muyassar, ed. Masse, 34-40, and the other sources mentioned under the article al-Afdal, add little of importance. The Mustá‘iní Ismá‘ili tradition is given in ‘Uyun al-akhbár of the da’í Idrís b. al-Hasan (d. 872) (ms. in possession of H.F. al-Hamdaní), vii, 151-75.—For relations with the Crusaders: Gesa Francorum, ed. Bréhier, 86, 96, 208-16; Fulcher Carlotines, i, 19, ii, 10-12; Hagenmayer, Epistulae et Chartae, Innsbruck 1901, 151, 286. The general European literature is given in al-Afdal and al-Mustá‘in; see also F.M. Holt, The age of the Crusades, London 1986, 121; Daftary, The Ismá‘ílís, their history and doctrines, Cambridge 1990, index, s.vv. al-Mustá‘in and Mustá‘oons, and Ismá‘ílíyya. (H.A.R. Gibb) MUSTA’MIN [see Aman].

MUSTAMI (a., the active participle of the Form X verb istamá‘a “to ask someone for dictation, to take down dictation from someone”), the title of a traditional transmitter’s clerk. From the earliest days when in Islam hadith [q.v.] was transmitted from master (shaykh) to pupil, the writing down of traditions has played a certain role in an attempt to protect them against loss. Although transmitting from memory to a pupil, who then stored what he heard in his memory, was felt in the beginning to be the most meritorious transmission procedure, this was gradually overshadowed by the ever-increasing awareness that writing the traditions down constituted a more reliable guarantee against forgetting. The human capacity to retain large numbers of reports pertaining to the time of Muhammad and his revered Companions, a capacity especially celebrated with the pious generations of old, became open to doubt, and the result was that, in practice, writing traditions down virtually eclipsed memorising, though never entirely: transmission by memory became the pro forma course of action, but hardly ever without written records of the material to be transmitted being kept for safety’s sake, albeit often out of sight.
It is generally assumed that the majority of transmitters of Prophetic traditions could read and write but, in the long run, the steadily-growing bulk of the transmitted material made the employing of secretaries imperative. It was then that the function of mustamli became established, the earliest representatives of this professional class emerging in the course of the first half of the 2nd/8th century.

The task of the mustamli can be gleaned from the lexical meaning of the word. In the first place, the mustamli would order his “to write the traditions down from dictation”. This task is not or less the same as that of a kātib (secretary) or warrāk (copyist). In the second place, the mustamli would assist the shaykh in the actual communication (tablīq) of the traditions to pupils who, it is alleged, were often so numerous that the mustamli’s voice could not possibly reach all of them from the spot where he taught. Thus the mustamli(s) had to reiterate the traditions in a way audible for all concerned. With respect to this activity also, the term muʾṣīd is found, as well as muktīb and muktiḥ. However, not every mustamli mentioned in the sources is to be understood as having fulfilled both functions, that of warrāk and that of muballīgh, but either one or the other.

Accounts of mass meetings during which hundreds, even thousands, of pupils are alleged to have gathered at a certain mosque or a caliph’s own residence or at the caliph’s own residence or at the caliph’s own residence or at the caliph’s own residence, attests to the secretaries imperative. It was then that the function of mustamli began to be assumed by secretaries. This task is more or less the same as that of a kātib (secretary) or warrāk (copyist). In the second place, the mustamli would assist the shaykh in the actual communication (tablīq) of the traditions to pupils who, it is alleged, were often so numerous that the mustamli’s voice could not possibly reach all of them from the spot where he taught. Thus the mustamli(s) had to reiterate the traditions in a way audible for all concerned. With respect to this activity also, the term muʾṣīd is found, as well as muktīb and muktiḥ. However, not every mustamli mentioned in the sources is to be understood as having fulfilled both functions, that of warrāk and that of muballīgh, but either one or the other.

Accounts of mass meetings during which hundreds, even thousands, of pupils are alleged to have gathered at a certain mosque or a caliph’s own residence or at the caliph’s own residence or at the caliph’s own residence or at the caliph’s own residence, attests to the secretaries imperative. It was then that the function of mustamli began to be assumed by secretaries. This task is more or less the same as that of a kātib (secretary) or warrāk (copyist). In the second place, the mustamli would assist the shaykh in the actual communication (tablīq) of the traditions to pupils who, it is alleged, were often so numerous that the mustamli’s voice could not possibly reach all of them from the spot where he taught. Thus the mustamli(s) had to reiterate the traditions in a way audible for all concerned. With respect to this activity also, the term muʾṣīd is found, as well as muktīb and muktiḥ. However, not every mustamli mentioned in the sources is to be understood as having fulfilled both functions, that of warrāk and that of muballīgh, but either one or the other.

Accounts of mass meetings during which hundreds, even thousands, of pupils are alleged to have gathered at a certain mosque or a caliph’s own residence or at the caliph’s own residence or at the caliph’s own residence, attests to the secretaries imperative. It was then that the function of mustamli began to be assumed by secretaries. This task is more or less the same as that of a kātib (secretary) or warrāk (copyist). In the second place, the mustamli would assist the shaykh in the actual communication (tablīq) of the traditions to pupils who, it is alleged, were often so numerous that the mustamli’s voice could not possibly reach all of them from the spot where he taught. Thus the mustamli(s) had to reiterate the traditions in a way audible for all concerned. With respect to this activity also, the term muʾṣīd is found, as well as muktīb and muktiḥ. However, not every mustamli mentioned in the sources is to be understood as having fulfilled both functions, that of warrāk and that of muballīgh, but either one or the other.
The sources present a confused picture of the chronology and names of al-Mustansir's viziers and other prominent officials. The exact balance of power between these men is not clear. At least two major figures at the caliphal court were Shīʿīs: Muhammad al-Kummī who had served under al-Nāṣir and al-Zāhir and who is described as kāshīʿ al-irḥaḥ (Ibn al-Dubayḥī, i, 134) and as waṣārī (Ṣibṭ, Mīrāt, 523, 533; Ibn al-Tīkṭākā, 568); and Muʿayyad al-Dīn Ibn al-ʿAlāʾī (ṣv.) who became deputy waṣārī (Ibn al-Dubayḥī, Khuldsat, 529) or waṣārī al-dīr and later served as waṣārī al-Mustansīm (ṣv.), the last ābāsīd caliph of Baghdad (Ibn Kathīr, op. cit., 139); it was he who was to be blamed later for treacherous complicity with the Mongols. According to Ibn al-Tīkṭākā (loc. cit.), al-Kummī was later replaced as waṣārī by Naṣīr al-Dīn b. Muhammad b. al-Nabdī, who remained in power until after al-Mustansir's death. Ibn al-Thaqlain reports that the most powerful officials in al-Mustansir's reign were the military commander Ikbr al-Ṣahrāʾī and the waṣārī al-dīr Ibn al-ʿAlāʾī, who were responsible for installing al-Mustansīm as caliph after al-Mustansir's death, an event which was briefly concealed to allow the succession to be arranged (op. cit., 318).

Information on al-Mustansir's reign remains lacunary: random in its occurrence and of very unequal importance. Entire areas of his life and actions are simply not recorded. His caliphate spans an uneasy lull between Mongol onslaughts. The first years of his reign were dominated by the flamboyant career of Djalāl al-Dīn Khāramdzīgāh (ṣv.), who was seen by contemporaries as a buffer between the Mongols and the Muslim world (Ibn Wāsīl, iv, 323). The sources devote much more attention to him than to al-Mustansir; his regime is characterised by a meagre campaigning principally in ʿIrāk, the Dżazira and western Persia. Djalāl al-Dīn seems to have harboured bellicose intentions towards the caliph (Ibn al-Aḥrīr, xii, 276-8). Moreover, Šībṭ Ibn al-Dījzārī mentions a letter from al-Mustansir to Djalāl al-Dīn, reproaching him for his treatment of his fellow Muslims (op. cit., 668).

The other political events of al-Mustansir's reign mentioned in the sources reveal the caliph as a petty territorial ruler and arbitrator. The ruler of Irbil, Muzaffar al-Dīn Kokbūrī, the brother-in-law of Šalāḥ al-Dīn (Saladin), being without male issue, had bequeathed the city to al-Mustansir. However, on Kokbūrī's death, the caliph had to send an army under his military commander, the eunuch Ikbr al-Ṣahrāʾī (Ibn Taghribirdī, vi, 346), to besiege Irbil before it finally surrendered on 17 Shawwal 630/27 July 1233 (Ṣīḥī, 568; Ibn Kathīr, 135). Al-Mustansir seems also to have mediated between various political factions. Thus he arbitrated in disputes in ʿIrāk between Kokbūrī and Badr al-Dīn Luʿūr (ṣv.) (Ṣīḥī, 680-1) and between the Ayyūbīds al-Malik al-Nāṣir Dāwūd and al-Malik al-Kāmil (Ibn Wāsīl, 100-2). Like his grandfather al-Nāṣir, al-Mustansir stands out as a great patron of architecture. Indeed, the most significant event of the latter half of his reign was undoubtedly the establishment of the Mustansīrya mādrasa in Baghdad. The building and inaugural
ceremony of this monument are described in some detail in the sources, notably the Hawdith al-jami'a, wrongly attributed to Ibn al-Fuwajih [q.v.]; cf. Rosen- thal's discussion in the centre of the octagon is mentioned by al-Dżazari [q.v.] and which bore the unmistakable royal and cosmological connotations (al-Irbili, Khululat, 287-8 quoting Ibn al-Sā'ī)). In addition to its scholarly functions, the Mustansiriyya was used by the caliph in his role as arbitrator to receive visiting potentates, such as Badr al-Dīn Lu'ī of Mawīl and Nāṣir al-Dīn Dāwūd of Damascus in 633/1235 (Ibn Wāṣīl, v, 100-2) and Nūr al-Dīn Aridānshāh of Shiraz the following year (ibid., 84). It is perhaps not too fanciful to argue that al-Mustansir intended the Mustansiriyya to serve as a symbol of Islamic unity under the auspices of a revitalised 'Abbasid caliphate. Al-Mustansir may well have been attempting to continue and elaborate the grandiose universalist policies of his grandfather al-Nāṣir [q.v.]. In one sense, the decision to house all Sunni madhhabsh under one roof was no abrupt innovation; it was merely a logical extension of al-Nāṣir's decision to establish a library with the best books on fikh, literature and science (Hawdith, 54). At the invitation of al-Mustansir, desirous no doubt to eclipse the fame of al-Nāṣir, Ibn al-Bawwab [q.v.] and his illustrious predecessor Sīhāb al-Dīn 

Although much scholarly attention has been focussed on the Mustansiriyya (cf. Bibliography), there remains much to be said about its function within its own historical context. In particular, it is noteworthy that the Mustansiriyya was the first madrasa to be founded by a caliph. It was also (even more importantly) the first universal Sunni madrasa: the patrons of earlier madrasas had been amirs, high officials such as wazirs, and occasionally sultans. It built upon the already existing practice of founding madrasas designed for more than one madhhab, and took the decisive further step of catering for all four madhhabsh. Moreover, al-Mustansir chose to build a madrasa, not a mosque or a mausoleum, which were traditionally the preferred buildings for a ruler wishing to perpetuate his name. Why choose a madrasa? The key reason may be that by building the Mustansiriyya the caliph established a teaching institution for all Muslims, not just for the people of Baghdād alone. There is other telling evidence which clearly points to wider and more grandiose aims on the part of the caliph. Firstly, certain features of this particular madrasa are unusual or suggestive. One of the crowning glories of the Mustansiriyya was its magnificent Riparian inscription of historical content which specifically names the caliph himself. This gigantic inscription, although following local architectural traditions in certain respects, nevertheless decisively flouted convention by its sheer size and lavish rendering. It appears to have been (at least so far as surviving evidence indicates) the largest and longest cur- sive inscription known in the Islamic world up to that time, and like some vast hoarding it proclaimed its ing glories of the Mustansiriyya was its magnificent

Most of the extant historical sources date from the period after the Mongol capture of Baghdād. overshadowed by this cataclysmic event, they may well have distorted the perspective of al-Mustansir's reign as seen by his contemporaries. The historical evidence of the Mustansiriyya, unaffected as it is by post fact commentary is thus even more important.

It may well be that al-Mustansir intended this building to be an instrument for continuing the policies initiated by al-Nāṣir, and to create under the caliphal banner some kind of unity amongst the Muslims whose territories bordered his own. Such a task was given added urgency by the recent Mongol onslaught on the eastern Islamic world. A political regrouping of the remaining Muslim powers in that area was therefore imperative. Al-Nāṣir had tried to encourage Muslim cooperation through establishing equal status for all four Sunni madhhabsh, through promoting Sūfism and through a pan-Islamic futuwwa [q.v.]. Whilst there is little positive evidence for al-Mustansir's involvement in the futuwwa, it is unlikely that he discontinued this aspect of al-Nāṣir's policies. Djalāl al-Dīn had lacked the acumen or the political stability to effect an eastern Islamic coalition against any future Mongol attacks. It may well be that by the building of the Mustansiriyya al-Mustansir was proclaiming (ironically, far too late in the day) the paramount need for unity in the Islamic world.

Al-Mustansir also erected other buildings. These included the Khamāsah near Wāṣīt (Ibn al-Tiktākā, 567-8) and the Khamāsah of Khārānina between Takrit and al-Balālīk (ibid.; G. Bell, Amurah, 219). Moreover, inscriptions on the Harba bridge over the Dupjayla canal between Baghdad and Samarra testify that it was built by al-Mustansir in 629/1231 (Ibn al-Tiktākā, 567; Janabi, Plates 12 and 13). Al-Mustansir

Secondly, the Mustansiriyya also boasted a highly sophisticated and lavishly adorned zodiacal clepsydra which were donated to those described by al-Dżazari [q.v.] and which bore the unmistakable royal and cosmological connotations (al-Irbili, Khululat, 287-8 quotation). In addition to its scholarly functions, the Mustansiriyya was used by the caliph in his role as arbitrator to receive visiting potentates, such as Badr al-Dīn Lu'ī of Mawīl and Nāṣir al-Dīn Dāwūd of Damascus in 633/1235 (Ibn Wāṣīl, v, 100-2) and Nūr al-Dīn Aridānshāh of Shiraz the following year (ibid., 84). It is perhaps not too fanciful to argue that al-Mustansir intended the Mustansiriyya to serve as a symbol of Islamic unity under the auspices of a revitalised 'Abbasid caliphate. Al-Mustansir may well have been attempting to continue and elaborate the grandiose universalist policies of his grandfather al-Nāṣir [q.v.]. In one sense, the decision to house all Sunni madhhabsh under one roof was no abrupt innovation; it was merely a logical extension of al-Nāṣir's decision to establish a library with the best books on fikh, literature and science (Hawdith, 54). At the invitation of al-Mustansir, desirous no doubt to eclipse the fame of al-Nāṣir, Ibn al-Bawwab [q.v.] and his illustrious predecessor Sīhāb al-Dīn 

Although much scholarly attention has been focussed on the Mustansiriyya (cf. Bibliography), there remains much to be said about its function within its own historical context. In particular, it is noteworthy that the Mustansiriyya was the first madrasa to be founded by a caliph. It was also (even more importantly) the first universal Sunni madrasa: the patrons of earlier madrasas had been amirs, high officials such as wazirs, and occasionally sultans. It built upon the already existing practice of founding madrasas designed for more than one madhhab, and took the decisive further step of catering for all four madhhabsh. Moreover, al-Mustansir chose to build a madrasa, not a mosque or a mausoleum, which were traditionally the preferred buildings for a ruler wishing to perpetuate his name. Why choose a madrasa? The key reason may be that by building the Mustansiriyya the caliph established a teaching institution for all Muslims, not just for the people of Baghdād alone. There is other telling evidence which clearly points to wider and more grandiose aims on the part of the caliph. Firstly, certain features of this particular madrasa are unusual or suggestive. One of the crowning glories of the Mustansiriyya was its magnificent Riparian inscription of historical content which specifically names the caliph himself. This gigantic inscription, although following local architectural traditions in certain respects, nevertheless decisively flouted convention by its sheer size and lavish rendering. It appears to have been (at least so far as surviving evidence indicates) the largest and longest cur- sive inscription known in the Islamic world up to that time, and like some vast hoarding it proclaimed its ing glories of the Mustansiriyya was its magnificent

Most of the extant historical sources date from the period after the Mongol capture of Baghdād. overshadowed by this cataclysmic event, they may well have distorted the perspective of al-Mustansir's reign as seen by his contemporaries. The historical evidence of the Mustansiriyya, unaffected as it is by post fact commentary is thus even more important.

It may well be that al-Mustansir intended this building to be an instrument for continuing the policies initiated by al-Nāṣir, and to create under the caliphal banner some kind of unity amongst the Muslims whose territories bordered his own. Such a task was given added urgency by the recent Mongol onslaught on the eastern Islamic world. A political regrouping of the remaining Muslim powers in that area was therefore imperative. Al-Nāṣir had tried to encourage Muslim cooperation through establishing equal status for all four Sunni madhhabsh, through promoting Sūfism and through a pan-Islamic futuwwa [q.v.]. Whilst there is little positive evidence for al-Mustansir's involvement in the futuwwa, it is unlikely that he discontinued this aspect of al-Nāṣir's policies. Djalāl al-Dīn had lacked the acumen or the political stability to effect an eastern Islamic coalition against any future Mongol attacks. It may well be that by the building of the Mustansiriyya al-Mustansir was proclaiming (ironically, far too late in the day) the paramount need for unity in the Islamic world.

Al-Mustansir also erected other buildings. These included the Khamāsah near Wāṣīt (Ibn al-Tiktākā, 567-8) and the Khamāsah of Khārānina between Takrit and al-Balālīk (ibid.; G. Bell, Amurah, 219). Moreover, inscriptions on the Harba bridge over the Dupjayla canal between Baghdad and Samarra testify that it was built by al-Mustansir in 629/1231 (Ibn al-Tiktākā, 567; Janabi, Plates 12 and 13). Al-Mustansir
also restored the Ḍājmī al-Ḳaṣr in Baghdād which had been founded by al-Muḳtafi [q.v.] and he placed in it benches on which students could sit and hold discussions after prayers had been performed (Ibn Wāsīl, 317).

Al-Mustansir is accorded the usual high-flown panegyrics in the sources. More specifically, he is described as pale-skinned, red-haired, corpulent and short (Ibn Ṭabḥirībīdī, vii, 345). As already mentioned, he was a great bibliophile. He is reported to have been copious in alms-giving, especially when plague hit Baghdād in the last year of his reign. He died on 10 Dūmādād II 640/12 December 1242 and was buried in the Rūṣāfīa cemetery.


**AL-MUSTANSIR** (II) biˈllah, Abu ‘1-Kasim Aḥmad b. al-Ẓāhir Muḥammad, the first ʿAbbāsīd of the ʿAbbāsīd caliphate. Upon death of the ʿAbbāsīds, Ṣafārī al-Dīn b. Luʾmān, the head of the sultan’s chancery, read the diploma (which he himself had composed in the caliph’s name) conferring the universal sultanate with plenary powers on Baybars. The provisions of the diploma, which purported to lay down Baybars’s duties as sultan, were in fact his political manifesto. Al-Mustansir was rewarded with the establishment of a military and civil household. On 6 Shwawādāl 3 September, the caliph accompanied Baybars to Damascus, where the two joined in public prayer at the Umayyad mosque on 10 Dūh ʿ1-Kaḍāʾs October. From Damascus, al-Mustansir and the sons of Badr al-Dīn Luʾluʾ, the late ruler of Mawsil (631-7/1233-59) [see Luʾluʾ] were sent on separate expeditions to Ṣirāk, to regain their ancestral dominions from the Mongols. Setting out on 23 Dūh ʿ1-Kaḍāʾs 19 October, al-Mustansir proceeded to ʿAna, where he encountered a kinsman and rival, a descendant in the fourth generation of the caliph al-Mustaḥfiḥ (512-29/1118-35 [q. v.]), who had been proclaimed as the caliph al-Hākim by ʿAbū ʿl-Battīrī, the Mamluk war-lord of Aleppo and at this time Baybars’s most dangerous opponent. The two caliphal pretenders, however, joined forces and advanced down the Euphrates to Ḥirīt. The Mongol authorities in Baghdād sent out troops to halt the invaders at al-Djarjarādīn, place opposite al-Anbār. The Muslims were at first successful, but then fell into a Mongol ambush. Al-Mustansir was almost certainly killed in the fighting (3 Muḥarrām 660/28 November 1261), while al-Hākim escaped and made his way to Cairo, where he was installed as caliph on 2 Muḥarrām 661/16 November 1262. His descendants continued the titular caliphate until it lapsed after the Ottoman conquest of Egypt in 922/1517.

Mustansir's reign, his mother, who was a Sudani slave, and her former master, the Jewish merchant Abu Sa'd al-Tustari. When Abu Sa'd was assassinated in 439/1047 after an outbreak of civil war, his place as the queen-mother's agent was taken by his brother Abu Naṣr Hārūn (see however the documents published by Mann [Bibl.]) and the kāfiʿ Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan al-Ŷazıʿūrī, who eventually accepted also the vizierate (7 Muḥarram 442/1 June 1050) and held it for eight years [see AL-Ŷ-zAẒŪRĪ]. Meanwhile, there was considerable unrest and perhaps also economic unrest in the country. If a statement in al-Makrīzī, i, 82 [92], ed. Wiet, ii, 4 [67], is to be believed, the kharāj of the Egyptian provinces amounted only to one million dinārīs in the time of al-Ŷazăūrī, but this may have been exceptional, though it is plain from other sources that the government had already been forced to the familiar expedient of confiscations and indemnities. The Delta was disturbed by Arab risings, the most serious of which, that of the Banū Kurra, was put down only with great difficulty by Naṣr al-Dawla (see below) with the Tayyī and other Arab troops at Kūm Šarīk in 443/1051 (see Ibn al-Šayrān, 42-3; Ibn al-Ăthlīr, ix, 396-7, and for the date Ibn al-Kalānī, 85). At the capital there was an increasing state of tension between the Turkish and Berber troops and the enormous bodies of Sudāni slaves raised by the caliph, mother (see Makrīzī, i, 94 [ed. Wiet, ii, 45] and 335; detailed but probably unreliable figures also in Naṣr-i Kuršaw, ed. Kaviani, 66, tr. Thackston, 48-9). In striking contrast to this is the magnificence of the court and prosperity of Miṣr-Fustat as described by Naṣr-i Kuršaw [q.v.]. There can be little doubt that the source of much of this prosperity, apart from the manufacture and supply of luxuries to the court, is already to be sought in the commercial relations between Egypt and the Indian Ocean on the one hand (cf. Naṣr-i Kuršaw's account of 'Āyyūhān) and Constantinople on the other. The general insecurity deepened after the execution of al-Ŷazăūrī, who was the last waṣīṣ to attempt to control the situation. He was followed by a rapid succession of wazirs as Imam. The next, and the last to attempt to control affairs, was the son of Abu Sa'd al-Dawla Ibn Hamdān, a descendant of the Hamdānids of Mawṣīl, defeated and drove the Sudānis into the Saʿrf through a standstill (although the Nile floods seem to have been uniformly good). The result was a famine which lasted from 459 to 464 (1067-72) and became progressively more severe. During these years the country was a prey to the utmost misery; the royal palace and cities were looted, and Fustāf was again plundered and even burned by Naṣr al-Dawla. Large numbers of the population, including even the caliph's own family, sought refuge in Syria and Trak (for the depopulation and shrinkage of Fustāf, cf. al-Makrīzī, i, 5, ed. Wiet, i, 12; on the fate of the royal library see also Olga Pinto, Le biblioteche degli Arabi, Rome 1928, 25-6). The Sunni historians dwell on this famine with some complacency, regarding it as the retribution for the impious attack of al-Basāsīrī [q.v.] on the ʿAbbāsid caliphate (see below), and circumstantial stories are related of the extreme destitution to which al-Mustansir himself was reduced. That these must be accepted with some reserve is clear from such passages as Ibn Ṭabīrī, ii/2, 186, 18-19.

At length in 465/1073, al-Mustansir, taking courage of despair, secretly invited the governor of ʿAkkā, the Armenian general Badr al-Dawla (q.v.) to assume supreme control in Egypt. Badr accepted the commission, on condition of bringing his own troops with him, and sailing from ʿAkkā in the winter, reached Cairo on 28 Dīnāmād 465/29 Jan. 1074. His rapid and energetic movements took the Turks by surprise, and he put to death the whole body of their leaders, together with a large number of Egyptian notables and officials. For his further military and administrative measures, by which he restored order and relative prosperity in Egypt (the total revenue of Egypt and its remaining Syrian possessions, which in 466/1073-4 had amounted to 2,800,000 dinārīs, rose by 483/1090 to 3,100,000 dinārīs: al-Makrīzī, i, 100; ed. Wiet, ii, 68; cf. Abū Sallīh, fols. 7b-9a). The alliance between general and caliph was cemented by the marriage of Badr's daughter with Naṣr al-Dawla's youngest son Ahmad, the future caliph al-Mustāfī [q.v.]. The ʿAbbāsid caliphate was saved but, like its ʿAbbāsid rivals, at the cost of abandoning its temporal authority to a series of military commanders, entitled umarāʾ al-ḥaṣarīn, from whose control it never afterwards succeeded in emancipating itself.

Al-Mustansir is described in contemporary sources as upright and amiable in character, and just and equitable in his dealings, but as a ruler his personality is entirely obscured by the successive waṣīṣ and generals who kept him virtually a prisoner. The statements of the later anti-ʿĀṣidī writers must, of course, be entirely discounted; the ʿĀṣidī sources, on the other hand, praise his sagacity and infallibility (ʿīma) as Imam. External relations. The empire to which al-Mustansir succeeded was beyond any doubt the most powerful Muslim state of its time. It extended from ʾIrīkiyya and Sicily to Mecca and central Syria, and maintained an active propagandist organisation in ʾTrak, Persia and Khurāsān (see the following section). Within a few years of his accession, its territories were still further expanded by Anāštāqīn's conquest of Aleppo in ʾṢaḥbān 429/May 1038 [see ʿĀSIMĀD and HABUSA] and extension of his authority even across the Euphrates, on the one hand, and on the other by the conquests of ʿAlī al-Šulayḥi in the
Yaman, after establishing himself at Masār in the same year (see SULAYHIDS and also H.F. AL-HAMDANI, in Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society [1931, 59], 192f., and in RAS[1932], 126 f.). After the deaths of Anūḥišṭāḏ and the wasṭār al-Djāḏarāṯī, who in spite of their rivalry zealously maintained the interests of the dynasty, the power and prestige of the Egyptian court steadily declined. The Arab tribes in Syria, though defeated in the field, remained unsubdued, and the caliph had to be content with the little more than nominal allegiance of the Mīrūḏīs [q.v.] at Aleppo. At Damās, the rivalries between the Berber and Turkish troops and the hostility of the citizens reduced the governors to impotence. The disturbed state of Syria was so disastrous that it made it impossible for the Fāṭimid government to give effective support to the amīr al-Bāṣāḏīrī (see the list of war material and subventions sent from Egypt, Ibn Taghribardī, 177) in his attempt to oppose the advancing Sallţjūk power, with the result that his occupation of Badghīd and proclamation of al-Mustansīr in 450/1059 was speedily brought to an end. The subsequent military and economic disorders in Egypt allowed a free hand to the Turkmen (Ghuzz) bands, who had appeared in northern Syria as early as 447/1055, though it was not until 463/1071 that the first Sallţjūk armies entered northern Syria and the Ghuzz bands under Atīzī [q.v.] occupied Palestine and began to harass Damās. In many of the other towns and districts of Syria, the authority was seized by local chiefs, such as the kāḏīs Ibn ʿAmmār (see ʿAmmār, Banū, and also G. Wiet, in Mém. Henri Basset, 279 f.) at al-Tārābūsul and Ibn Abī Akīl at Tyre, though both of these acknowledged the spiritual authority of the Fāṭimid caliph (cf. also the account of the foundation of the castle of Sākhdh by Ḥasan b. Mīmār al-Kalbī in 466/1073-4, quoted from Sībt b. al-Djāḏarī in Ibn Taghribardī, 253). The menace of the Sallţjūks became more substantial after the arrival of Totūkhī [q.v.] in 470/1077-8, but the latter never actually organised a full campaign against the Fāṭimid. On the contrary, the offensive was taken by Bhāḍrī, who succeeded in restoring Egyptian control on the coast as far as Sīriver, Sidūn and Dhībāyīl in 482/1090, not in recovering the interior of Palestine and Damās (lost in 468/1075-6), in spite of a certain revulsion of feeling in Syria in favour of the Fāṭimid. It is difficult to know how much weight to lay on the story (Ibn Taghribardī, 272-3) that Totūkhī at one time proposed to ally himself in marriage with Bhāḍrī.

The success of the Sallţjūks also affected the position of the Fāṭimid in Arabia. In 462/1069 the ʿAbbasīd caliph was acknowledged in the Holy Cities, and after a brief return to the Fāṭimid obedience between 467 and 473/1074-81, the Ḥijdāţ passed definitely to the ʿAbbasīd cause. In the Yaman, the Sulayhīdīs in the interior and the Zurarīyīdīs in the important commercial centre of ʿAḏen maintained the suzerainty of the Fāṭimid, the latter until the Ayyūbid conquest by Turānghalī in 507/1113 [see ʿALĀʾ AL-DĪN].

Meanwhile, the Fāṭimid empire had been similarly shorn of its possessions in the West. About 435/1043-4 al-Muʿizzī b. Bāḏīs [q.v.], the Żirīd lieutenant of the Fāṭimid caliph in Kayrawān, began a series of repressive measures against the Shīʿīs of Ifriqiya; in 440/1048-9 he seems to have made the first overt gesture of independence, and in 441/1049-50 the rivalry of the Shīʿīs and the Żirīdīs culminated in 443/1051 that he formally renounced the Fāṭimid suzerainty and obtained an investiture from the ʿAbbasīd caliph. According to the traditional account (already fully developed in Ibn al-Šaʿrāfī, the wasṭār al-Yazzūrī in his account launched against him the nomad bands of the Banū Ḥillīl [q.v.]), the tribes mentioned by the Egyptian sources are Zughba, Ṣiyāḥ, al-Ṯahbāḏi and ʿAdi, who had been a cause of much trouble to the government in the Ṣaʿīd and were now given a free hand to plunder the territories of the Zirīdīs [q.v.]. As Wüstenfeld has already indicated, Geschen..., 234 n., the story as it stands is open to serious objections, and there can be little doubt that it has been amplified and popularised.

The westward movement of the Hilalīs began as early as 440/1048-9, and there is no reason to reject the account of Ibn ʿĪḏāḥī that it was the Muʿizzī himself who invited the Arab tribes, then in Barka, to enter Ifriqiya as his qaḏim (since he was not on good terms with the Ṣanḥāba), and that they, having set out in response to his invitation, began to plunder on their own account and already before the close of 443/1051-2 had inflicted a severe defeat on his troops. The two traditions are not, however, mutually exclusive and may be reconciled by supposing that the Banū Ḥillīl were transported in the first instance to Barka (the governor of which had thrown in his lot with al-Muʿizzī), and that their advance into Ifriqiya was facilitated, for opposite reasons, by both al-Muʿizzī and the wasṭārī (cf. also Ibn al-ʿAthīr, ix, 357-8). During the first years of his reign, the son and successor of al-Muʿizzī, Tamīm, (453/1061-1107), temporarily returned to the Fāṭimid allegiance (see H.R. Idris, Sur le retour des Zirides à l’obédience fāṭimide, in AIEO Alger, XI [1953], 25-39), but with the conquest of Sicily by the Normans in 463/1070, Barka became the western limit of the Fāṭimid state.

The diplomatic relations of al-Mustansīr with non-Muslim states covered a wide field. In 428/1036 the existing treaty with the Byzantine Emperor was renewed and relatively cordial relations established. If Nāšīr ʿIṣḥāq, ed. Kaviani, 6, tr. Thackston, 49, is to be trusted, the Egyptian government was in communication in 439/1047 also with the Georgians, the Daylamīs, the Khāḵān of Turkistan and even the rāḏaḵ of Dīhilī, all of whom shared with Egypt a common hostility to the Sallţjūks and the Ghaznavīds. The friendly relations with the Christian Byzantines were broken off in 446/1054, when the Empress Theodora demanded an offensive alliance against the Sallţjūks. Egyptian troops were despatched on an unsuccessful expedition against al-Lāḏīḵīyī, the Empress retaliated by opening negotiations with the Sallţjūks, and al-Mustansīr seized the treasures of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre (al-Kumdam). This breach with Constantinople had important consequences for the future of Egypt, since to it may perhaps be ascribed the opening up of direct commercial relations with the Italian trading cities, though documentary evidence on the point is lacking (see Heyd, Histoire du Commerce du Levant, i, 105, 124).

Religious conditions. The wide expansion of the Fāṭimid power under al-Mustansīr is reflected also in the religious situation. Propaganda on behalf of the Fāṭimid power under al-Mustansīr is reflected also in the religious situation. Propaganda on behalf of the Fāṭimid government was in communication in 439/1047 also with the Georgians, the Daylamīs, the Khāḵān of Turkistan and even the rāḏaḵ of Dīhilī, all of whom shared with Egypt a common hostility to the Sallţjūks and the Ghaznavīds. The friendly relations with the Christian Byzantines were broken off in 446/1054, when the Empress Theodora demanded an offensive alliance against the Sallţjūks. Egyptian troops were despatched on an unsuccessful expedition against al-Lāḏīḵīyī, the Empress retaliated by opening negotiations with the Sallţjūks, and al-Mustansīr seized the treasures of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre (al-Kumdam). This breach with Constantinople had important consequences for the future of Egypt, since to it may perhaps be ascribed the opening up of direct commercial relations with the Italian trading cities, though documentary evidence on the point is lacking (see Heyd, Histoire du Commerce du Levant, i, 105, 124).

Religious conditions. The wide expansion of the Fāṭimid power under al-Mustansīr is reflected also in the religious situation. Propaganda on behalf of the Fāṭimid government was in communication in 439/1047 also with the Georgians, the Daylamīs, the Khāḵān of Turkistan and even the rāḏaḵ of Dīhilī, all of whom shared with Egypt a common hostility to the Sallţjūks and the Ghaznavīds. The friendly relations with the Christian Byzantines were broken off in 446/1054, when the Empress Theodora demanded an offensive alliance against the Sallţjūks. Egyptian troops were despatched on an unsuccessful expedition against al-Lāḏīḵīyī, the Empress retaliated by opening negotiations with the Sallţjūks, and al-Mustansīr seized the treasures of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre (al-Kumdam). This breach with Constantinople had important consequences for the future of Egypt, since to it may perhaps be ascribed the opening up of direct commercial relations with the Italian trading cities, though documentary evidence on the point is lacking (see Heyd, Histoire du Commerce du Levant, i, 105, 124).
Allāh b. Mūsā al-Mu’āyyad fi Dīn Allāh [see AL-MU’AYYAD], doubtless the most prominent personality of his time in the ʿĪṣāʾī ʾda‘wā, He endeavoured to win over the court and the Daylāmī troops to the Fāṭimid cause, but was forced to leave his post in 439/1047-8 as the result of pro-Abbasid intrigues. In the first part of his autobiography (see Bīḥ.), al-Mu’āyyad gives a detailed account of his activity, and in particular publishes his correspondence with an unnamed Sunnī from Khurāsān, in which he explains the religious and political principles of his mission. How much the power of the Fāṭimidīs and the success of their emissaries in ʿĪrāk and Persia was feared at the time of their emissaries in Persia


(Ḥ.A.R. GIBB and P. KRAUS)

AL-MUSTANŠIRIYYA [see MADRASA. I. IV, at Vol. V, 1127a, and III, at Vol. V, 1148, and al-MUSTANŠIR (i) bi ʾĪLĀH].

MUSTA’RĪB [see MOZARAB].

MUSTA’IL B. ABDALLĀH (a.), "arabiscus", the name of one of the groups into which the Arab genealogists divide the population of Arabia. The first is the ʿarab ʾāriba, the original Arabs of pure stock; they numbered nine (some say seven) tribes which are regarded as the descendants of Irama and Lūd b. Sām b. Nūḥ and the first settlers in Arabia: ʿAd, Ṭāmuḥ, Unayyim, ʿAbīl, ʿAsṣām, Qādīs, ʿImīlī, Ḥurūm and Wābab. These are extinct except for a few remnants incorporated in other tribes. The second group comprises the mutaʾarriba [q.v.] who are not pure-blooded Arabs. They are regarded as descendants of Kābṭān (the Yūkān of the list of nations in Gen. x. 25 ff.) and live in southern Arabia. The third group is called mustaʿriba; this name is also applied to tribes who were not originally Arabs; they trace their descent from Maʿṣīd b. Ḥadān, a descendant of Ismāʾīl [q.v.]. All the north Arabian tribes are included among the mustaʿriba, so that the Kurāysh, to which Muhammad belonged, are one of them; his genealogy is in this way traced back to Abraham and he thus thought he could prove his connection with the Biblical prophets. The old term mustaʿriba, for tribes not originally of Arab descent, obtained a new meaning after the conquest of Spain. It was applied to the Christian Spaniards who retained their religion under Islam; the word mustaʿriba was corrupted to Mozarab [q.v.].

Bibliography: Caetani, Annali dell’ ʿIslām, i, 43; idem, Stati di storia orientale, i, 306 ff.; Caussin de Perceval, Essai sur l’histoire des Arabes, i, 6 ff.; C. Ritter, Arabien, 57; Tabari (Leiden) i, 213-16; Caskel, Gamharat an-nasab, i, 40-41; Su’yūṭī, Muzhir, 1st nāw, 7a; F, i, 371, f Lane, Lexicon, s.v.

MUSTAŞHĀR (A.), counsellor, used in Ottoman Turkish as muṣṭaḥār, meaning "general secretary to a ministry" or "under-secretary of state". The word, which means literally "one who is
consulted", comes from the same root as mushdr [q.v.], which properly means "he who gives advice". Şâmi Bey regards the word musteshdr as a synonym of the old Turkish inal. The office was called musteshdr or more simply musteşgarlıık.

Like the title mügêrî, that of musteşgar was created by Mahmûd II. There were at first two müstesghân in the grand-vizierate, one for foreign and the other for home affairs. The latter was later replaced by a Minister of the Interior who had in his turn a müstesghân. The number of müstesghân gradually increased, but some less important departments had musülânes "assistants, deputies" (in 1296/1897 for example there were musülâns in the finance and police departments). The office was retained under the Turkish Republic and each ministry or wekâlet has its müstesghân, that of national defence has three (for army, navy and air force).

The chief kadî of Istanbul used to have a müstesghân. According to Lutfû Efendi, the post of müstesghân of the Navy was created in 1253/1837 (Ta‘rîh, v, 91) and that of müstesghân of the padreyn or of the two kadî’s saskar [q.v.] in 1262/1846 (viii, 127). On the honorary grades of müstesghân, cf. idem, vi, 66; cf. also 103, line 8 from below.

Müsîdeşdr is also the name given to the "counselors", of Turkish or foreign embassies or legations. The title of müstesghân aawal bore by the ambassador himself, sent by the Sultan of Morocco to Istanbul in 1197/1783 is inexplicable to us (cf. Diewdet Paşa, Ta‘rîh, Istanbul 1309, ii, 251; cf. Recueil de Mémoires Orientaux de l’École des Langues Orien-tales à Paris, 1905, 6).

As to the term mügêrî, a synonym of the predecessors from the same root, it is applied to technical advisers, whether foreigners or not, e.g. hukûk mügêrî "legal adviser".

Bibliography: See the various Ottoman calendars. The historians Ahmed Diewdet and Lutfû, following their predecessors, give few details of the administrative organisation.

(J. DENY) AL-MUSTARSHID, ABU MAHMUD AL-FAHÄRDJED. Abu Mahfûz caliph (reigned 512-29/1118-35), was probably born in 486/1093-4 (though some sources suggest a date as early as 484), the son of al-Mustarshid [q.v.] and a slave girl called Lubaba. Al-Mustarshid remorselessly pursued him, already been handed over to Zangl, who released him (Ibn al-KalanisI, 230; Ibn al-Dbayy, c. 227-8; Ibn al-Athîr, x, 423-4; Ibn al-Djawzî, ix, 235, 242-3). The caliph also humiliated Dubays by writing to his father-in-law, the Artûkîd Bognor, ordering him to annul Dubays' marriage with Il Gâzî’s daughter (Ibn al-Dbayy, c. 226). Even after Dubays had fled from ‘Irâk and fallen into the hands of Bûrû, the ruler of Damascus, al-Mustarshid remorselessly pursued him, sending the caliphal kadîb il-înâ (Ibn al-Dbayy, c. 470-1; Sîbî b. al-Djawzî, 135-6). The growing assertiveness of al-Mustarshid clearly alarmed Mahmûd’s shûbna, Yûrûn-Qish, who clashed openly with the caliph in 519/1125-6. Yûrûn-Qish visited the sultan and warned him that the caliph was no longer docile and that he would not tolerate the sultan’s interference in Baghdad (Ibn al-Djawzî, ix, 255-6). Sultan Mahmûd advanced rapidly, ignoring the excuses fabricated by al-Mustarshid to delay his arrival. After skirmishes between the troops of caliph and sultan, al-Mustarshid sued for peace. Before leaving Baghdad on 10 Rabî‘ I 520/5 May 1126, Mahmûd took the precaution of appointing a new shûbna, Zangî, to keep a close eye on the caliph (Ibn al-Dbayy, c. 447-50; Atdbe, 29-31; al-Husaynî, 57; Ibn al-Azrâk, 51).

In the complicated power struggle which followed sultan Mahmûd’s death in Shawwâl 525/August-Sep-tember 1131 and the short reign of his brother, sultan Toghîrl, Sandjâr’s appointee (526/1132-529/1134), al-Mustarshid behaved in a quietly subversive way and played off the various factions against each other, no doubt in an attempt to increase his own power. Several earlier caliphs had practised such brinkman-ship. But in the case of al-Mustarshid, an inflated sense of his own importance coupled with his awareness of Saldjuk division at this critical point made a dangerous combination, and his own rash (perhaps even bellicose) personality tipped him over the brink and precipitated an adventure that was to be fatal to him. When Sandjâr attempted to instal Toghîrl as sultan, al-Mustarshid urged Toghîrl’s brother, sultan Sandjâr, to keep a close eye on the caliph. Sandjâr responded by launching Zangî and Dubays into an attack on Baghdad (Ibn al-Dbayy, c. 476-7; Atdbe, 44). The caliph defeated them on 27 Radjab 526/13 June 1132. It is interesting to note that Usâma [see
Munisih, Banu in an unnamed book of his mentions that he was present at this battle and that he saw for himself "the caliph's black satin tent in which he sat upon a throne" (Ibn al-Wasi', 50, and Ibn al-Furat, 94). It could be argued that thus far al-Mustarshid had only been defending himself against attack. It was his next step which took the matter a crucial degree further. After the battle, al-Mustarshid once more opposed Sandjar by proclaiming Mas'ud's name in the Ashura at Baghdad in Muharram 527/November-December 1132 (Bundari, 175; al-Husayni, 102; Ibn al-Djawi, x, 249; Ibn al-Djawi, x). Later that year, the caliph again left Baghdad to launch a retaliatory attack against Zangi in Mawzil. After a three months' siege, al-Mustarshid was forced to return home, out-manoeuvred by Zangi, for whilst the latter's deputy, Na'ij al-Din Djakar, strengthened the city's fortifications, Zangi had left Mawzil and cut off the caliph's food supplies (Bar Hebraeus, 127; Ibn Khallikan, i, 330; Ibn al-Azarak, 64; Ibn al-Athir, Atabegs, 47-8). At this point, one would have expected al-Mustarshid to have learned his lesson. Manifestly he had not.

It is difficult to disentangle the circumstances surrounding al-Mustarshid's decision to set out to fight Mas'ud in western Persia: the received version of events is as follows. Mas'ud had sought al-Muktab's help in 528/1133-4 against Toghril, but they had quarrelled. Mas'ud had then rushed to Hamadhân on the news of Toghril's death in Muharram 529/October-November 1134. Mas'ud subsequently quarrelled with some of his amirs, who had arrived in Baghdad and incited the caliph to go out against Mas'ud (Ibn al-Athir, Atabegs, 48-9; Ibn al-Djawi, x, 36-41). Al-Mustarshid, with heavy baggage train and official entourage, left Baghdad in Shaban 529/17 May-18 June 1135 and joined battle against Mas'ud at Day Marg outside Hamadhân (for a discussion of Day Marg, cf. Schwarz, Iran, 497-8, 926). The caliph's army was defeated, after the Turkish amirs rejoined Mas'ud's side, and al-Mustarshid and all his officials were taken prisoner. His goods were seized (according to Ibn al-Tiktaka, op. cit., 521, 170 miles were needed to carry away the contents of the caliph's camp) and his officials were imprisoned in the castle of Sar-i Djakar near Kâzvin and Rayy. As for the caliph, he was obliged to move around Adharbaydjan with Mas'ud. When the sultan made camp outside Maraghâ, the caliph was murdered in his tent in Dhul-I-Ka'da 529/August 1135, allegedly by Assassins. The body of al-Mustarshid was wrapped in green silk and was often in dire need of funds to pay the troops (in 528/1133-4 al-Mustarshid's men surrounded the citadel of the khutba. Birzûz al-Khadîm, until he disbursed funds to pay the caliph's army (Ibn al-Djawi, x, 35). Al-Mustarshid also appeared on the battlefield on several occasions. Thus he arrogated to himself the traditional prerogatives of the Saldjuk sultan and his deputies and revealed himself unwilling to accept the usual, albeit uneasy, accommodation between the military and the civil authorities.

What of the attitude of the Saldjuk towards al-Mustarshid? According to Ibn al-Anbarî, the caliph's kêtib al-inshâ, who was released from prison and brought to sultan Mas'ud at Maraghâ, Mas'ud told him categorically that he could no longer endure a caliph like al-Mustarshid. He preferred someone on the throne who would meddle in nothing but religious matters and who would not "raise an army, take up arms or assemble men" (Ibn al-Azarak, 73). Al-Mustarshid was clearly perceived as a growing threat to the Saldjûks; he was an opponent difficult to mollify. Even though he had descended into the military arena and had tarnished the caliphal aura, sultan Mas'ud still baulked at the idea of killing the caliph in battle. Instead, the conventional device of private assassination was chosen. Al-Mustarshid was afraid to return alone to Baghdad fearing to be killed en route and Mas'ud refused to accompany him (Bar Hebraeus, 260). Thus it came about that he was murdered in Mas'ud's camp itself. Most of the sources gloss over this deed; the strongest condemnation of the caliph's murder is given by Ibn al-Kalânî who, expanding on the more muted criticism of al-Bundârî, finds the killing repugnant (op. cit., 249).

How then should al-Mustarshid's unconventional reign be assessed? He certainly made a fateful error in leaving his power base, Baghdad, and its environs. Nor was he likely to achieve frequent military successes against such hardened warriors as the Saldjûks or Zangi. Apart from the fiasco which occurred during the short reign of his son al-Râshîd, the military option was not repeated by subsequent caliphs. Nevertheless, al-Mustarshid had gone a considerable way towards removing the Saldjûk presence from 'Irâk and towards the creation of a small caliphal state in that area. This proved a valuable basis upon which al-Mu'tasîf and above all al-Nâsr [q. v.] could later build.

Not surprisingly, al-Mustarshid's preoccupation with military matters left him with little time to devote to the activities usually associated with his office. There is no trace in the mediaeval sources of a lavish train to its burial-place in Maraghâ. Ibn al-Tiktaka mentions that he saw the caliph's tomb when he visited the town in 697/1297-8 (op. cit., 522).

The traditional version of al-Mustarshid's final battle and murder needs some revision. Most of the sources attribute the blame for the caliph's killing to Sandjar or Mas'ud or both. Was the caliph the victim of a trap set by Mas'ud? Did Mas'ud send the amirs to Baghdad to lure the caliph (and more especially, his lavish train) to Adharbaydjan? This is certainly a strong possibility. All this casts doubt on the story that it was the Assassins who killed him. However, al-Mustarshid had gone a considerable way towards removing the Saldjûk presence from 'Irâk and towards the creation of a small caliphal state in that area. This proved a valuable basis upon which al-Mu'tasîf and above all al-Nâsr [q. v.] could later build.

Not surprisingly, al-Mustarshid's preoccupation with military matters left him with little time to devote to the activities usually associated with his office. There is no trace in the mediaeval sources of a lavish train. Al-Mustarshid's building programme was modest: he is recorded as rebuilding the wall delivered by the caliph at Kirmânshâh, strongly denouncing the Saldijs (tr. E.G. Browne, 37-8).

The reign of al-Mustarshid represents a critical phase in the relations between the Saldjûks and the caliphate. He was a man of great boldness who, expanding on the more muted criticism of al-Bundârî, finds the killing repugnant (op. cit., 249).
around Baghdad in Safar 517-April 1123 (Ibn al-
Athir, x, 435; Ibn al-Djawi, ix, 243), building the
octagonal palace (al-mu‘jammana) for his wife, Safa-
djâd dil. He arrived in Baghdad for the wed-
ding in Radjab 518/August-September 1124 (Sîbî b.
al-Djawi, 113), and he added the great hall (the bâb al-
ba‘dara) to the Tâdû palace (cf. Le Strange, Baghdad,
259-60).

A number of prominent officials served al-Mustar-
shîd. These included the wa‘zîr Djalîl al-Dîn Hasun b.
‘All b. Sadaca (d. 522/1128) whom, under pressure
from the sultan’s wa‘zîr, Uglmân b. Nizâm al-
Mulk, the caliph was obliged to remove temporarily in
favour of Ahmad b. Nizâm al-
Mulk. In the later years of his caliphate, Abu l-
Kâsim al-Kutubî, ii, 248; Ibn al-Djawi, ix, 197) Ibn al-
Athîr claimed that he had seen al-Mustarshid’s hand-
writing, one of the finest examples of râ‘a’ (xi, 17).
Al-
Mujâhid al-Sufi, who, like many other professionals
belonging to the Shafi‘i madhab (al-Suyûtî, 454)
was an accomplished poet (‘Imâm al-Dîn al-
Isfahânî, i, 30; Ibn Wâsîl, 51; al-
Kutubî, ii, 249). To him are
attributed the grandiose words: “My horses will re-
ach the land of Rûm and the gleam of my blade will
extend to the limits of China”.
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MUSTASHRIKUN (A.), orientalists, those who
study the Orient.

A. Terminology

Mustasrik (not yet mentioned in Lane) is the active
participle of the Xth form of the root g-r-t and means
either “people studying/seeking for the East/Orient”
or “people knowing about (i.e., Easterners/Orientals).
The word mustasrikân consequently conveys a
broader scope of meaning than the present-day
Western term “Orientalists”, i.e. “scholars specialised
in Oriental studies” does. The term “orientalist” first occurs in English around 1779, in
French in 1799; “orientalism” had then the broad
meaning of “being oriented towards an oriental culture”.

In 19th and early 20th century usage, the term
“orientalist” had both a general cultural and a
scholarly meaning. Cultural orientalists were those,
including painters and writers, who were inspired by
the Orient. Scholarly orientalists were specialists in
oriental languages and cultures, as distinct from
“classical orientalists” who studied the classical
languages and literatures in past and present as well
as other cultural monuments in the fields of art and
archaeology. During the 19th and early 20th century,
the concept “orient” widened in scope to comprise the
whole of Asia, retaining the sense of largely unknown cultures challenging Western man to discover them. Up to the Second World War, Orientalism in its broader sense indicated a particular cultural orientation in Europe and North America, and in its narrower sense it meant empirical Oriental studies.

The first International Congress of Orientalists was held in Paris in 1873, and in 1951 an International Union of Orientalists was founded. Since the Congress in Moscow in 1960 the term has been challenged for various reasons, and after the Congress in Paris 1973 the name of the congresses has been changed.

Asian cultures are of course only “East” when seen
as such an orientalist was more than a pure technician of languages, he was a humanist supposed to possess a real profound knowledge of one or more oriental cultures and devote himself to the study of Oriental languages and literatures in past and present as well as other cultural monuments in the fields of art and archaeology.

During the 19th and early 20th century, the concept “orientalist” had both a cultural and a

In 19th and early 20th century, the term
“orient” stood especially for the Near East but it also comprised the rest of the Ottoman empire and, in
French parlance, North Africa. The “Ancient” East was the Near East up to the spread of Christianity in
the region, which is part of the search for solid knowledge of the “Christian” East, followed by that of the “Muslim” or “Islamic” East when the region was Islamicised. During the 19th and early 20th century, the concept “orient” widened in scope to comprise the whole of Asia, retaining the sense of largely unknown cultures challenging Western man to discover them. Up to the Second World War, Orientalism in its broader sense indicated a particular cultural orientation in Europe and North America, and in its narrower sense it meant empirical Oriental studies.

The first International Congress of Orientalists was held in Paris in 1873, and in 1951 an International Union of Orientalists was founded. Since the Congress in Moscow in 1960 the term has been challenged for various reasons, and after the Congress in Paris 1973 the name of the congresses has been changed.

Asian cultures are of course only “East” when seen from Europe, and since these cultures are now studied by specialists coming from the regions themselves and elsewhere, the term “orient” has become largely metaphorical. At the present time the tendency is to speak of “human sciences in Asia and North Africa”, and orientalist scholars are now identified by their culture, period and region of specialisation, and by their specific discipline. Given the nature of the encyclopedia we mean by mustasrikân here specifically scholars of Islam and Muslim societies and cultures. “Oriental studies” stands here specifically for that branch of it which is devoted to the study of the
Islam and Muslim societies and cultures, that is to say "Islamic studies" in the broad sense of the word. The notion of "orientalist" in the domain of Islam and elsewhere has changed in several respects since the beginning of the last century. Whereas formerly mustashrikun were by definition non-Muslim Western scholars of Islam, there are now Western scholars who are Muslim, non-Muslim scholars outside the West, and Muslim scholars in this field both in and outside Muslim countries. And whereas formerly the West and the Muslim world were two different geographical areas, they now interpenetrate and various Muslim communities live in Western countries. At present mustashrik in Islamic studies should be understood as comprising all impartial scholars of Islam, Muslim societies and cultures, whether of Western or non-Western, Muslim or non-Muslim origin and whether they work in the West or elsewhere. Cooperation between scholars in the field takes place beyond differences of faith, country of origin and place of work. The sole difference seems to be that Muslim scholars are more aware of the immediate implications of their research for the Muslim community.

Another change in the notion of "orientalist" concerns the area of specialisation. In former times almost all mustashrikun were professional philologists specialised in Oriental languages, with or without a historical interest. This was a tough course of study where one had to be an expert in something that hardly left room for new paradigms of research. During the past few decades, however, scholars from other disciplines have increasingly engaged in research on Muslim societies and cultures. They include social historians, anthropologists, sociologists and other researchers in the social sciences, and also specialists in the fields of literature, the arts and religion. In this article the term mustashrik, when used for the past, refers to scholars of Oriental languages, literatures and histories; when used for the present, it also includes representatives of other disciplines contributing to our knowledge of Muslim societies and cultures.

The social function of orientalists has changed too. More than formerly, mustashrikun have become experts in Western societies on certain aspects of Islam, Muslim societies and cultures. They perform certain corresponding roles in society; besides research and teaching, they provide information where necessary and mediate in communication when needed. In some cases special tasks may be assigned to them. More than before, society puts pressure on them to make their expertise socially relevant; more than before, they have to comply with the needs of institutions in their society.

If mustashrikun had an expert knowledge, they have also held certain opinions about Islam; sometimes they have opposed particular Muslim ideas and practices, at other times they have tried to spread their own ideas and practices among Muslims and in many cases they have had personal friends among them. Such personal activities and commitments of mustashtraikun should be seen and judged in the particular context of their own society and in the context of the relationships between that society and particular Muslim societies. To the extent that the search for knowledge takes priority, mustashrik scholarship increases, but alongside this scholarly knowledge there has always existed a wide margin of private ideas, values and orientations of the mustashrikun themselves which they have communicated to certain groups in their own society. This non-academic human cultural side of the mustashrikun has been interwoven with their work and is not without interest. It is striking, for instance, to see to what extent they have been in the first place specialised researchers, with little idea of the political or social implications which their work could have for either their own society or the society studied. Like other scholars, they have mostly been defenceless against possible misuse of the results of their work. The fact of being a scholar in the field of Islam has little to do with insight into present-day Third World problems. Such scholars are not necessarily keen to distinguish the various ways in which Islam has been presented ideologically or used politically for different interests, those of Muslims and of non-Muslims alike. And they are not per se aware of situations of social tension in which Islam has been used as a battle-cry, as a symbol of a programme of social and political action, or simply as a utopian formula.

The work done by the mustashrikun, like any study of other societies and cultures in the past and at present, has different dimensions: (1) the technical expertise acquired by detached scientific treatment of factual data; (2) the researcher's attitude to and possible involvement with his subject-matter in the course of his work; (3) the various motivations (romantic, humanist, religious) and objectives for which such studies are carried out, including particular causes adhered to by the researcher, and his personal experiences and orientation which are relevant to his research; (4) the social setting in which the research is carried out, its place in society and its relationships with particular Muslim societies; this also includes its organisation and funding and its institutional setting; (5) the extent to which the researcher fulfills a bridge function between two or more cultures, developing distance from his own society and an increasing impartiality in his evaluations and judgements on either society.

The question remains to what extent there has been a direct correspondence between the role which their society has attributed to the mustashrikun and the kind of knowledge and general ideas which these last have developed about Islam and Muslim peoples. Where have they developed knowledge and ideas, so to say, ahead of their own society and where have they simply complied with its current ideas and behaviour? Where and how did they relativise or criticise norms and values adhered to in Western societies? Some mustashrikun have, consciously or not, created a distance between their own society and Islam or Muslim people by describing Islam as absolutely different, as a danger or an object or mission. Others of them have, consciously or not, created a rapprochement between their own society and Islam or Muslim people by describing what human beings, societies and cultures have in common, taking communication and learning from each other as self-evident. More than has been appreciated generally, most mustashrikun have been much less original in their attitudes than is generally thought of and have merely been spokesmen of their societies in their assessment of the distance between Islam and the West. Except when they have wanted explicitly to study Islam and Muslim societies and cultures independently of current ideas and practices (sometimes emphatically against them), their appreciations of Islam have been heavily dependent on ideas and values current in their own society or community.

B. The period until the 19th century

When the Arabs carried out their conquests in the south, and in the 8th and early 9th centuries in the south-west of Europe, two worlds found themselves
opposed to each other. For centuries they identified themselves as the Christian and Muslim worlds. The love of each other was not only identified as Christian and Muslim but also increasingly as the European and the "Oriental" domain, the Orient starting at the boundary of Ottoman rule.

The history of the encounter between these two worlds and their relations, specifically around the Mediterranean and in the Balkans (also, further east, on and within the borders of the Russian empire) is complex; the borders of the two worlds have witnessed many kinds of interaction. Here we shall only deal with one aspect of cultural interaction: the development of the knowledge which European scholars acquired of the world represented by Islam, including the Arabic and Turkish languages, before the 19th century, when Islamic studies became firmly established as a distinct field of research in European universities. What knowledge of Islam had been acquired, what motivated the search for it, what major obstacles had to be conquered, and what was the European cultural context within which this search for knowledge developed?

1. The Arabic heritage; the mediæval period

Until the Crusading movement began in the second half of the 11th century, with the conquests of Toledo in 1085, Sicily in 1091 and Jerusalem in 1099, knowledge about Islam and Muslim lands in Latin Europe was limited. Its sources were scattered; incidental reports from Christians living in the Levant or in Spain under Muslim domination, doctrinal positions typical of Islam which had been related by John of Damascus and Byzantine theologians in their refutations of Islam, and what had been reported to the Church of Rome about Muslim dealings with Christians, outside or under the authority of the Roman Church. This knowledge was very limited. It was mixed with elements of religious imagination and coloured by efforts to show that Muslims constituted a danger for Europe and Islam for Christendom not only politically but also religiously. Islam was not the right religion: at best it was a Christian sect, but it was certainly not based on Revelation like Christianity.

Spain

The first instruments of work for the study of Arabic in Europe known to us come from Spain: a 12th century Glossarum Latina-Arabicum (with ca. 11,000 Latin key words of which one-third have not been translated) and a 13th century Vocalistis in Arabicis (with ca. 4,000 Latin key words and ca. 8,000 Arabic index words). They must have served the purpose of translating from Latin into Arabic, largely for purposes of missionary work among Muslims in areas brought under Christian rule by the Reconquista.

The first written information about Islam and Muhammad comes from a certain Moses Sefardi (1062-1110) who knew Arabic astronomical works well. In 1106 he converted to Christianity and took the name Pedro de Alfonso, moving subsequently to Spain. In 1109, at the same time as Peter the Venerable (1094-1156) abbot of the Benedictine monastery of Cluny, visited Spain in 1142, the two men may have discussed the project of translating some Islamic texts from Arabic into Latin. In any case, Peter the Venerable then commissioned two scholars of his order working on Arabic astronomy, Robert of Ketton (Chester) and Hermann of Dalmatia, to translate five Islamic texts, including the Qur'ān, into Latin; Robert succeeded in finishing the Qur'ān translation by 1143. Peter the Venerable himself wrote two texts in addition to these translations, the more descriptive Summa totius haeresis Saracenorum and the polemical Liber contra sectam sive haeresem Saracenorum. These texts together constitute the so-called Cluniac Corpus or Toledo collection.

Peter the Venerable, known for his anti-Jewish stand over against Bernard of Clairvaux, also differed from him as regards the attitude to be taken to the Muslims. Whereas Bernard actively preached the call to the second Crusade, Peter believed that, rather than war, it was missionary work that would bring victory over Muslims. But to combat Islam one had to know it, and this was the reason that he ordered original Arabic texts to be made available. Peter the Venerable, known for his anti-Jewish stand over against Bernard of Clairvaux, also differed from him as regards the attitude to be taken to the Muslims. Whereas Bernard actively preached the call to the second Crusade, Peter believed that, rather than war, it was missionary work that would bring victory over Muslims. But to combat Islam one had to know it, and this was the reason that he ordered original Arabic texts to be made available. Peter the Venerable, known for his anti-Jewish stand over against Bernard of Clairvaux, also differed from him as regards the attitude to be taken to the Muslims. Whereas Bernard actively preached the call to the second Crusade, Peter believed that, rather than war, it was missionary work that would bring victory over Muslims. But to combat Islam one had to know it, and this was the reason that he ordered original Arabic texts to be made available.

2. Western orientalism

The Oxford Lexicon of Islam, VII

Encyclopaedia of Islam, VII
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Cluniac Benedictine, Dominican and Franciscan orders. Since one of the most important themes in the establishment of the Christian and Muslim worlds, mentioned at the beginning, was the relationship between the Christian and Muslim faiths, views of this very relationship have greatly influenced the way in which people coming from these two worlds have perceived the encounters between them, rationalising them in terms of their respective religions.

In connection with the Crusading movement which started in the second half of the 11th century in Spain, Sicily and the rest of Western Europe (with Urban II's call of 1096), an image of Islam as the great Adversary of Christianity arose in Europe. W.M. Watt describes the following four main features of this image as follows (The influence of Islam on Medieval Europe, Edinburgh 1972, 73): "(a) the Islamic religion is falsehood and a deliberate perversion of the truth; (b) it is a religion of violence and the sword; (c) it is a religion of self-indulgence; and (d) Muhammad is the Anti-Christ."

The author correctly speaks here of a "distorted" image of Islam, an image which has been scrupulously analysed by Norman Daniel (Islam and the West, Edinburgh 1960). It is fair to add that the factual improvements in knowledge of Islam possessed by the authors quoted above always remained within the limits of the four features of the image of Islam just mentioned, sanctioned by the Roman Church and have asserted its identity over against Muslims and Jews in this way as it had done earlier over against gnostics and pagans in its first centuries, and Europe may have sought and found its soul, but it may also be feared that the European Christians were mobilised for the wrong cause and with the wrong means. In any case, the Crusading ideology with its centres, propaganda and the missionary efforts based on a distorted image of Islam did not merely constitute the greatest obstacles to true knowledge of Islam and Muslim societies. In Spain the mediaeval Christian syndrome and the underlying attitudes, supported by the Inquisition, led to the human tragedy of the elimination of both Islam and Judaism within three centuries after the military victories of the 13th century by the Christian kings. Both Jews (1492) and Muslims (1502) were put before the alternative of baptism or expulsion, the final solution of the time. This political action was ideologically justified by the distorted image of Islam and Judaism and by the absolute claims of the Church and its institutions, and had been prepared theologically by Augustine's De civitate dei, Aelius' Car deus homo and Aquinas' Summa contra gentiles.

Arab sciences and philosophy

It was in Spain, too, that another type of studies developed and another kind of knowledge was acquired which may more properly be called the forerunner of Oriental studies in the modern sense of the word. This was the translation activity which started in Toledo after it was taken in 1085, with the encouragement of Don Raymundo mentioned above. This concerned in particular the translation from Arabic into Latin of scientific and philosophical texts sought after in Europe. They were either translations of Greek philosophical, scientific and medical texts (e.g., Aristotle in Arabic translation) or texts, including commentaries, written by Muslim authors (e.g., Ibn Sinâ, 980-1037 [q.v.]) whose work became known in Europe ca. 1180. A group of scholarly translators devoted themselves to this translation work for more than two centuries, some of them from outside Spain; Jewish scholars played here a role similar to that which Nestorian scholars had played in the earlier 9th and 10th century translation activity in Baghâd from Syriac (Greek) into Arabic.

Outstanding leaders of the translation work in the 12th century were Domingo Gonzalez and the prolific Italian scholar Gerard of Cremona (1114-87) who is said to have been responsible for the translation of more than 70 works in Arabic. Among the prominent Jewish scholars working in the movement was Abraham ben Ezra (1089-1167). It was especially in the 13th century that philosophical works were translated, partly serving as a basis for the great apologetic treatises of Christianity written at the time, partly stimulating the increasing debate among Christian thinkers about the relationship between faith and reason. Two translators in the service of the Emperor Frederick II (r. 1215-50) were famous for these philosophical translations: Michael Scotus (ca. 1200-ca. 1236) and Jacob Anatoli (ca. 1230-50). In the second half of the 13th century, the names of Hermannus Alemannus and Moses ibn Tibbon (1240-83), the latter working in Syria-Palestine, are well known. In Spain it was the great Alphonsio X of Castile, Alfonso el Sabio (r. 1252-84), who commissioned translation work and founded several institutions of higher learning.

The influence of Arabic philosophy on European thought in the 13th century is a case of "orientalism" in itself. Several European philosophers studied and quoted it: Roger Bacon (ca. 1214-92) in his Opus maius (he also treated the different religions in his Moralis Philosophia, IV), Robert Grosseteste (d. 1253) of the Platonic tradition, Albertus Magnus (ca. 1200-1280) and Thomas Aquinas (1225-74) of the Aristotelian tradition, and the Latin Averroïst Siger of Brabant (ca. 1235-ca. 1282). After much debate, Latin Averroïsm was finally condemned by Bishop E. Tempier of Paris (1277).

Sicily, Syria-Palestine and Europe until 1500

Orientalism in its wider sense, the taste for Oriental culture and the desire to know it and derive values from it, did not arise in Spain where the Roman Church imposed its institutions and doctrines by force, but in other places of encounter between the Christian and Muslim worlds. Sicily, where the Arab Kalbi dynasty had ruled (902-1091), became such a meeting-place after its conquest by Roger I (d. 1101). His son Roger II (r. 1130-54), the latter's grandson Frederick II of Hohenstaufen (r. 1215-50), and later Manfred and Charles of Anjou, not only engaged translators for Arabic-Latin translation work but also themselves possessed a direct knowledge of Arab-Muslim manners and customs, accepting Arab cultural norms and values.

Another place of encounter was Syria-Palestine during the Crusader period (1099-1291). William of Tyre's (ca. 1130-84) Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum, describing the period 1094-1184 (the years of the author's lifetime), contains careful observations of Arab Muslim behaviour and may be called an Orientalist's historical work in its own right. Here, too, certain translations of scholarly works from
Arabic into Latin were made. The knowledge which the Franks obtained here first-hand from an essentially superior culture, while making Muslims in actual life, gave a more realistic turn to Europe's knowledge of the East; numerous cultural borrowings occurred and trade increased between both sides of the Mediterranean.

Godfrey of Viterbo (12th c.) was now able to give a reasonable historical account of Muhammad's life in his *Universal Chronica*. Don Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada, Archbishop of Toledo (early 13th century) provided a fair account of the history of the Arabs, in particular in the West, including Spain in his *Historia Arabum* (or: *Saracenia*). Somewhat later travellers like William of Rubruck (William de Rubruquis, ca. 1220-ca. 1294, travelled in 1254) and Marco Polo (1254-1324) were to discover other worlds, cultures and religions beyond the realm of Islam. And within Europe itself spiritual travellers along initiatory paths discovered positive features of Islam represented for instance by the figure of Șâlāh al-Dīn and given an esoteric form in Wolfram von Eschenbach's *Parzifal* and *Willehalm* as well as in the German version of the *Grail*.

The last two contributions to Arabic studies of this period are again from Spain and can be dated to thirteen years after the fall of Granada (1492). In his *De vera castellionum historia* (printed 1505), the scholar Pedro de Alcalá (*Petrus Hispanus*) left a precious account in Latin script of the Arabic vocabulary of the spoken language in Granada at the time. And in the same scholar's *Arte para ligeramente saber la lengua aravaiga* (printed 1505, 2nd ed. corrected and enlarged also 1505) we have the first Arabic grammar written by a European, describing the spoken Arabic of Granada by means of the categories of Latin grammar.

During the 14th and 15th centuries, humanists of the Italian Renaissance studied not only the classical Greek and Latin authors but also paid attention to Hebrew kabbalistic writings and Arabic texts basic to European science, medicine and philosophy. At the time, the Arab cultural heritage was still part of the European conscience, at least in Italy. In the course of the 15th century, however, a change occurs, represented by the great humanist Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1463-94) who, though knowing Arabic and Hebrew well, reverted to the classical heritage and left the Arab heritage aside. Over against the "classicists" it was the "orientalists" to whom the task fell of revealing the facts and significance of the Arab Islamic world and its heritage.

2. The Turkish threat; the period 1450-1700

After the failure of the Balkan Crusades and the efforts at unification with the Greek Orthodox Church, the Roman Church's initial reaction to the fall of Constantinople (1453) was one of relative openness, thanks to the efforts of some great intellectuals. Immediately after the fall of Constantinople John of Segovia (ca. 1400-58) proposed a conference between Christian clergy and Muslim *fukahd* to open a dialogue on their respective faiths. Nicholas of Cusa (1401-64) had already published his *De pace fidei*, a dialogue between representatives of the major religions in search of what was their truth and unity. His *Cirillo Alcoran* (1460) is a careful examination of the contents of the Kurʾān, trying to identify what connects Islam with, and what separates Islam from Christianity on the basis of the text. Moreover, he subjected some of the Islamic* qur'ānic* verses to the standards of a Christian conference proposed by John of Segovia. And the new Pope Pius II, the humanist Aeneas Silvius (1405-64), Pope from 1458 onwards, at John's instigation wrote a letter to the Ottoman sultan Mehemed II (q.v.), the conqueror of Constantinop- le, in which he appealed for true and practical common sense in the foreseeable relations between the two worlds confronting each other.

The proximity of the Ottoman empire, a firmly-established state whose power was still increasing until the mid-16th century (Vienna was besieged in 1529) affected the development of knowledge of Muslim societies and Islam in Europe. Whatever the reasons, the Europeans recognised a clear need for true and objective knowledge of this Muslim empire, its administration, resources, religious institutions, and so on; its proximity, moreover, facilitated the acquisition of this directly and indirectly. Besides primarily military and political interests, there were economic interests at stake in establishing and expanding trade relations with Istanbul, Smyrna and the Levant. This need for practical knowledge was supplemented by the stimulus of humanist and Renaissance thought. A new subject of study arose: Islam in its Ottoman context, Islam being now largely identified with the Turcs and their rule. The idea of Islam as a hateful religion and ideological structure was subtly transformed into the idea of Islam as Ottoman power and civilisation. This civilisation was regarded as different from the European Christian civilisation. Both the European and Islamic civilisations beyond the Ottomans, in Persia, India, China and Japan. This idea of an Islamic civilisation was later to develop into the idea of Islam as a subtle and refined culture expressed in attractive *1001 Nights* and even beautiful literature (Arabic and Persian poetry).

Printing presses and their use

Ottoman Turkish was written in Arabic script and the technology first of woodcut and then of loose letter printing imposed itself as an important tool for Oriental studies. The first Arabic printed edition was made in Rome in 1514; it was a Christian liturgical text meant for Oriental Christians. An Arabic Kurʾān seems to have been printed in Venice about 1530 but the whole edition must have been destroyed on the order of Pope Paul III (r. 1534-7). Be that as it may, Daniel Brünig installed an Arabic press in Venice around 1537.

There were several Arabic presses in Rome, the most important being that of Ferdinand de Medicis, installed around 1586, which printed the four Gospels in Arabic in 1590, again for use by Oriental Christians, among other texts. In fact, the Roman Church's interest in Arabic printing had to do with intensive efforts to establish contacts and eventually union with the Oriental Churches in the Ottoman empire, just as in mediaeval Spain during the *Reconquista* the study of Arabic had been inspired by missionary activity among the Muslim population living in territories conquered by the Christian kings. In the same perspective of church union, a Maronite College was established in Rome in 1584 (and also an Armenian one) and Maronite clergy and laymen were invited to Rome both to receive instruction and to render services, for instance, in matters of Arabic language. In 1627 Urban VIII founded the College of the Propagation of Faith (*Officium de propaganda fide*) which also encouraged the study of Oriental languages for missionary purposes.

Another famous Arabic press was the one installed by François Savary de Brèves, first in Rome around 1613 and later in Paris in 1615, where it became the *Imprimerie des Langues Orientales*. Francisca Rapalengius (1539-97) established a commercial press in Holland, while Thomas Erpenius (1584-1624)
installed a private one which was later sold to Elzevir in Amsterdam. On a smaller scale, Arabic texts were printed in Breslau on a press which Peter Kirsten (1575-1640) established before he returned to Sweden in 1636 (see further, MATHAŠA, B. 1. In Europe).

Guillaume Postel and the French context

Following Portugal and Spain, 16th century England and France both enjoyed an immense broadening of their horizons and interests, and people developed a vivid sense for what was new and foreign yet accessible. This happened literally through the voyages of geographical discovery and, probably more than in the Iberian peninsula, through intellectual and spiritual discovery. Guillaume Postel (1510-81) is representative of such a discovering state of mind, within the special context of France, Italy and Austria at the time. Gifted for languages, he studied a number of them and Francis I (1494-1547, king of France from 1515 on), who was eager to attract artists and humanists at his court, became interested in him. Given his pro-Ottoman Levant policies, which had produced a treaty including valuable Capitulations in 1535 [see MÝTÝVÝΛΩX], and in view of the Papal policy of union with Oriental Churches, a policy which he supported, Francis I needed expertise. Postel, who had just finished an extensive journey to Egypt and Constantinople and published his Grammatica Arabica, based on the Arab grammarians (1559-9), was appointed Professor of Arabic (1568) at the newly established Collège Royal (1550) which was later to become the Collège de France. Postel published a book on the Ottoman Empire, De la republique des Turcs, in 1560, in which he presented a highly idealised picture of the King's ally. For various reasons Francis I dismissed Postel from the Collège Royal in 1543, and this marked the beginning of a new period in this man's agitated life. After far-reaching spiritual, intellectual and political adventures, and several brushes with the Roman Inquisition, he ended his life as a prisoner in a French convent (1562-81), still moved by great ideas of world conversion and world domination before the nearby apocalyptic end of times. His precious manuscripts went to the University of Heidelberg.

Internationalisation of Oriental studies: Leiden

An interesting example of a concerted effort to develop Oriental studies in the first half of the 17th century is provided by the history of this field at the University of Leiden, which soon achieved eminence. The university was established in 1575 as a reward for the city's withstanding the Spanish siege of 1574. The Low Countries declared their independence in 1581. Oriented as they were towards the sea and maritime trade, with vital interests in the Ottoman empire and Morocco, the Dutch considered a knowledge of Oriental languages a demand of the time. Franciscus Raphelengius (1539-97) started to teach Hebrew in Leiden in 1586, and in 1593 he added Arabic and prepared his Lexion Arabicum which was published posthumously in 1613. The classicist, historian and Arabist Joseph Scaliger, a pupil of Postel, was appointed professor in 1593 without specific teaching duties. A separate chair of Arabic was created in 1599. After Scaliger, the reputation of Leiden in this field was enhanced by two scholars of great stature. In 1613 Thomas Erpenius (1584-1624), whose main interest was in languages, was appointed Professor of Oriental Languages; in the same year he published his important Grammatica Arabica which was to become a classic for two centuries (1636). This was followed in 1656; 1748). Jacob Golius (1596-1667) was appointed his successor in 1624; in 1653 he published his important Lexicon Arabico-Latinum, based on Arab dictionaries and his own readings, which also became a classic instrument of research. Besides publishing these major works of scholarship, the two men distinguished themselves also with a typical pedagogical concern; both prepared Arabic reading materials for beginners which lasted for nearly two centuries. In this regard, Erpenius prepared the Lomani Sapientis Fabular with some Arabic maxims (1615) and a voweled text with notes and Latin translation of the Surat Yûsuf (1617), while Golius published his Suratul ad-Din al-Azhari (1629).

But Leiden established its reputation for Oriental studies in another scholarly and practical sense too. Just as Guillaume Postel had been sent out by Francis I to buy Oriental manuscripts in the East, Golius after his appointment spent from 1629 until 1629 in the East, bringing back a harvest of some 300 Arabic, Turkish and Persian manuscripts. Still more importantly, the Dutch representative of the States General at the Porte after 1655, Levinus Warner (1619-65) who had studied in Leiden and lived in Istanbul since 1644, bequeathed his precious collection of about 1,000 manuscripts and his books to the University Library of Leiden. This had already earlier acquired Scaliger's library and Golius' manuscripts, and it subsequently became a kind of Mecca for Arabists.

Among the scholarly works of the period under consideration which deserve mention is first of all Joseph J. Scaliger's De emendatione temporum (1583; enlarged edition 1598; 1629). This was the fruit of extensive Oriental researches and readings, encompassing various Oriental calendars and expounding a kind of world history. A century later Richard Simon (1630-1712) was able to offer his Histoire critique de la science et des coutumes des nations du Levant (1684), in which he presented side-by-side and as objectively as possible the Muslim and Christian communities living in the Near East. Around the same time appeared in Vienna the precious Thesaurus linguarum orientalium... of Franz Meninski, in three volumes, a Turkish-Arabic-Persian-Latin dictionary which became a classic.

In this connection, the problem of the edition and translation of the text of the Kur'ân must be mentioned. Pope Alexander VII (1655-67) still forbade both its edition and its translation. Thanks to the Protestant theologian Bibliander, the Latin Kur'ân translation by Robert of Ketton, dating from 1143, could be printed in Basel in 1543, with a second edition appearing in 1550. In 1647 André du Ryer published an original French translation accompanied by a "Sommaire de la religion des Turques"; this translation was in turn translated into various other European languages. In 1694 A. Hinckelmann published the first Arabic text edition of the Kur'ân. It was in 1698 that the learned Catholic scholar Lodovico Maracci published an Arabic text edition and Latin translation of the Kur'ân, preceded by a lengthy introduction called the Prodomus. This was the standard scholarly edition and translation for at least a century and a half.

Other editions of important texts besides the Kur'ân are that of Ibn Sinā's Kitāb al-Šifd, and his Kitāb al-Nadīj, published together as early as in 1593, in Rome. Erpenius edited the voweled Surat Yûsuf with a Latin translation and notes as an introduction to reading the Kur'ân (1617), and also the Arabic New Testament (1616) and Pentateuch (1622). In 1625 he edited and translated of the latter part of the world chronicle of the Coptic historian al-MaKin.
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The breakthrough and emancipation of the study of Islam and Muslim lands in a spirit of rational Enlightenment (Aufklärung) happened to take place precisely at a time in which the Ottoman empire, after its last siege of Vienna in 1683, was on the retreat and had to accept the terms of the Treaty of Carlowitz (1699) [see Karlofca]. This disappearance of the Turkish danger from the European scene, marking the end of the wars of religion, must have meant an easing of most restrictions, and so the study of Islam as a natural religion. This was not only a matter of personal judgement but had to do with the dominant place of Christian theology at the universities. Arabic philology was often used as an aid to the exegesis of the Hebrew Old Testament; a scholar like Albert Schultens (1686-1570), as others before him, even considered Arabic as a dialect of Hebrew. Islam was nearly always compared with and judged in the light of the doctrines of Christianity. In other words, Arabic and Islam had in fact been studied according to norms of Christian theology or even as ancilla theologiae.

The breakthrough and emancipation of the study of Islam and Muslim lands in a spirit of rational Enlightenment (Aufklärung) happened to take place precisely at a time in which the Ottoman empire, after its last siege of Vienna in 1683, was on the retreat and had to accept the terms of the Treaty of Carlowitz (1699) [see Karlofca]. This disappearance of the Turkish danger from the European scene, marking the end of the wars of religion, must have meant an easing of tension, not only political but also psychological, cultural and religious. Just as the Turks were no longer a political danger, Islam could no longer be seen as an inherently dangerous religion. Through the voyages to the East, Europe on its part had already started to develop a curiosity and cultural openness in the second half of the 17th century and this could now extend beyond Chinese culture to Islamic culture too.

One of the first publications breathing this new, fresh and open spirit was the thousand pages-long Bibliothèque Orientale (1697) edited by Bartholomé d’Herbelot (1625-95), who represented a new type of enlightened “orientalist”. It was prepared with royal support and sought to offer the French public all that had previously been kept apart. d’Herbelot had also edited with royal support and sought to offer the French public all that had previously been kept apart. D’Herbelot’s Esquisse, published in 1687, was a predecessor of the modern study of Islamic religion. The book, written in Latin, was translated into French and German and may be called the first enlightened study of Islam as a religion. In the same spirit of reasonable presentation, the lawyer George Sale (d. 1736) published his “Preliminary Discourse” on Islam as a religion, preceding his English Kur’an translation (1734). That this change of perspective, the freedom of research and the emancipation of Arabic and Islamic studies from theological patronage, was not that easy shows up in the work and still more the autobiography (Lebensbeschreibung, 1783) of that gifted but non-recognized Arabist Johann Jakob Reiske (1716-74). As Reland was a predecessor of the modern study of the religion of Islam, Reiske, besides being an Arabist according to modern standards, in his Prodigiosus ad Haghi Chalipas librum memoriam (written 1747, published 1766) was a predecessor of the modern study of Islamic history.

Another sign of the new open spirit was the kind of thoughtful travel literature which saw the light now, as for instance Volney’s (1757-1820) Voyage en Syrie et en Égypte (1787). This open spirit could also lead to a new sensitivity to belles lettres and literary beauty. One of the first Orientalists following this path was William Jones (1746-94), highly gifted in languages and from 1783 judge in Calcutta. In 1774 he published his Postea Asiatiae commentarium libri sex, offering a first panorama of the rich field of poetry existing in particular in Muslim countries in Arabic, Persian and Turkish. Once arrived in India, he put himself to Sanskrit and translated several Sanskrit works into English. At the same time, with a clear awareness of practical necessities, he took the initiative to prepare the publication of the Digest of Hindu and Mohammedan Law.

Role of persons from the regions concerned

In several ways, people from the regions concerned, nearly always Christians, played a role in the process of acquiring knowledge about Islam and Muslim societies. The glossaria in Spain were made with the help of Muslim converts to Christianity who, whatever their knowledge of Arabic, knew little
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or no Latin. As "new Christians" speaking Arabic they could act as intermediaries between the Christian community and the Muslim population.

In the second half of the 16th century Near Eastern Christians, mostly Maronites but also members of the Uniate Churches, started to play a role too. A certain number went to the new Maronite College in Rome, founded in 1584, to pursue theological studies. Others went to Italy and France to study or act as translators into Arabic. Others again simply came in order to improve their own situation. All too often lacking proper education, Oriental Christians pretended to be able to teach Arabic, give reliable information about Islam, creating in this way more confusion than providing knowledge.

There were exceptional figures, however. The Moroccan prisoner al-Hasan b. Muhammad al-Wazzân al-Zayyâti converted to Christianity, took the name Leo Africanus [p. e.] and wrote a book on "Famous Men among the Arabs" and his well-known Descrittione dell'Africa (around 1520). In Paris, Erpenius learnt much from a Moroccan called al-Andalusî, who also informed him about Islam. Members of the Maronite al-Sîmânî family catalogued Arabic manuscripts in several libraries in Italy during the 18th century and the catalogue of the Arabic manuscripts of the Escurial Library was published in two volumes (1760-70) by the Maronite Michael al-Qâzîrit (Casîri, 1720-91). The learned Syrian Christian Nasîf al-Yazîdî (1800-71) wrote a critical [q.v.] text on Islamic culture. Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall (1774-1856), who established the scholarly study of Oriental languages and literatures in Austria, founded the first orientalist journal Europe has known. Between 1809 and 1818 six issues of the Fundgruben des Orients appeared, bringing and encouraging knowledge about the world of Muslims and Islam, its motto being the second half of Sura II, 142/143.

G. The period of the 19th and 20th centuries

1. International scholarship until the Second World War

The 19th century saw the rise of Islamic studies as a scholarly field of studies in its own right. The publication of the voluminous Description de l'Égypte between 1809 and 1822, written by a number of French scholars who had done research in Egypt during Bonaparte's campaign there, gave a powerful impetus to Oriental studies in general. This enterprise was an example of what scholars could accomplish through co-operation when they enjoyed good financial support and efficient organisation.

A prerequisite for any research on Islam and Muslim societies was the study of Arabic; descriptive grammars and the compilation of dictionaries prepared the way for critical editions of manuscript texts. Scholars of great repute in this field were Antoinne Silvestre de Sacy in Paris, Edward William Lane (1801-76) in England and Egypt, Reinhart P. Dozy (1820-83) and Michael Jan de Goeje (1836-1909) in Leiden, Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer (1801-88) in Leipzig and I.Y. Krachkovsky (1883-1951) in St. Petersburg-Leningrad. A landmark was Gustav Flügel's (1802-1879) publication of the Arabic text of the Qur'ân in 1834 with the concordance to it in 1842. This was the prerequisite for a more accurate literary and historical study of the Qur'ân. A pioneering study in this respect was Theodor Noldeke's (1836-1930) Geschichte des Korans, originally a dissertation in Latin (1856), the German version of which (1860) was to be followed later by a considerably augmented edition in three volumes, supervised by three other German scholars, which appeared between 1909 and 1938. An increasing number of printed critical editions of Arabic, Persian and Turkish texts from manuscripts followed, first in Europe, and then also in Cairo and elsewhere.

Available manuscript resources were described for instance by Moritz Steinbescher (1816-1907) for Arabic Muslim and Jewish manuscripts, followed by Carl Bühler (1889-1956) for Arabic manuscripts in general and Georg Graf (1875-1955) for Christian Arabic manuscripts. Brockelmann's Ge-
schichte der arabischen Literatur has now in part been superseded by Fuat Sezgin’s invaluable Geschichte der arabischen Schrifttums (since 1967). C.A. Storey published his Persische Literatur (1862-1926) for Persian literature (of Persian manuscripts) from 1927 onwards, with a new enlarged edition by Yuri Bregel (1972).

Broad historical surveys of literature in these languages were undertaken, for instance, by Von Hammer-Purgstall and Elias John Wilkinson Gibb (1857-1901) for Turkish literature, and by Edward Granville Browne (1862-1926) for Persian literature.

Reynold Alleyne Nicholson’s (1895-1971) for the history of Islamic institutions in the world were Alfred von Kremer (1828-89) for Islamic studies proper, that is to say the study of Islam and Muslim societies and cultures, could now come into being. In this respect, scholars like Ignac Goldziher (1850-1921), Hellmut Ritter (1892-1971) and Louis Massignon (1883-1962) paved the way. To them may be added the names of Joseph Schacht (1902-72) for Islamic law, Hamilton Alexander Roskeen Gibb (1895-1971) for the history of Islamic institutions in particular, Gustav Edmund von Grunebaum (1909-72) for the history of Islamic culture and civilisation generally and Arendt Jan Wensinck (1882-1939) for the study of Islam within the perspective of science of religion. A scholar of exemplary modesty, Wensinck was the moving spirit behind two major enterprises of international collaboration in the field of Islamic studies. These are the first edition of the Encyclopaedia of Islam [see MAWSI, 4.1], which appeared in five volumes in an English, French and German edition between 1913 and 1942 (and which inspired the Turkish Encyclopedia Islamiyet which started to appear in 1940), and the Concordance et indices de la tradition musulmane which appeared in eight volumes between 1933 and 1989, both published by E.J. Brill in Leiden.

2. Institutionalisation and developments until the Second World War

The immense development of Oriental studies in general and Islamic studies in particular in Europe and North America since the middle of the 19th century cannot be explained only in terms of spiritual motivations and scholarly interest in the non-Western world. It also came about thanks to the availability of funds to develop these studies in new independent institutions and institutional arrangements for research and teaching. Universities became better organised, special chairs were established, scholarly meetings facilitated communication. Certain publishers specialised in books in this field and societies were established specifically to favour Oriental studies.

In France J.B. Colbert had established the École de jeunes de langues in Paris in 1700; this functioned as a school for interpreters until its closure in 1873. In 1790 the École spéciale des langues orientales was founded, in 1914 renamed École nationale des langues orientales vivantes and in 1971 Institut national des langues et civilisations orientales; it has now become part of the University of Paris. In 1822 the newly founded Société asiatique met for the first time, and the same year it began to publish its Journal asiatique. For a long time Oriental languages and literatures were not taught at French universities but at special institutions, all of them in Paris; the Collège de France from 1530, the institutions mentioned above, and the Ecole Pratique des hautes Études after 1868. The Revue du Monde musulman (1906-26), and its successor the Revue des Études islamiques (1927-), have been keen to publish on events throughout the contemporary Muslim world with an important part of which France was involved from its occupation of Algeria in 1830 until Algeria’s independence in 1962.

The French also established academic research institutes in different countries overseas, for instance the Institut français d’études arabes de Damas, established in 1930 (replacing an older Institute of 1922) and attached to the University of Paris, which has regular publications until the present time. In 1929 an Institut d’études islamiques was created as part of the University of Paris. This was to constitute the centre of Islamic studies in France, with numerous students from North Africa attending after the Second World War. The Department of Arabic and Islam at the University of Algiers and similar institutions in Tunis and Rabat had political relevance within the framework of French interests in what was then French North Africa. Scholars like Robert Montagne (1893-1954), for instance, studied Islam in this framework. French historical and linguistic scholarship on Islam in Spain and North Africa was represented, e.g., by Evariste Lévi-Provençal (1884-1956), Roger Le Tourneau (1907-71), Georges (1876-1962) and William (1874-1956) Marçais. Jean Sauvaget (1901-50), besides his own historical work, wrote a useful bibliographical introduction to the historical study of Islam in Spain and North Africa.

In Germany, Oriental studies developed around the middle of the 19th century as an academic discipline at the newly-founded or organised universities, and it remained firmly linked to the universities, Arabic often being taught as one of the Semitic languages at the Faculties of Theology. In 1845 the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft was founded, bringing together all German orientalists; it has been publishing the Zeitschrift der DMG since 1847. Islamic studies acquired some political relevance in Germany in the context of the rapprochement with the Ottoman empire and during the thirty odd years during which Germany had some Muslim colonies in Africa. Carl Heinrich Becker (1876-1933), for instance, besides his historical work paid attention to contemporary Islam in these regions, at the Kolonialinstitut established in Hamburg in 1908. The Nazi period and the Second World War (1933-1945) gave an unforeseen ideological twist to German scholarship. A few German orientalists, mostly of Jewish descent, succeeded in escaping abroad; others perished or survived under heavy stress. After 1945 Oriental studies in both parts of Germany had largely to be built up again.

Islamic studies in Germany have remained very much part of the older German orientalist tradition of solid philological and historical work, lack of social and political commitment and relatively little interest in the realities of the contemporary scene. It is probably in Germany that the orientalists’ tradition has achieved the greatest degree of technical perfection in what may be termed scholarly precision engineering, a phenomenon which can be observed elsewhere too. This has interests in what we call, at a price: a certain isolation through remoteness from other scholarly disciplines, an aloofness from contemporary developments and a certain weakness of scholars to...
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take a personal stand, disciplined objective scholarly
ship being the cause for which they live, imagination
being subordinated to mental discipline. Much less
formulation of basic problems of research has taken
place here than could have been expected, given the
German philosophical tradition, and compared with
important changes of paradigm in other scholarly
disciplines in the country. Islam as a faith and religion
as well as contemporary developments have tended,
paradoxically, to be marginalised in Islamic studies as
disciplines in the country. Islam as a faith and religion
in the broader context of cultural history, among them
the aforementioned Carl Heinrich Becker and Hans
Heinrich Schaeder (1896-1957). A younger genera-
tion of German Islamicists has established closer com-
munication with and commitment to living Muslim
societies and their future.
Oriental studies in Great Britain in the 19th and
20th centuries have been very much influenced by
contact with a number of important Muslim regions
within and outside the empire, e.g., Persia. Quite a
few British scholars have not been attached to univer-
sity institutions but have carried out research on their
own, sometimes working as civil servants in the colo-
nial administration or diplomatic service but also as
independent travellers and authors. As early as 1874, the
Asiatic Society of Bengal was founded by Sir William Jones
in Calcutta. A parallel society in Bombay was to
follow. The Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and
Ireland was founded in London in 1823; it has been
publishing its Journal since 1834.
Academic studies of Arabic, Persian and Turkish
were concentrated in the universities of Cambridge,
Oxford and Edinburgh, where old traditions in this
field existed. The London School of Oriental Studies,
attached to the University of London, was founded
after the First World War and renamed the London
School of Oriental and African Studies after the
Second World War. It brings together a broad range
of orientalists' expertise and field experience. Britain,
too, founded some academic institutes overseas in An-
kara, Amman, Baghdad and Tehran, which
stimulated archaeological and art history research in
particular.
The Netherlands' overseas history with Islam
came through contacts with Indonesia. The world's
first society of Oriental studies, the Batavian Society
for Arts and Sciences, was founded in Batavia (Jakarta) in
1778 and would publish its own Journal. In Dutch
Oriental studies as elsewhere, a distinction can be
made between academic Oriental studies for the sake
of scholarship and the study and teaching of Islamic
law and institutions and Muslim languages and
ethnography for the benefit of the colonial administra-
tion. The second tradition was combined with the first
in the dominating personality of Christiaan Snouck
Hurgronje (1857-1936), who for a number of years
was an official adviser to the government on Muslim
affairs.
For Russia, the Orient started with the presence of
the Tatars, Islamised since the 1260s. The main
institutions of Oriental studies were in St Petersburg,
then the capital: the Asiatic Museum, founded in
1818, and the Institute for Oriental Languages, estab-
lished as part of the Asiatic Department of the
Ministry of the Exterior in 1823. A faculty of Oriental
Languages was founded here in 1856. The city held,
and still holds, a remarkable manuscript collection.
A school of Arabic scholarship was established in
Russia by Viktor Romanovich Rosen (1849-1908).
His most outstanding Arabist pupil was the aforemen-
tioned I. V. Krachkovsky whose Among Arabic manu-
scripts (Eng. tr. 1953) brought Oriental studies nearer
to the general public, even in the West. It is, however,
Turkish Islam with which Russia has had the most
direct relations and a centuries long common history.
The foremost scholar in this field was Vasili Vladimi-
rovich Barthold (1869-1930), also a pupil of Rosen
(see Yuri Bregel, The bibliography of Barthold's works and
the Soviet censorship, in Saray, no. 108 [1979], 91-107).
Russian Oriental studies changed greatly after the
revolution of 1917, gradually becoming subjected to
ideological constraints. Islamic studies, like Islam
itself, were severely curtailed from the later twenties
on, as part of the general drive to eradicate religion.
In the fields of linguistic, literary and historical
studies, however, research went on. After the Second
World War the Institute of Oriental Studies was
founded in Moscow as part of the USSR Academy of
Sciences, and the existing Institute of Oriental Studies
in Leningrad became a branch of the Moscow
institute.
In most other European countries, too, traditions of
Islamic scholarship established themselves during the
period under consideration. Prominent in the Italian
tradition were Leone Caetani (1869-1935), Ignazio
Gandini (1844-1910) and Michael Angelo Blunt (1886-1946) Guidi,
Carlo Alfonso Nallino (1872-1939) and Giorgio Leoni
della Vida (1886-1967). Prominent in the Spanish
tradition were Julián Ribera y Taragó (1858-1934)
and Miguel Asín y Palacios (1871-1944). Special men-
tion should be made of Arminius Vambery (1832-
1918) in Hungary, Adam Mez (1869-1917) in
Switzerland, Tor Andráe (1885-1946) in Sweden
and Armand Abel (1903-1973) in Belgium.
In the USA, an interest in Oriental studies appeared
on the East Coast in the first decades of the 19th
century. The American Oriental Society was
founded in 1842 and started to publish its Journal in
1880. Universities began to teach Oriental studies in
the 19th century, but Islamic studies lagged behind
somewhat. After the First World War, Princeton
University became the main centre for Middle
Eastern and Islamic studies, as they were developed
by Philip Hitti (1886-1978); The University Library
here was able to acquire a large manuscript collection.
Other centres of Oriental studies where Islamic
languages were taught were Harvard University, and
Universities in Philadelphia, Chicago and Berkeley
(UCB). Since the Second World War, the teaching of
Islamic languages has been regarded as a vital
necessity and programmes of Middle Eastern area
studies, including Islamic history, have been
developed at a number of American universities, to
which European scholars like G.E. von Grunebaum,
H.A.R. Gibb and B. Lewis have been attached. The
Library of Congress has tried to acquire consistently
all publications which have appeared in Muslim coun-
tries and has the most important collection of
materials on the subject in the world.
Similar Islamic studies, based on philology and
history, have been pursued at some Western institu-
tions in Muslim countries. To the French
institutions in Damascus and North Africa, men-
tioned earlier, should be added the Jesuit Université
de St.-Joseph in Beirut, recognised in 1881, with its
Faculté orientale (between 1902 and 1914) and its Institut
de Lettres orientales, from 1937 on. The Belgian scholar
H. J. Lammens (1862-1937) worked here. At the
American University of Beirut, which goes back to
the Syrian Protestant College, founded in 1863, the
Arabic Language and Islamic history have been
taught for a long time. Islamic studies were also pursued at several British institutions in British India, for instance in Lahore. Many text editions were published in Cairo, Haydarābād and other centres of Islamic studies in Muslim countries.

From the beginning a number of independent scholars have carried out research, often in disciplines other than philology, textual source analysis and documentary history represented by the universities at the time. Their work has proved to be crucially important for Islamic studies. Some of them studied non-textual material sources like Arabic epigraphy (Max van Berchem, Swiss, 1863-1921), numismatics and archaeology, and art and architecture (Keppel Archibald Cameron Creswell, British, 1879-1974). Others explored contemporary Muslim societies in ethnographical studies such as those carried out by the above-mentioned Christian Snouck Hurgronje in Mecca, Acheh and Gajoland; Edmond Duut (French, 1867-1926) in Morocco and Algeria; and Edward Westermarck (Finnish, 1862-1939) in Morocco. After the Second World War, anthropological fieldwork developed rapidly and Islamic studies are now unthinkable without the contributions from it and other social sciences.

Another idea current in the 19th century was that certain characteristics of a particular language like Semitic and Indo-European. A third idea in vogue at the time when Oriental studies developed was that in contrast to the West, the spiritual and in particular the mystical of Islam, mystique of Islam, had much importance has been attached to the influence of religion, specifically Islamic ideas and practices on Muslim societies, while general technological, economic and social factors tended to be neglected.

Another idea current in the 19th century was that peoples could be classified according to races, each possessing inherent cultural and psychological characteristics. The dynamics of Islamic history were then largely explained as a struggle between religious movements or a struggle between races, in particular Semitic and Indo-European. A third idea in vogue at the time when Oriental studies developed was that certain characteristics of a particular language like Arabic or a language group like the Semitic languages reflected themselves in specific cultural features of the speakers of that language. In the case of Islam, this meant that Europeans had a marked tendency to interpret Islam and Muslim societies in terms of the characteristics of what were held to be the “religious” elements. While overestimating the role of religion, race and language, mustashrik had difficulties in drawing conclusions about the social and economic factors of the texts originated and functioned. It was possible to reconstruct the chronology of political events mentioned in historical texts but much harder to draw conclusions for instance as to the social history of Muslim societies and the way they functioned and function. While overestimating the role of religion, race and language, mustashrik greatly underestimated, or even refused to acknowledge, the role of, for instance, particular demographic and ethnic structures, and social and economic causes in explaining particular facts or developments. In short, precisely because of their interest in Islam and in what distinguishes Muslim from Western societies, orientalists tended to stress the specificity of things Islamic and to reify Islam as an explanatory cause. They tended to neglect the many things that human beings, societies and cultures had in common and to disregard general causes as explanations of particular developments in Muslim societies.

Furthermore, the very equipment of orientalists, bound or at least accustomed by their education to work on texts, prevented them from interpreting adequately contemporary developments in Muslim societies. Most of them found themselves at too great a distance from the tangible world they studied, including the psychological and social distance to the people created by the political relationships of colonial times. The orientalists in fact did not know much more about contemporary Muslim societies than other Westerners. In their thinking they mostly tended to accept as self-evident the basic assumptions and presuppositions current in their own society. Consequently, it was not so much the professional orientalists as travellers and journalists, missionaries and tradesmen, politicians and military experts who, whatever their natural biases, furnished factual observations and practical knowledge of contemporary Muslim societies, with which they were often involved over many years.

The focus of interest and style of research of most mustashrik in the period under consideration was fact-finding and the search for permanent structures. A deeper causal or structural cohesion between the known facts was seldom sought; these facts were rarely interrogated with a view to their social implications; the patterns of meaning which these facts taken together conveyed to the people concerned were seldom investigated. Whenever attention was paid to these people’s interpretations of the facts, there was a certain predilection in the West and among some orientalists for the exotic, archaic, and poetic meanings of what were held to be the “religious” elements. Although orientalists in principle and quite naturally could listen to the people of the culture and society they studied, understand what they needed or want to convey and defend their interests, most of them refrained from doing so. Their primary concern was their scholarly work. Moreover, a widely-held official view in the colonial period held that natural resistance to Western political and economic domination at the time was to be attributed to Islam (“Muslim fanaticism”, “Panislamism”, etc.) rather
than admitting self-critically that it was due to the growing penetration of Western power all over the world.

Paradoxically, it was not only the colonies but also the orientalists who tended to become victims of Western domination, which caused normal relations between people to become disrupted, and prevented Muslim people and societies, their culture and religion from being perceived and understood as they understood themselves. The uneven relationship between the Western and the Islamic worlds put the orientalists in a difficult position, since this kind of relationship obstructed true insight rather than promoting it. Some did not realise the complex nature of their situation and, rather than trying to build bridges between peoples and cultures and correct misconceptions at home, they tended to legitimate and defend Western domination without question. Those orientalists who took up the defence of the people on the other side often justified this with a religious or ideological terminology which was hardly comprehensible to others. Most, however, working in the service of Western scholarly institutions to study Islam and Muslim societies, must have seen the course of events as irreversible and the people of the Orient as doomed to lose out to the West.

ii. Muslim critical responses

Soon after the establishment of the scholarly field of Islamic studies in Europe, scholars from Muslim countries too became interested in it. Many cooperated with Western scholars in studying and publishing manuscripts. They attended Western universities, took part in broader research projects, and could be appointed to teach and do research at Western scholarly institutions. While the immense amount of knowledge generated by the mustashrikun evoked the admiration of Muslims of all persuasions, it also aroused a certain unease because this knowledge was made available in the first place to people in the West. Moreover, was it the right knowledge? A whole literature circulating in Muslim countries alleges that it is not, and insinuates that orientalists have somehow intentionally or because of material interests distorted the reality of Islam and Muslim societies and cultures.

Since the culture and religion under study is theirs, the cooperation of researchers and scholars from Muslim countries has proved to be indispensable as well as self-evident. They have been able to contribute considerably to Islamic studies, in particular when working in Western countries. They have also been able to correct certain mistakes made by mustashrikun in their handling and interpreting of materials. In the case of precise data, they could initiate scholarly debates which are the essence of research proper.

Muslim criticisms have gone further than that, however, entering into debate concerning certain orientalists’ general ideas, underlying attitudes towards Islam and the value judgements they have passed on it. Some have gone as far as to deny at least in part the scholarly validity of the work of all orientalists, using sweeping arguments which can neither be proved nor disproved and must be seen as part of a broader protest against Western domination. The mustashrikun themselves often seem to have been taken by surprise by what they have seen less as a lack of appreciation of hard work than as an attack on their profession and critical scholarship in general. The ensuing debate has led, however, to greater awareness of the problem and to more acute self-revelation, and to wiser and more accurate ways of reflecting on the facts, familiar to cultural anthropologists, since they occur in the study of other cultures and religions in general.

Following E. Rudolph’s interpretation, to which the present writer owes much (Westliche Islamwissenschaft im Spiegel muslimischer Kritik. Grundzüge und aktuelle Probleme einer orientalistischen Diskussion, Berlin 1901), critical Arab Muslim responses to orientalism, particularly in Egypt (elsewhere the situation seems to be less turbulent), present the following historical development:

a. Debates between modernist reformers and Europeans writing on Islam (al-Afghani against Renan, 'Abdul against Hanotaux).

b. Critical reactions by Muslim reformists and Azhar scholars to non-Muslim secular scholarship in the West concerned with Islam (Rashid Riadi against E. Dermenghem, the campaign against A.J. Wensinck’s membership in the Royal Academy of the Arabic Language in Cairo). Parallel to this are the violent reactions, often by the same people, to ‘secular’ research pursued by Muslim scholars, e.g., at the University of Cairo (attacks on Tahà Haçayn and M.H. Haykal).

c. Critical reactions to Western scholarship on the Kur'ân and historical criticism of hadith literature (Mustafâ al-Sibâ’i and Muhammad al-Ghazzâli attacking Goldziher’s work), after the Second World War.

d. Accusations that orientalists in general, and certain of them in particular, are engaged in a broader attack on Islam and Muslim societies, in league with Colonialists, Christian Missionaries and Jewish and Gentile Zionists. Such attacks have been launched in the Arab world (e.g., by 'Umar Farrîhch, Muhammad al-Bâhayy, Anwar al-Djundî, Bint al-Shâî, Maliq Bennabi). Orientalism is here seen as an ideological enemy of Islam, and from ca. 1960 on the debate about it has been of a clearly ideological nature.

e. More subtle criticism of mustashrikun through an intellectual analysis of the underlying notions of the Orient, Orientalism and Orientals current in the West, for which orientalists are alleged to be partly responsible or of which they are victims. One of the main proponents of the ensuing debate is Edward W. Said, an Arab but not a Muslim.

Feelings have been the highest when Muslim religious convictions have been hurt by secular Western scholarship. A brief analysis by R. Peters (Abendlandische Islamkunde aus morgenländischer Sicht, 20. Deutscher Orientalistentag, Erlangen, October 1977) presents critical responses by Arab Muslims to Oriental studies of Islam, in defence of Islamic religion. According to these, the orientalists are divided into two groups. The first group consists of those orientalists who evaluate Islam correctly (al-munsîfûn), i.e., they speak positively about Islam or praise it. They suffer, however, from insufficient knowledge and intellectual incapacity.

The second group consists of those who do not appreciate Islam correctly (ghuyr al-munsîfûn). It consists of four subgroups: Christian clerics (out to convert Muslims to Christianity), Zionists (seeking to weaken Islam in order to strengthen political and ideological Zionism), colonialists (isii mâtârrûn, in the service of colonial governments), and ‘free thinkers’, Marxists and materialists (who aim to weaken the faith and morale of Muslims and mankind generally, in order to enslave them mentally and morally). This second group is held to constitute a coherent movement which tries to achieve through science what the Crusaders sought to do under the banner of imposing Islam on the world.

Peters lists some typical themes which, according to this literature, mustashrikun exploit in their efforts to defame Islam: the pretended lack of originality of
MUSTASHRIKÜN

Islam, textual criticism of Kur'an and historical criticism of sunna (hadith literature), diversity in Islam, textual criticism of Kurgan and historical criticism of sunna (hadith literature), diversity in Islam, textual criticism of Kurgan and historical criticism of sunna (hadith literature), diversity in Islam, textual criticism of Kurgan and historical criticism of sunna (hadith literature), diversity in Islam, textual criticism of Kurgan and historical criticism of sunna (hadith literature), diversity in Islam, textual criticism of Kurgan and historical criticism of sunna (hadith literature), diversity in Islam, textual criticism of Kurgan and historical criticism of sunna (hadith literature), diversity in

While admitting that on closer analysis certain statements made by orientalists may indeed be seen as insulting to Muslim readers, Peters emphasizes that the accusation that the majority of orientalists collaborated with the colonial governments is untrue: as philologists, they were far removed from contemporary politics. He then shows that one of the deeper reasons for the defamation of the orientalists and Oriental studies in general has been the onenessidedness of these studies carried out by westerners—allegedly, a unilateral and unselﬁcricical operation performed by Western scholars on Eastern people who are patients in the original sense of the word ("sufferers"). This is also the deeper reason why Muslim critics identify orientalism with colonialism: both exclude an equal exchange between two parties and imply that the one party simply regards and treats the other as an "object". Perhaps because of their high expectations, Muslim critics feel strongly that mustashrikün misunderstand them profoundly and, as they tend to see it, intentionally. If suspicion deepens into distrust, it may even produce a demand to repudiate Islam and religion for what the West is supposed to have tried to do to Islamic culture and religion. As a possible solution, Peters suggests that Western researchers into Islam should be able and willing to collaborate with Muslim researchers.

The reproaches described here have been repeated at various times and on various levels. For instance, A. J. Wensink's ofﬁcial appointment (1933) by King Fu'ad to the Royal Academy of the Arabic Language in Cairo had to be revoked in 1934 under pressure from Muslim activists in Cairo, since his article on Ibrahim in the ET (1st edition) spoke of the Kur'an as relating the "legend" of Ibrahim, not his historical reality (see file by L. Massignon on this matter in the University Library of Leiden). Ideological attacks on mustashrikün have been made precisely by people who do not know what scholarship is, and those who know better have not been able to express themselves often because of political and social pressures.

Muslim intellectuals who have studied in the West articulate their reproaches on another level. A recurrent one levelled at the mustashrikün is their lack of the necessary scientiﬁc tools to acquire sufﬁcient or true knowledge about Muslim societies and Islam, for instance, competence in the social sciences. The texts which they read do not allow them to draw the right conclusions about Muslim societies and cultures. A second reproach is that they display a cool objectivity, a lack of sympathy or a hidden antipathy even going so far as hatred towards Islam and Muslim societies. The orientalists allegedly exhibit a lack of modesty and a profound incapacity or unwillingness to understand correctly. A third reproach directed at them is their lack of concern with, let alone commitment to, any real improvement in the situation of the people or any authentic development of the societies they study. Summing up, what Muslim critics object to appears to be, above all, a certain inhumane and incommunicative attitude to be found in the West and among orientalists. While claiming to be true knowledge, in fact their scholarship is used by political and ideological agencies and serves to humiliate Muslims as human beings and denigrate their religion, which to them is the highest value.

The relative naivety of many orientalists about their paradoxical situation and their complex condition as bridge-makers between cultures becomes manifest precisely in their emotional reactions of disappointment and anger about such attacks. They feel that, despite their good intentions, and quite incomprehensibly, their scientiﬁc work is not understood, let alone appreciated. It is ever intentionally misrepresented by the people they study and about whom they claim to present objective scientiﬁc knowledge.

Misunderstandings exist on both sides. iii. Oriental studies as a risk: the meeting of cultures

From the way in which mustashrikün have deﬁned their work and tended to react to critical responses, it becomes clear that in general scholars in Oriental studies have not been prepared for the problems of cultural interaction they have encountered and in which they became involved. They have had little idea of what could happen when, in the name of Science, they started to publish things which offended values not in their own but in another living society and culture. They have had little idea or concern that they could offend people who had become sensitive to any attacks on what they felt to be their basic norms and values, indeed their identity, and who often saw such attacks as a threat to their very existence.

From the responses described it also becomes clear that, within Muslim societies at the time, very few people have known or understood what Western scholars and in particular orientalists have been doing. They have understood still less what mustashrikün can know scientiﬁcally and what are the limits of their science, where the realm of private opinions begins. Given a lack of ordinary everyday communication, much of the natural suspicion of foreigners who, for some mysterious aims and purposes, want to know a foreign society, has been projected on the orientalist in situations of political tension or conﬂict.

In the ensuing debate on "orientalism", the very perspective in which orientalists carry out their studies is at stake. Consequently, some kind of fundamental reﬂection is required and to this Edward W. Said's book Orientalism, because of its provocative and critical tone, seems only to have opened the door halfway. There is no reason why the notion of the "Orient" should not be replaced by a less ambiguous notion, for instance "peoples and cultures of Asia and Africa". There is no reason either why the philological and historical approaches should not be seen within a broader multi-perspective framework in which, for instance, the social sciences and in particular cultural anthropology but also the study of religion have their part to play. Again, the study of living societies and their aspirations, as well as of the underlying norm and value systems, can gain immensely from the collaboration of scholars who themselves come from such societies and have grown up in the traditions concerned. Again, for the study of contemporary societies it is mandatory that researchers have free access to them, meet people and work together with researchers from the country concerned.

It is also questionable whether in the human and social sciences, including history and comparative religion, any research can claim to be satisfactory when it takes no account of the points of view and the values of the people under study. Any kind of social science research, for instance, which objectiﬁes human beings to ﬁt into a particular scholarly model remains limited within the parameters of the model applied. It cannot claim to offer much knowledge
about a society or culture beyond the limits of the particular model chosen or the experimental situation and analysis.

As a consequence, the search for knowledge of Oriental as of all foreign societies and cultures requires insight in given limits and absence of any desire to dominate. The venture of intercultural studies requires that the researcher take the personal step of leaving his own world for a time, and reaching a world of other people, for which real communication is required. In the complex relations between people from different societies and cultures, the orientalists, like the anthropologists, at best belong to the few who, not essentially bound by loyalties to either party, in principle have the capacity to transcend the clash of societies and cultures, and for that matter religions, on a personal level. Failing in mediation is the risk of the profession, but it is something to be learned from.

iv. Muslim studies of other cultures and religions

Just as Western orientalists have shown an interest in Islamic civilisation and religion, Muslim scholars recently have developed an increasing interest in the common history of the Muslim world and the West, for instance, in the various forces which have shaped European history. After some travel accounts in the middle ages, travelogues belonging to the category "discovered" first by Ottoman Turks and Arabs and later in particular by students from Muslim countries studying in Europe. This interest has been pursued now by professional researchers. Already in the mediaeval period Muslim thinkers had shown a certain interest in other cultures and religions than Islam, and this interest may arise again (J. Waardenburg, *World religions as seen in the light of Islam, in Islam: past influence and present challenge*, ed. A.T. Welch and P. Cachia, Edinburgh 1979, 245-75).

4. Progress in Islamic studies since the Second World War

The advancement of Islamic studies since the Second World War can be indicated briefly on three levels: that of institutions and organisation, that of areas covered, and that of reorientations of a more fundamental nature.

i. Institutions and organisation

There is a trend, cautious in Europe and gradual in North America, for university appointments in Islamic languages and history, as well as in social science research on Muslim societies, to include an increasing number of researchers and scholars from Muslim countries themselves. If, at the beginning of the fifties, they were mainly language informants, at present qualified Muslim scholars may occupy posts at higher levels too. The increasing number of Muslim students in Islamic studies at Western universities means that possibilities of instruction and communication have multiplied not only in teaching but later also in research. Whatever the ideas on orientalists in Muslim countries, direct contact with them in the West has become possible on a scale and in ways unimaginable before the Second World War.

Besides the older Oriental research associations, new organisations have been founded specifically to promote the study of the Middle East and Islam, encouraging fresh approaches and new ways of questioning. Local organisations are increasingly coming under the umbrella of larger organisations which stimulate research and mutual collaboration, for instance the *Union européenne d'Études et d'Études de l'Islam*, in Europe, and the *Middle East Studies Association* in North America. Besides larger meetings and congresses, workshops and colloquia of a new kind are organised on specialised subjects, with a restricted number of participants from different countries. A new type of research institute, specifically for Islamic Studies, with good libraries, has emerged, like the *Institute of Islamic Studies* at McGill University in Montreal. There are also several Centres dedicated to the study of Muslim-Christian relations: in Hartford, Ct., USA; in Birmingham, England; and the *Pontifical Institute of Arabic and Islamic Studies* in Rome.

There are, however, some worrying developments too. Current budget cuts in most Western countries threaten the standard of Islamic studies. There are several cases where financial assistance from Islamic foundations or Muslim countries has permitted chairs to survive. In the present unemployment situation it would be of great help if translation programmes like that of Tabari's *History* could be set up, funded by Muslim foundations or oil-producing states, where younger academics could usefully be employed.

Great care has to be taken that Western academic institutions continue to guarantee freedom of research and publication in the field of Islamsics as in other fields. In some notorious recent cases, for instance, pressure has been exerted by Muslim interest groups in connection with university appointments and publications. In other cases, excessively pedantic programming or the organisation of the study of Islam along rigid ideological lines have thwarted research and the emergence of fresh ideas. Academic Islamic studies ought not to serve particular interests but develop as an autonomous field of teaching and research.

Recent history has increased interest in the Middle East, Islam and the Islamic world, and this interest has become specialists. Among them a distinction has developed between those who carry out research on the so-called "hard", infrastructural sectors of Muslim societies (in particular social scientists) and those who study the so-called "softer" sectors of language and literature, art and history, culture and religion (in particular humanistic scholars). A distinction has also emerged between those specialists who work on specific Muslim societies, regions and periods, and those who work on particular cultural expressions like art or religion which are common to all Muslim regions. We indicate now, by way of example, some areas of research which have gained prominence since the Second World War.

First of all, precious bibliographical surveys of Islamic history have been published (Cl. Cahen, J.D. Pearson, J. Sauvaget) and manuscript resources brought together (F. Sezgin). Significant research has been going on to give the texts laid down to the rise of Islamic studies (H.A.R. Gibb, G.E. von Grunebaum, H. Laoust, B. Lewis). Within the realm of historical studies, social and economic history has developed rapidly (Cl. Cahen, M. Rodinson) and have also thrown new light on the beginnings of Islam and the history of Islamic thought (W. Montgomery Watt). The volume *Islamologie* (ed.)
F.M. Pareja) represents the field and the state of Islamic studies as conceived in the 1950s. Second, critical philological and literary analysis applied to the Kurān has led to new questions about its early history and composition (A. Neuwirth, J. Wansborough). Similarly, critical hadith research has provided further insight into the history, nature and function of this kind of literature (G.H.A. Juynboll) as well as its meaning and that of the Kurān as ‘Divine Word’ (W.A. Graham). New questions have been put concerning the early history of Islam (M. Cook, P. Crone). Equally, early Islamic thought has been analysed and certain basic positions identified (J. van Ess). Careful research on the semantics of religious terminology has proved rewarding for our understanding of the Kurān and other religious texts (T. Izutsu). Semiotic research has opened up basic structures in Islamic discourse and writing (M. Arkoun).

More attention has been given to the notion of the Muslim community (ummah) both in its ideal forms (L. Gardet) and in social reality (W. Montgomery Watt). This has led to further research both on the legal and social status of women within Muslim societies in the past and at present (G. Ascha, L. Beck-N. Keddie and many others), and on the legal and social status of the religious minority within Muslim communities in modern times (A. Faruqui, M.A. Fazlur Rahman, S.D. Goitein, A. Hourani, B. Lewis), and the functioning of religious institutions, in particular religious authorities (‘ulama’, Sūfī shaykhs) (N. Keddie) and religious education (G. Makdisi).

Extensive research has been carried out on Islam outside the heartlands of Islam, e.g., in the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent (A. Ahmad, A. Schimmel, W.C. Smith) and Africa (J. Cuq, J. Spencer Trimingham). A field which hardly existed before the Second World War, for various reasons, and which has expanded tremendously, is that of contemporary developments in Islam. General surveys have become rare (H.A.R. Gibb, W.C. Smith, W. Ende-U. Steinbach); specialisation has become the rule here too. Attention has continued to be paid to popular Islam (L.R. and H. Kriss) as well as sectarian forms of communal Islam (Klaus E. Müller), devotional practices (C. Padwick) and mysticism (A. Schimmel). Islamic aspects of recent social history (J. Berque) and of political developments (O. Carré, J. Piscatori and many others) in the Arab world and elsewhere have attracted ever more interest. This is also true for the developments of jāhiz in modern times (M. Gilsenas, F. de Jong) and of reform and modernisation movements (A. Hussain, M.H. Kerr and others) as well as the Muslim Brotherhood (R.P. Mitchell).

Due to recent developments in Iran and elsewhere, Shi‘i Islam has become an area of renewed interest (first of all H. Corbin, later S.H. Nasr for its gnostic aspects; H. Enayat, K.H. Göbel and others for political thought), as has the more recent history of Iran (N. Keddie, A.K.S. Lambton).

The most noteworthy and innovating contribution to our knowledge of present-day living Islam, however, has probably been made by anthropologists specialised in particular Muslim regions (C. Geertz, E. Gellner, M. Gilsenas and others) or surveying the various Muslim peoples (R.V. Weckes).

An area of research which is developing rapidly is that of the study of different religions existing side by side in the same region, for instance the Middle East (A.J. Arberry) and the Indian Subcontinent (W.C. Smith). Questions have been raised about the relationships and interaction between Muslim and other religious communities in history (W.C. Smith) and the development of knowledge in the Muslim world about other religions and the formation of images about them (G. Monnom, J. Waardenburg). The relationships between the Muslim world and Europe have been the subject of historical and comparative studies (M. Canard, G.E. von Grunebaum, A. Hourani, B. Lewis).

The study of Muslim minorities outside the Muslim countries has become a new area of research, especially since the migration of Muslim workers to Europe and the establishment of mainly Turkish and North African communities there (F. Dassetto, T. Gerholm-Yngve G. Lithman, G. Kepel, J.S. Nielsen, H. Safar and others).

New orientations

The question should be raised, to what extent the general scholarly view of Islam has changed in the last decades, not only in the expansion of its subject areas and themes of research but also in the way in which Islam and Muslim societies and cultures as a whole are approached? Or more precisely, has our view of Islam changed intrinsically since the classical times of Goldziher and Snouck Hurgronje, say since the First World War? The answer must be affirmative.

In the first place, breakthroughs have been achieved thanks to the innovations of some prominent scholars: L. Massignon revealing the presence of largely unknown spiritual forces in Islam; G.E. von Grunebaum stressing fundamental analogies between mediaeval cultural expressions in the Muslim, Byzantine and Latin worlds; W.C. Smith affirming first the role of class and the national independence struggle in Muslim presentations of Islam and then Islam’s specific kind of faith and its taking shape in various ways; C. Geertz and others calling attention to basic patterns and variations of meaning within Muslim societies; M.G.S. Hodgson writing a new kind of overall history of “the venture of Islam” within world history; and M. Rodinson urging a reconsideration of aims and tools of research in Islamic studies and, on the basis of infrastructural factors, throwing new light on Islamic ideologies developed in history and at the present time.

In the second place, the rise of independent Muslim nation states has brought about an important change in perspective. If older generations of Islamicists customarily regarded contemporary Islam as void of political expression and Muslim societies as developing according to the needs and directives of the West, researchers who started their work after the Second World War, in the fifties, sixties and seventies, have inevitably developed very different views of today’s Muslim world, stressing its own internal dynamics.

In the third place, Muslims themselves have asserted their Islamic identity during the last decades in ways that were hardly imagined in the fifties. Such self-assertion in words and deeds, including intense political action, can no longer be interpreted simply as a rebellion against Western law and order. It has its own impetus and since the mid-sixties and still more the late seventies it has had unforeseen effects both political and religious, resisting various current forms of domination. Muslim Islamicists (Fazlur Rahman, Muhammad Arkoun) working in Western universities have given their own interpretations of such developments, M. Arkoun pleading for an applied islamology. Once-aloof Western scholars, too, have become alert to new responsibilities, scholarly and social.

All of this has led to a certain shift in perspective on Islam and the Muslim world at large, with its natural
implications for the development of scholarly research. We may summarise this change of perspective by trying to identify roughly three successive phases since the Second World War which have each implied a new orientation towards Islam.

a. The first phase is that immediately following the colonial period. Scholars in the forties and fifties tended to be very aware of the effects of Western culture in the broadest sense on Muslim societies, which had just been liberated from Western political dominance. The focus of attention was on processes of modernisation, sometimes simply put on a par with "westernisation". Islam was seen as an ancient tradition which seemed to be losing ground under the influence of the rather secular-minded national leaders after independence. Perhaps Von Grunebaum's interpretation of modern Islam as a search for cultural identity (1962) can be seen as representative of this orientation which, in any case, took a positive attitude towards the future of the Muslim world whose own historical and cultural identity it recognised. It thus distinguished itself from the more pessimistic views of scholars of the colonial period such as Snouck Hurgronje, who saw a future only in assimilation to the West.

b. The second phase started when scholars observed that profound and radical economic and social changes were taking place in Muslim countries, often after internal revolutions. Researchers on contemporary Muslim societies became attentive to the use of Islam as a social ideology justifying necessary or desired social changes. Islam, instead of being a hangover from the past, was being used to effect by influential leaders like Gamal Abd al-Nasir. The adjective "Islamic", far from suggesting something antiquated, was serving to connect present-day solutions with hallowed, age-old religious tradition. Scholars came to realise that processes and events in Muslim countries should be studied not only in terms of Western theories but also within their own cultural framework, in which they became more meaningful. The social functions of Islamic ideas and practices, the basis of changing interpretations of Islam, the social basis of an Islamic religious tradition, or institutions legitimated by religion, all became subjects of research. Scholars became aware that elements of Islam could convey political, social and religious meanings simultaneously, and that particular ideologisations of Islam, or chosen Islamic ideas and practices, could appeal explicitly to specific groups in particular circumstances. In short, there was a discovery of Islam as a social ideology, and social scientists started to cooperate in building on this discovery in research on Islam.

c. With the self-affirmation of Islam not only as a social but as a religious ideology, a new phase started. This may be dated broadly speaking from the late sixties in the Middle East and it then spread throughout the Muslim world as a whole. As a result, scholarly attention has come to be directed more towards Islam as a religion and faith which is appealed to in different ways according to country and group. While recognised as a religion providing its own absolute norms and values, Islam is then seen not only as an instrument of political action but also as an instance of appeal against various kinds of injustice, economic deprivation and political oppression. In this phase, the contribution of the study of religion is needed to lay bare the religious aspects, amongst others, of present-day appeals to Islam.

To ensure that scholarly standards are maintained and intellectual rigour is preserved when religion is the object of inquiry, the following remarks are in order.

First of all, Islam is not an empirical piece of data in the same way as a text, a practice or even an ideal which is subjected to the scrutiny of scholarly enquiry. The way in which Islam, in research, is conceptualised, what is held to be the reality of Islam, and whether the scholarly concept of religion (and of Islam) used is simply descriptive or also normative, largely depends on the theoretical framework within which a particular scholar is working. The variability of frameworks and point of departure explains the fact of continuous discussions taking place amongst orientalists, between Muslims and orientalists, and among Muslims themselves about what is to be understood by Islam.

Second, when we address our research to the interpretations which Muslims themselves have given of Islam as a religion, some hermeneutical warnings are in order. Scholars as well as believers have often tended to reify Islam, forgetting that we have to do not with an "Islam" in itself but always with an interpreted Islam and that, throughout history, the Muslim community has kept this interpretative process going. Accordingly, special attention should be paid to what Muslim authors, speakers, groups and movements, either explicitly or when they may as well, interpret themselves in particular situations in terms Islamic or with an appeal to Islam. In such research we should free ourselves as much as possible from current interpretations, applications or explanations or Islam, both Western and Muslim.

What can the study of religion contribute to a better grasp of the religious aspects of Islam and Muslim societies and cultures? Islam as a religion, in the strict sense of the word, can probably best be called a network of signs; when such signs are internalised, they become symbols. The Kur'ân itself hints at such an interpretation, for Islam, according to it, is supposed to constitute the right human response to the āyāt that mankind has been provided with, notably in the Kur'ân, in nature, and in history. These āyāt are considered to be nexus points of divine revelation and human reflection and Muslims are enjoined to draw the right conclusions from them and to act accordingly. But even apart from this, a scholar of Islam as a religion will study its elements (Kur'ân verses, ābadāt, ritual prescriptions, living traditions, etc.) as signs and symbols. His enquiry will concern the various ways in which particular Muslim persons and groups in specific situations have interpreted these elements of Islam and the ways in which they have acted.

Insofar as this scholarly approach runs parallel to a notion of religion present in the Kur'ân, it avoids stamping Islamic data with inadequate Western-influenced concepts, while remaining scientific. A study of Islam as a network and reservoir of signs and symbols, constantly interpreted and applied by individual members and groups of the community, reveals certain texts and practices as permanent vehicles of meaning; these permit communication between Muslims despite varying circumstances of place and time. By approaching Islam as a communicative, religious sign and symbol system, we avoid the one extreme of searching for an eternal essence of Islam and reifying it as well as the other extreme of denying any spiritual reality to Islam as measured against the material world. The focus of attention from the point of view of the study of religions should be the interpretations and usages which Muslims have made and made of "their" Islam and its elements. This is fruit-
ful to understand, for instance, what particular Muslims mean when they speak of applying the mustashrikun, establishing an Islamic state, or going back to the sources of Islam.

5. Needs and suggestions

The community of the mustashrikun has become ever more varied and, from the inside, this diversity is just the opposite of what their opponents ascribe to them. They are anything but an ideological bloc, and their present discourse is anything but spellbound by a magic Orient. Present-day conflicts and tensions in and around Muslim countries, particularly in the Middle East, make it nearly impossible for serious, hard working scholarship to float away on the clouds of the Orient or anywhere else.

The subject-matter of Islamic studies has become much less clearly identifiable among mustashrikun now than in former times, when orientalists were less specialised and Muslims ideologised Islam less. For a long time, a more or less stable image of Islam existed in scholarly research, as a historical reality and a set of doctrines and practices (J. Waardenburg, L'Islam dans le miroir de l'Occident, 1970). This image has been broken by the course of history and the progress of specialised scholarly research. At the same time, new religious, ideological, political and other "readings" of Islam have arisen, of very different kinds, so that one may speak also of a growing plurality of interpretations of Islam among Muslims.

One of the most pressing problems on a more theoretical level is the way in which any particular (Muslim) interpretation and application of (elements of) Islam is related to the particular historical and social context in which it occurs. How should the study of specific Muslim societies in the past and at present be linked to the study of Islam as a subject of an ongoing process of interpretation? Second, a certain rigid "model" view of Muslim societies is being replaced by a view which allows for a much more precise and differentiated observation of them, their social history and their corresponding articulations of Islam.

A solution to this problem, at least on a theoretical level, seems to be within reach. For one thing, a certain fixed "reifying" or essentialist view of Islam is being replaced by a study of Islam as a subject of an ongoing process of interpretation. Second, a certain rigid "model" view of Muslim societies is being replaced by a view which allows for a much more precise and differentiated observation of them, their social history and their corresponding articulations of Islam.

Another need in Islamic studies and Oriental studies generally is for scholars to acquaint themselves more than before with certain new developments in the human sciences, including the science of religion, which take place across the borders between the disciplines. Too exclusive a devotion to philology, history or anthropology leaves little time for enquiry about what happens in other disciplines and what can be learnt from them. It also increases the risk of Oriental studies being cultivated as a ghetto apart from and somehow backward compared to other fields of scholarship.

Again, the field of Islamic studies as well as the study of non-Western societies and cultures in general would also greatly benefit if research problems were to be formulated on a somewhat higher level of abstraction than is done in the day-to-day "technical" work. More reflection on problems of method and theory of research would certainly facilitate cooperation between Islamic studies and other fields of scholarship, including science of religion.

Finally, it may be suggested that, now that the classical image of Islam as a more or less closed entity of religion and culture has been broken, efforts be made to place Islamic history, societies and religious expressions within the broader history of mankind, the manifold human societies, and the large number of man's religious expressions. Special attention can be paid to historical interactions, and to similarities and differences by means of comparative research. In order to understand contemporary developments in Muslim societies, it will be useful to place them within the broader context of contemporary developments of Asian and African societies generally.
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Under the Mongols, the title was given to the superintendent of provincial finances (e.g., Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfi; see HAMD ALLAH MUSTAWFI). The Persian metres, as found in the works of several early poets such as Djalal al-Dīn Rūmī (604-72/1207-73), Amir Khusraw d-dajsh (1782-1859) composed a number of mustāzdīs based on this short line in the muṣṭawfī 'l-mamdlik. The different varieties of mustāzdī may be distinguished not only by their basic ghazal or rubāʾī forms, but also by their rhyme scheme. In the majority of cases, the rhyming in the mustāzdī is of two kinds. The first category consists of poems in which the rhyme in the short line corresponds with that of the main hemistich; while the other category is comprised of examples wherein the short line has a rhyme of its own independent of the main hemistich.

The mustāzdī has remained a sparsely-used form, presumably because of its unorthodox character. One of the underlying principles of Arabic-Persian prosody is that all the lines in a given poem should be in one metre and conform to the same metrical length. Accordingly, the mustāzdī, with its mingling of long and short lines, does not fit into the general pattern, and could not but remain an exception in a poetic tradition constructed by rigid conventions.

Perhaps the earliest known mustāzdī in Persian (incidentally a deviation from the metrical rule described in the beginning) is one which was written by Masʿūd-i Saʿd-i Salmān (d. 515/1121) (cf. Dīwan-i Masʿūd-i Saʿd-i Salmān, ed. Rashld Yasimi, Tehran 1318 sh. 1399, 561). Sporadic examples of the mustāzdī are found in the works of several early poets such as Djalal al-Dīn Rūmī (604-72/1207-73), Amir Khusraw d-dajsh (1782-1859) composed a number of mustāzdīs based on this short line in the muṣṭawfī 'l-mamdlik. The different varieties of mustāzdī may be distinguished not only by their basic ghazal or rubāʾī forms, but also by their rhyme scheme. In the majority of cases, the rhyming in the mustāzdī is of two kinds. The first category consists of poems in which the rhyme in the short line corresponds with that of the main hemistich; while the other category is comprised of examples wherein the short line has a rhyme of its own independent of the main hemistich.

The mustāzdī has remained a sparsely-used form, presumably because of its unorthodox character. One of the underlying principles of Arabic-Persian prosody is that all the lines in a given poem should be in one metre and conform to the same metrical length. Accordingly, the mustāzdī, with its mingling of long and short lines, does not fit into the general pattern, and could not but remain an exception in a poetic tradition constructed by rigid conventions.

Perhaps the earliest known mustāzdī in Persian (incidentally a deviation from the metrical rule described in the beginning) is one which was written by Masʿūd-i Saʿd-i Salmān (d. 515/1121) (cf. Dīwan-i Masʿūd-i Saʿd-i Salmān, ed. Rashld Yasimi, Tehran 1318 sh. 1399, 561). Sporadic examples of the mustāzdī are found in the works of several early poets such as Djalal al-Dīn Rūmī (604-72/1207-73), Amir Khusraw d-dajsh (1782-1859) composed a number of mustāzdīs based on this short line in the muṣṭawfī 'l-mamdlik. The different varieties of mustāzdī may be distinguished not only by their basic ghazal or rubāʾī forms, but also by their rhyme scheme. In the majority of cases, the rhyming in the mustāzdī is of two kinds. The first category consists of poems in which the rhyme in the short line corresponds with that of the main hemistich; while the other category is comprised of examples wherein the short line has a rhyme of its own independent of the main hemistich.

The mustāzdī has remained a sparsely-used form, presumably because of its unorthodox character. One of the underlying principles of Arabic-Persian prosody is that all the lines in a given poem should be in one metre and conform to the same metrical length. Accordingly, the mustāzdī, with its mingling of long and short lines, does not fit into the general pattern, and could not but remain an exception in a poetic tradition constructed by rigid conventions.

Perhaps the earliest known mustāzdī in Persian (incidentally a deviation from the metrical rule described in the beginning) is one which was written by Masʿūd-i Saʿd-i Salmān (d. 515/1121) (cf. Dīwan-i Masʿūd-i Saʿd-i Salmān, ed. Rashld Yasimi, Tehran 1318 sh. 1399, 561). Sporadic examples of the mustāzdī are found in the works of several early poets such as Djalal al-Dīn Rūmī (604-72/1207-73), Amir Khusraw d-dajsh (1782-1859) composed a number of mustāzdīs based on this short line in the muṣṭawfī 'l-mamdlik. The different varieties of mustāzdī may be distinguished not only by their basic ghazal or rubāʾī forms, but also by their rhyme scheme. In the majority of cases, the rhyming in the mustāzdī is of two kinds. The first category consists of poems in which the rhyme in the short line corresponds with that of the main hemistich; while the other category is comprised of examples wherein the short line has a rhyme of its own independent of the main hemistich.
AL-MUSTAZHIR BI'LLĀH, ABU 'L-CABBAS

AHMAD, 'Abbâsîd caliph, was born in Shawwal 4707 April-May ... a further Syrian delegation to Baghdad.
Mawdud was finally sent out against the Crusaders (Ibn al-Athir, x, 340).

AHMAD, Abbasid caliph, was born in Shawwal

Al-Mustazhir's

the work usually known as the Kitâb al-Mustazhirî, in which he set out to prove the legitimacy of the 'Abbâsî caliphate and to refute the claims of the Ismâ'îlî imamsate (this is confirmed by Ibn al-Djâwîz, ix, 170). On the other hand, it is evident from the sources that in the years after his death, he was never to be in the position to obtain the regalia of the caliphate as Munkidh had been in 496/1102-3. 

The role and importance of al-Mustazhir's officials remain imprecise, although a number of names are mentioned in the sources. The office of caliph's wa'azî was still dominated by the Banû Djihrî (q. v.). At the beginning of his reign, al-Mustazhir reappointed 'Amid al-Dawla Ibn Djihrî, who had served two preceding caliphs in the post (Ibn al-Djâwîz, ix, 82). He was, however, arrested in Ramađân 493/July-August 1100 (probably at the instigation of Barkyârik and his Saldjuk activities whilst allowing the caliph no scope for political autonomy. On one occasion only was there a hint of military aggression on the part of the caliph. When news of Barkyârik's high-handed treatment of Salmun of Dihîyân came to Baghdad, the caliph announced his desire to fight alongside Muhammad Tapar against Barkyârik. This suggestion was rejected very firmly by Muhammad (Ibn al-Djâhîr, x, 225). Despite the unstable political situation, al-Mustazhir managed, however, to emerge intact from the many, often threatening visits to Baghdád made by the different pretenders to the western Saldjuk sultanate and to co-exist uneasily with the various high-handed claims sent (often concurrently) by the three Saldjuk princes to police the caliphal capital during their absences. Described in the sources as malleable, al-Mustazhir tried at times to play the rôle of peacemaker and to humour the claimants to the Saldjuk throne.

Initially, he juggled adroitly with the numerous requests by the Saldjuk princes to be mentioned in the khutba at Baghdád but in the end he knew how to carry out the decision of the eventual victor, Muhammad Tapar (Ibn al-Djâhîr, x, 210). In 495/1101-2 the Saldjuk brothers Muhammad and Sandjar (q. v.), unhappy with Barkyârik's rule (al-Husaynî, 77), were received in solemn ceremony by al-Mustazhir clad in full caliphal regalia. Al-Mustazhir honoured both Muhammad and Sandjar with the gifts customary to the rank of sultan and he then had the khutba pronounced in Muhammad's name (ibid.; Bundarf (sub anno 496), 261; Ibn al-Djâwîz, ix, 130; Ibn Khallîkân, quoting the lost Saldjuk history of al-Hamadhâni, tr. de Slane, iii, 233).

The struggle between Muhammad and Barkyârik continued, however (in 496/1102-3 the caliph seems to have been temporarily unsure as to which candidate to support and omitted any reference whatsoever to the sultan in the khutba (Ibn al-Djâhîr, x, 245; Ibn al-Djâwîz, ix, 132)). Stability was finally secured with the death of Barkyârik in 498/1105.

The disturbed period of al-Mustazhir's caliphate favoured intensified activity from the Assassins, although Muhammad Tapar, once firmly established in power after 498/1105, made determined efforts to quell them. At the very beginning of al-Mustazhir's reign, al-Muktafirî, on the evidence of the sources (44), had been commissioned by the caliph himself to write the work usually known as the Kitâb al-Mustazhirî, in which he set out to prove the legitimacy of the
Al-Mustazhir is praised in the sources in conventional panegyrical terms. He is described as a poet and fine calligrapher. He also sponsored new building programmes. In Rabi‘ II 488/April-May 1095 he began building the wall of the harim which comprised a large part of eastern Bagdad (Ibn al-Athir, x, 172; Ibn al-Djawi, ix, 85). Later, between 503/1109 and 507/1113, he built a new palace known as the Dar al-Rayhaniyyin (for a detailed description, cf. Le Strange, 272-3). Al-Mustazhir died of a throat tumour 4 months after sultan Muhammad on 16 Rabi‘ II 512/6 August 1118 aged 41. His body was washed by Ibn ‘Akl and prayers were recited over him by his son and waqf ‘ash, the future caliph al-Mustarshid [q.v.]. Al-Mustazhir was buried initially in the caliphal palace. Later, his body was moved to the Rusa‘a cemetery alongside his caliphal predecessors. Ibn al-Athir wryly observes that as with the deaths of Alp Arslan and Malikshah, which were quickly followed by those of the caliphs al-Ka‘im and al-Muktadi, the caliph Al-Mustazhir died very shortly after sultan Muhammad (x, 375).


According to the Arabic account, the reason why Muhammad sent 3,000 men to this region was that an envoy whom he had sent to the king (presumably the imperial governor of Bosra) had been killed by a Qhasanid, but the real reason seems to have been that he wished to bring the (Christian or pagan) Arabs living there under his control. If the story is correct that he chose three leaders for the expedition, Zayd b. Harihça [q.v.] and, if he fell, his cousin Da‘far b. Abi Thalib [q.v.] and, if he also fell, the poet ‘Abd Allâh b. Rawâhâ [q.v.], he must have fully recognised the hazardous nature of the enterprise; but the tendency of the stories to describe the dangers of the expedition and the overwhelming nature of the opposing force as very great in order to put the unfortunate result of the battle in a better light is quite evident. In the divan of Hassân b. Thâbit (xxi, cf. cxvi) we are only told that the three leaders above mentioned fell in succession. When the Muslims arrived in Ma‘addon in eastern Jordan, they learned that no less than 100,000 Byzantine soldiers and Bedouins—a much exaggerated figure which Ibn Hishâm doubles—had assembled in Ma‘âb. Musil (Arabica petraea, i, 29) located this Ma‘âb, which according to al-Tabârî, i, 2108, was not a town but a camp (fustat), at Ladjâjun [q.v.], a place near a spring with traces of an old Roman camp. But Abu ‘l-Fidâ‘ identifies it with al-Rabba which he describes as a village on the site of the former capital of the rûfis (Arabica petraea, i, 2108), the quraysh al-Masbâhid (P. Thomes, Loca sancta, 25; Brünnow, in MNDPV [1895], 70-1, with photographs; Musil, op. cit., 370 ff., 381).

According to the Arabic story, it was the emperor Heraclius himself who assembled this great army in Ma‘äb, which is of course not true. When the Muslims heard this, we are told, they lost courage and wanted to wait until the Prophet could send them reinforcements, but ‘Abd Allâh b. Rawâhâ was able to fill them with such enthusiasm for a possible martyr’s death that they marched on the imperial army. According to Ibn Hishâm, the latter met them at a village of the Balka‘ called Maghârîb, but this must be a misunderstanding, as this term means the Syrian fortresses on the edge of the desert. At the sight of the great force of the enemy, they withdrew to the south, but fighting began at the village of Mu‘ata and they were routed. When the three leaders named by Muhammad had fallen in the order indicated, they wanted Thâbit b. Arkân to take command but he gave it to Khâlid b. al-Walid, who succeeded in saving the rest of the force; this was the first occasion on which his military talents benefited the Muslims; how he did it, we do not know, as the strategem related by al-Wâkidî, tr. Wellhausen, 312, is not to be taken seriously.

Besides the Muslim account we have a Byzantine one, the earliest in the history of the Prophet, by the historian Theophanes, whose version bears the stamp of veracity. According to him, Muhammad sent four chiefs to the land east of Jordan against the Christian Arabs there. They went, to a village named Mucheon, which M.J. de Goeje, Mémories sur la conquête de la Syrie, 6 ff., takes to be a copyist’s error for Ma‘âb, while Musil, op. cit., 153, identifies it with Khîrêl al-Mahma which lies in a broad depression, in order to fall upon the Arabs on a feastday (عُطَرَةٌ تَيُّنُ أَنَّ دُوَّارُ الكُنَّة) which seems to indicate a heathen rather than a Christian population), but the vicarius Theodorus there learned of their plans and, rapidly collecting the garrisons of the fortresses, fell upon the Muslims and defeated them. Most of the five leaders and most of the force were killed, and
Chalebos, who was called the “sword of God”, alone succeeded in escaping. The tombs of the martyrs who fell there used to be pointed out at Muṭa, where a mausoleum was built over them.


---

**MUTA** (א), literally, “enjoyment”, used in Islamic law in the sense of temporary marriage (according to the Arab lexicographers “marriage of pleasure”), a marriage which is contracted for a fixed period on rewarding the woman.

I. Before Islam. According to Ammianus Marcellinus, xiv, 4, 4, temporary marriage was in use among the Arabs already in the 4th century A.D.; but this can hardly be a reference to muṭaʾ, as the woman brings a lance and tent to the man and can leave him if she likes after the period has elapsed. It is also doubtful if there is a distinct muṭaʾ character in the marriage of Hāshim b. Salma bintʾAmr, whom he married during a temporary stay in Yathrib and left with her family there after the birth of her child (Caetani, i, 111, § 92). From the passage in Aḥadārān, xvi, 65 (muṭiʿiṣiḥ bāḥaʿ l-laylat) as well as from Muslim traditions, it may be concluded that muṭaʾ was known in the Ḍaiḥiliyya. If we remember that the same kind of temporary marriage as muṭaʾ was known in Eṣṭaryea (Conti Rossini, *Principi di diritto consuetudinario*, Rome 1916, 189, 249), it seems certain that muṭaʾ is an old Arabian institution. (Temporary marriage is also attested among other peoples; cf. Wilken, 21-2; Westermann, *History of human marriage*, London 1925, iii, 267-8; cf. also the ṣuyūfīs of Ḥarmān, which are in part referred to the conquest of Mecca (Muslim, Nikāh, trs. 21, 24, 25, 27, 28; al-Dārīmī, Nikāḥ, bāb 16; Ahmad b. Hanbal, iii, 404, 405), and in part to the farewell pilgrimage (Ibn Mādīq, Nikāḥ, bāb 44; al-Dārīmī, Nikāḥ, bāb 16; Ahmad b. Hanbal, iii, 404-5). Their substance is as follows. The Prophet permitted muṭaʾ; Sabra therefore went with a companion to a woman and each offered her his cloak. She chose the younger with the shabbier cloak and slept three nights with him; thereupon the Prophet forbade it. According to the stories associated with the Farewell Pilgrimage, the woman wished muṭaʾ only for a fixed period, so that ten days or nights was agreed upon, but the Prophet forbade it after the first night, saying “Whoever of you has married a woman for a period, shall give her what he promised and ask nothing of it back and he shall separate from her; for God has forbidden this up to the day of resurrection”. (For the conclusion, cf. also the fragments of this in Muslim, Nikāḥ, trs. 23, 30.)

According to a second group of traditions, which goes back to Ibn b. Ṣawdaʾ and his companion Abū Al-Ākwaʾ, the Prophet permitted muṭaʾ for three days on a campaign (al-Bukhārī, Nikāḥ, bāb 71; Muslim, Nikāḥ, trs. 14, 15; Ahmad b. Hanbal, iv, 47, 51; according to Muslim, Nikāḥ, tr. 19, and Ahmad b. Hanbal, iv, 55, this was in the year of Awtās, i.e., shortly after the capture of Mecca). In al-Bukhārī we have at the end of the “The partnership of the two parties lasted three nights; and if they agreed to extend it, they did so; and if they wished to separate, they did so”. A prohibition is given only in two versions in this group.

According to other traditions, muṭaʾ was first forbidden by the caliph ʿUmar at the end of his caliphate (Muslim, Nikāḥ, trs. 16-18; Ahmad b. Hanbal, iii, 304, 300, and iii, 325, 356, 363, where there is a reference to the two kinds of muṭaʾ, i.e., *muṭaʾa* on the pilgrimage and muṭaʾ as *muṣāmeh*). ʿUmar threatened the punishment of stoning, so that he regarded muṭaʾ as fornication (Ibn Mādīq, Nikāḥ, bāb 44; Muslim, Nikāḥ, tr. 42; al-Ṭayālīsī, no. 1792). Cf. the angry exclamation of Ibn ʿUmar when he was asked about muṭaʾ: “By Allāh, we were not immodest in the time of the Prophet of Allāh nor fornicators” (Ahmad b. Hanbal, ii, 95, 104).

What, then, is the state of the bottom of these contradictory traditions? While Wellhausen regards muṭaʾ as simply prostitution and not an old Arabian custom, Caetani points out that the traditions agree in connecting muṭaʾ
with an entrance of the Prophet into Mecca and some-
times even with the Hadj. and that a three days' dura-
tion is necessary; the man (mut'a) taking account of other
considerations, he concludes that mut'a in the pagan
period was religious prostitution on the occasion of the
Meccan festival. However tempting this explanation may
be, there is a complete lack of evidence for any
religious prostitution in Mecca. With Wilken and
Robinson Smith, we must rather regard mut'a as the
survival into Islam of an old Arabian custom. The
Prophet gives this custom sanction in the Kur'ān and
also practiced it himself. The traditions, if examined
carefully, only mention two cases of prohibition by the
Prophet: Khaybar and Mecca. As both these are later
than the above Kur'ānic passage (years 3-5, according
to Nölecke-Schwally, G. des Qu., i, 198) this prohibi-
tion would be quite possible. But since on the other
hand the 'Umar prohibited mut'a, which there is
no reason to doubt, we might regard the tradition of
prohibition as representing later views, which, as is
often the case, are put back to the time of the Prophet.

IV. Attitude of the fuṣūkā'. Ibn 'Abbās (d. 68)
is an ardent champion of mut'a (al-Bukhārī, Nikāh,
bōb 31; Muslim, Nikāh, tr. 18; al-Tayyālīsì, no. 1792;
Fākhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, Muṣaffāt al-aghay, Cairo 1324,
iii, 195). In Mecca and the Yaman, according to Ibn
Rughd (Bidāya, Cairo 1339, ii, 54), he also had fol-
dowed mut'a; but he had been converted to the opposite view (al-Tirmīdhī, Nikāh, bōb 28; al-Rāzī, loc. cit.). In later times, people still
spoke derivatively of a marriage by a fatawa of Ibn
'A Abbas. In the second half of the 1st century in
Mecca, fatawa were still given permitting mut'a
(Muslim, Nikāh, tr. 29). The Kur'ān commentators
Muṣājātī, (d. 100), Sa'd b. Dīyab (d. 95), and al-
Suddī (d. 127) also referred the above verse of the
Kur'ān to mut'a. Al-Suddī says that it is a marriage for
a fixed period and that it should be concluded with the
permission of the woman and with two witnesses; that
after the expiry of this period the man has no longer
any claim on the woman and that the two parties can-
not inherit from one another; but according to some,
and with two witnesses; that

V. The teachings of the Imāmī. 1. Form.
Mut'a is an irrevocable (lāzim) contract which, like
every contract, comes into existence through kābūl and
ṣi'dah. It may be concluded without words, but the words nikāh,
tawāzīd or tamattu', but must always contain a precise
statement of the period (aqdīs) and a definite recompense
(adgī or mahīr). This recompense may be the dowry usual in other marriages or a handful of
corn, a dirham or such-like. The period may vary from
a day to months or even years. Witnesses are not
necessary; nor need it be concluded before the kābūl,
if the parties are capable of using the formulae cor-
correctly. If the mahīr is not given, the contract is invalid;
if the period is not given, according to some it is a
regular marriage provided that the word tamattu' was
not used at the end of the ceremony; in the latter case,
the contract is again invalid.

2. The two partners must naturally fulfill the usual
criteria for the conclusion of an agreement.

The woman must further be unmarried and chaste
('afīja) and, if possible, ought to know about mut'a,
i.e., be a Shī'ī, and can only contract a temporary marriage with a Muslim. According to Ibn Bābyūa
(d. 381/991) and al-Mufīd (d. 413/1022), mut'a with
an unbeliever is forbidden, even with a member of the
possessors of a scripture (kitābīyya). The nāsībīs
(extreme Kāshīdīs) are included among the
unbelievers. According to most Imāmīs (and Tāzīs
also), however, mut'a with a Christian or Jewish
woman is permitted but makruh with a magāṣīyya.
Mut'a with a slave-girl is only admitted with the con-
sent of her master. Usually, the woman contracts the
marriage without a wāli; only a virgin (bihir), accord-
ing to some, requires her father's consent (Abu ʿI-
Ṣalāḥ, d. 82; Ibn Bābyūa, Ibn al-Barrāq, d. 461; cf.
al-Hillī, iii, 92). The man may in this way take other
wives in addition to his four legal wives, especially on
journeys. He must not, however, take two sisters at
the same time, not even during the 'idda.

3. The mut'a ends on the expiry of the period agreed
upon. It cannot be prolonged by arrangement
between the two parties; a new temporary marriage with
a new mahīr must rather be contracted at the end of
the period. Divorce is impossible; according to some,
hūlū and zikār are permitted.

4. The woman possesses the law of the man and is not
expected to provide food and home for the woman. The two partners
cannot inherit from one another; but according to some,

inheri8ance may be provided for in the contract. The 'idda after the expiry of the mut'a is two menstrual periods or 45 days, i.e., the 'idda of a slave-girl. There is, however, disagreement whether on the man's death the period of waiting is the usual one for a wife or that for a slave. The children go with the father.

VI. Modern practice. Although these Shafi'i views have certainly a moral support, mut'a in many cases can only be described as legalised prostitution. It is true that in Persia such marriages are made for very long periods, e.g., 99 years, but the Persian, for very long periods, e.g., a year, and caravanserais mullahs and other brokers offer a wife to each new arrival. To make this business more profitable, the 'idda period is evaded by concluding a second temporary marriage with the same man after the expiry of the first, for in such cases a marriage the 'idda is not necessary. This marriage and a second temporary marriage with the same man after the expiry of the first, for in the case of such a marriage the period of waiting is the usual one for a wife.

The constantly-quoted story (first in Wilken, 19) of Alex. Hamilton (A new account of the East Indies, Edinburgh 1727, i, 51) that at the beginning of the 18th century temporary marriages were publicly negotiated in Souan (= 'San'a') in South Arabia and concluded before the kalâf, is a very improbable one, for Hamilton knew only the coast towns from his own observation and wrote his account of his travels later from memory. He seems to be confusing them with conditions in Persian towns, and he makes mistakes on other matters.

In Mecca, in modern as well as ancient times (for the Middle Ages, cf. Li8an al-'Arab: wa-mut'at al-ta8zwi bi-Makka minha), temporary marriages were concluded among the inhabitants of the Sana', but no legal opinion is said on this in the marriage contract or this would make it invalid; everything necessary is arranged previously by word of mouth. On the conclusion of the contract, the man utters the talâk formula with a time limit. Such agreements are as a rule kept (Snouck Hurgronje, Melka, ii, 156; Verspr. Geschriit, vi, 150). The same artifice is used in such cases as al-Shafi'i indicated long ago (cf. above).

In the early 20th century, marriages of this kind were still concluded at Deir ez-Zor in eastern Syria by Bedouins who came there temporarily to trade (V. Müller, En Syrie aux Bédouins, Paris 1931, 231-2).

Finally, it should be noted that mut'a is used in Islamic law in a quite different sense from that of 'temporary marriage' for the indemnity payable to a divorced wife where no mahr or dowry has been stipulated (Coulson, A history of Islamic law, 31-2; Schacht, An introduction to Islamic law, 167).


MUT'AARRIBA (a.), "those who seek to become Arabs", the term applied to the descendants of Kahtân (the Biblical Yoktan) who were regarded by the genealogists as "having become Arabs" in contrast to the supposedly indigenous "pure" Arab tribes like 'Ad, 'Thamud, etc. [see mut'A'.] They settled in South Arabia and adopted Arabic from the "pure" Arabs. The latter had learned it during the 21st century B.C. (BC), the only man who spoke Arabic in Noah's Ark (all the rest spoke Syriac), and his son-in-law Iram b. Sam b. Yasmam spoke Syriac), and his son-in-law Iram b. Sam b. Yasmam.

regent al-Muwaffak [q. v.] and a Greek slave-girl called Dirar, the date of his birth is unknown but was probably around 245/860. His father gave him a military training and from 267/880-1 he is found leading operations against the Zanj rebels [q. v.]. In 271/885 he suffered a humiliating defeat at the hands of the troops of Krumawawayh b. Ahmad b. Tullun [q. v.]. Relations between him and his father were not always cordial, and one occasion in 275/888-9 Ahmad actually ordered his arrest. The incident showed that the future caliph had already acquired his own military following, who now demonstrated and secured his release.

On his father's death in Safar 278/June 891, Abu 'l-'Abbas was given the honorific of al-Mu'tadid and inherited his father's position as second in line of succession to the caliphate after al-Mu'tamid's son, al-Mu'awwad. He also inherited his father's chief supporters, notably the wa'azir 'Ubayd Allah b. Sulaymân b. Wahb and the commander of his army Badr [see BADR AL-MU'TADID IN SUPPL.]. In Muharram 279/September 892 al-Mu'awwad was unceremoniously removed from his position as heir apparent, which then passed to al-Mu'tadid and six months later in Rajab 279/November 892 he became caliph without opposition on al-Mu'tamid's death.

Al-Mu'tadid's great strength was the close relations with the army which he had inherited from his father and the close and harmonious relations between civil and military leaders, and he was determined to use these assets to reassert the power of the 'Abbasid family. He led his armies in person and spent much of his reign on campaign. While he was forced to acknowledge that Khurrasan, Syria and Egypt were lost to the 'Abbasids, at least for the time being, he strove to re-establish control over the core territories, 'Irak and al-Djazira, so important as a source of grain for Baghdad, and western Persia.

In al-Djazira he was faced by the ruler of 'Amid, Ahmad b. Isâ b. Shâykh al-Shaybânî. In 280/893 he drove Ahmad out of Mawšût and retook the city, and in 286/899 he took 'Amid from Ahmad's son and successor Muhammad. He also secured the support of the Taghlibi chief Hamdân b. Hamdun, so, unwittingly, beginning the rise of the Hamdanid dynasty [see HAMDAYD].

In Persia, the keystone of al-Mu'tadid's policy was the development of a working relationship with 'Amr b. Layth [q. v.], the Sa'did leader, perhaps trying to recreate the sort of partnership which his predecessors had had with the Tahirids. The country was divided into spheres of influence, with the Sa'dids keeping Khurasan, the East and Fars, while the 'Abbasids controlled Rayy, Isfahan and the West. The 'Abbasids were unable to maintain themselves in Rayy, which was handed over to the Sa'dids in 284/897, but in the Isfahan area the last of the Dulafids, 'Umar b. Ahmad b. 'Abd al-'Azîz, was dispossessed in 283/896 and the city brought back under 'Abbasid rule. In 285/898 al-Mu'tadid appointed 'Amr as governor of Transoxania, but he was humiliatingly defeated by Isma'il al-Sāmānī and sent to Baghdad, where he was killed in prison in 289/902 immediately after the caliph's death.

'Ubayd Allah b. Sulaymân b. Wahb remained wa'azir until his death in 288/901 when he was replaced by his son al-Kâsim. The all-important finances of 'Irâk were managed by the Banu 'l-Furat [see IBN AL-Furat] until 286/899, when they were replaced by their arch-rivals the Banu 'l-Dâmrâr. Command of the army remained in the hands of the loyal Badr. His reign saw the final return of the 'Abbasid capital from Sâmarra to Baghdad, which had long been his father's base of operations against the Zanj. The geography of the city was altered, however, the new official quarter being on the east bank and downstream from the city of al-Mansûr and al-Mahdi. This was the new city which was to form the nucleus of modern Baghdad.

From 284/897 the authorities began to be troubled by Karmaj [q. v.] disturbances. In the early days these were essentially small-scale rebellions among the peasantry of the Sawâd of al-Kûfah but from 286/899 the Karmania leaders Abu Sâdîd al-Qânânî [q. v.] also controlled Bauhara and in 287/900 decisively defeated the 'Abbasid troops under al-'Abbâs b. 'Amr al-Qâhânâwî and took the provincial capital of Ḥâdjar. It was not until after the iron hand of al-Mu'tadid was removed, however, that the Karmaj became a serious threat.

Al-Mu'tadid died in Rabi' II 289/April 902. He had already secured the succession for his son al-Muktafi [q. v.], who had received a sound practical training as governor in Rayy and al-Djazira. By his military energy and determination he had greatly extended 'Abbasid power, but his reign was too short to reverse long-term trends and re-establish 'Abbasid power on a lasting basis.
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AL-MU'TADID BI 'LLAH, ABU 'AMR 'ABBÂD B. MUHAMMAD B. 'ABBÂD, the most important and most powerful sovereign of the 'Abbasid dynasty [q. v.] who reigned over the little kingdom formed by his father Abu 'l-Kâsim Muhammad b. 'Abbâd, with Seville [see IAMMIYA] as his capital, at the time of the break up of the Umayyad caliphate of Spain and the rise of the reyes de taifas (mulûk al-tawa'if) [q. v.]. In the course of a reign of more than 25 years (433-67/1042-69), he very considerably increased his territory by making himself the champion of the Spanish Arabs against the Berbers in Spain whose numbers, already very large in the 4th/10th century, had been much increased since the period of the 'Amridid dictators. When he succeeded his father, the new king of Seville, who was then 25, following the usual practice of the period, assumed the title of hâdjîb, and a little later the lakab of al-Mu'tadid bi 'llâh by which he is best known. Gifted with real political ability, he was not long in revealing his character, that of an autocratic ruler, ambitious and cruel and little scrupulous in the means which he used to achieve his ends. As soon as he came to the throne he continued the war begun by his father against the petty Berber ruler of Carmona [see KARMUNA], Muhammad b.
Abd Allah al-Birzali, then against the latter’s son and successor Isḥāk. At the same time, Al-Mu’tadid was extending his kingdom in the west between Seville and the Atlantic Ocean. It was with this object that he attacked and defeated successively Ibn Tayfūr, lord (jāhīb) of Mertola [see MIRTLA], and Muḥammad b. Yahyā al-Ŷashūbi, lord of Niebla (Ar. Labla [q.v.]), who in spite of his Arab descent had had the audacity to ally himself with the Berber chiefs. In face of these successes of the king of Seville, the other malāk aljawāzī [q.v.] who distrusted him formed a kind of league into which entered the principal of Badajoz [see BATJLAWYS], Algeciras [see AL-QAẒĪBA AL-KHADRA], Granada [see GHARNĀTA] and Málaga [see MĀLACA]. This soon became a war between the ‘Abbāsid of Seville and the Afṣāṣīd [q.v.] of Badajoz al-Muẓaffar [q.v.]; it was to last far many years in spite of the efforts at mediation by the Ḍawwarīd ruler of Cordova, which only achieved their end in 443/1051. Down to this year, while harassing the frontiers of the kingdom of Badajoz, Al-Mu’tadid displayed other activities; in succession he defeated Muḥammad b. Ayyūb al-Bakrī, lord of Huelva [see WALBA] and of Saltes [see QALṬAH] (whose son was the famous geographer), the Banū Muẓayyin, lords of Silves [see SIYL], and Muḥammad b. Sa’īd Ibn Ḥārūn, lord of Santa María de Algarve [see UKHSHUNUBA], and would go on till he had restored to him his former empire subdued and pacified in its integrity. In order not to be exposed to the cruelty of the king of Seville, the majority of the petty Berber chiefs settled in the mountains of the south of Andalusia, acquiesced in this make-believe and paid homage to the ‘Abbāsid and the Commander of the Faithful, miraculously restored to aid the cause of Al-Mu’tadid but at the same time carefully concealed by him. It was labour lost for them. One day, the ‘Abbāsid invited to his palace in Seville all these petty chiefs with their suites and put them to death by asphyxiating them in baths, the openings in which he walled up. In this way he took not only the capital city but the greater part of the Banū Khīḍrūn, Moron [see MAWBRÛ] defended by the Banū Dammār, and Ronda [see RUNDA], capital of the Banū Ifrān (445/1053). This aroused the wrath of the most powerful Berber ruler in Spain, Bádīs b. Ḥabbūs al-Zirīd [q.v.], who ruled in Granada and who alone seemed able to resist Al-Mu’tadid. The latter, however, found that fortune favoured him in this war, and a little later took Algeciras from the Hammūdīd al-Kāsim b. Hammūd. He next tried to seize Cordova, and sent an expedition against it in charge of his son Ismā‘īl; the latter tried to profit by the occasion to rebel and created for himself a kingdom with Algeciras as capital. This rash plan cost him his life, which his father took with his own hand, just as before him ʿAbd al-Rahmān III and al-Manṣūr b. Alī ʿAmīr had inflicted the supreme penalty on their unworthy sons. This was the beginning of the political career of Al-Mu’tadid’s other son Muḥammad al-Muṭamīd [q.v.], who was to succeed him on his death; by his father’s orders he went with an army to support the Arabs of Málaga, who had rebelled against the tyrannical rule of Bádīs, the despotic Berber of Granada. But the latter routined the Sevillan army, and Al-Mu’tadid took refuge in his mountain fortress of Thulā. After peace was concluded with the Ottomans in 959/1552, he took as an envoy of the Ottomans to reconcile the Frankish christians, exer-cising limited authority over districts northwest of Ṣan‘ā’. The progressive alienation of hitherto pro-Ottoman native elements by several poor Ottoman governors in succession encouraged Al-Muṭahhar to resume the offensive in 973/1566. Although by 976/1569 his followers had reduced the Turks to a small coastal enclave, within two years his fortunes were completely
reversed by a massive Ottoman force under Köprülü Pascha. Al-Mutahhar died in relative obscurity on 3 Rajab 989/November 1572.

Al-Mutahhar was imām only inasmuch as he excelled politically and military leadership. Both his congenital lameness and the fact that he was not a muqaddas (one learned in Zaydi doctrine and law) precluded his being recognised as a true imām like his father.

Bibliography: Two primary sources are Rawh al-dār (in the main) by 'Isā b. Lutf Allah (d. 1048/1638), the grandson of Al-Mutahhar; and Balk al-Yamānī (Ghazāyat al-durūsīa, ed. H. Dijāsīrī, Riyadh 1967) by al-Nahrwālī (d. 990/1582). Other Arabic ms. sources include Ibn Dā'irī, al-Futūhāt; Dīwān al-Din Muhammad, al-Sulāk al-dahabiyya; and al-Shihāb, al-Sandāl al-bāhir.


AL-MUTAHHAR B. TĀHIR (or al-Mutahhar) AL-MAKDISI, Abū Naṣr, the otherwise unknown author of an 'historical' encyclopedia called Kitāb al-Bad‘ wa l-ta‘īrīḥ composed at Bust [q.v.] around 355/966 at the prompting of an anonymous Sāmānī minister. Cl. Huart had the merit of bringing out of oblivion an eloquent piece of work which witnesses to the interest shown in the history of humanity, probably less in regard to actual events than in regard to culture, by mediaeval Muslims. Huart’s edition of this ‘historical’ one 1240/1825 to which the Arabic text of this and a French translation (Paris 1899-1919, repr. Baghdad 1962), and up to the sixth volume retained the title adopted originally of Liere de la Création et de l’histoire attribuée à Abou-Zeid al-Balkhi, when, thanks to the citations which al-Tha‘ālibī made to it, in his Kitāb al-Qurān, partial-ly tr. by H. Zosenberg in his Histoire des rois de Perse (Paris 1900), it was possible for him to identify the author and to rectify, in the prefaces to vols. ii, iii and iv his earlier error of attribution.

The K. al-Bad‘ wa l-ta‘īrīḥ recalls al-Mas‘ūdī’s [q.v.] Murūdī, but history here is envisaged from a more philosophical and certainly from a more critical point of view. The author displays a good knowledge of ancient and alien religions, whose cultural value he stresses without however ceasing to place Islam above them. He follows the usual order. Beginning with the creation of the world, he devotes the first three volumes—half of the whole work—to ancient history and to philosophical, theological, geographical, etc., considerations and does not reach a consideration of Islam until the fourth volume (cf. the parallel lay-out of al-Mas‘ūdī’s work, in which these earlier topics occupy only two volumes out of five), finally reserving a restricted place for the Umayyads and ‘Abbāsīds.

One inevitably wonders why this encyclopaedia, whose value is undeniable, should nevertheless have fallen into oblivion. It has remained unknown not on-ly to the Muslims (the extant mss. are all in Istanbul and al-Sāhāwī, e.g., does not cite it in his plā‘īn) but also to Orientalists (J. Sauvaget and Cl. Cahen do not make use of it either in their Introduction à l’histoire du monde musulman). Such a disdain may possibly arise precisely from the originality and free thought of a writer who seems to have maintained a certain independence and not to have been an adherent of any religious movement of the age when he lived. Al-Mutahhar mentions a work that he had written before the Bad‘, a Kūbih al-Mas‘ūdī (above all, at iii, 98) and another that he wrote further ones: K. al-Nafs wa l-ta‘īrīḥ (ii, 107/115), K. al-Dīvān wa l-amānī (i, 64/70-1) and K. al-Mā‘ṣūdī (i, 83/91).

Bibliography: Brockelmann, S 1, 222; F. Rosen-thal, A history of Muslim historiography, Leiden 1968, index; Sēqīn, Gās, i, 337; and above all, A. Mi-quel, La geographie humaine du monde musulman, i, Paris-The Hague 1967, p. xxxii, 211 ff. and the in-dices to the succeeding volumes. (Ed.)

MUṬAHHARI, AYATULLĀH MURTADĀ (1920-79), Iranian religious thinker, writer, and close associate of Ayatullah Khummānī, active in fostering the intellectual developments that contributed to the revolution of 1978-9. Born on 2 February 1920 in Farīman, about 60 km distant from Maqīhad, to a religious scholar who was also his first teacher, Muṭahhari began his formal schooling in Maqīhad at the age of twelve. He also attended the lectures of Ayatullah (then Husaynī) Khummānī on ethics and key texts of the traditional philosophy and mysticism that stayed with him throughout his life. In 1937 he moved to Kūr, where he remained for many years, studying fiqh and wizīl with Ayatullah Ḥududīj Khūkānī, Sayyid Muhammad Dāmād, Muhammad Kiāda Gulpāyagānī, Sadr al-Dīn Sadr, and — from 1944 onwards— Muhammad Husayn Burūqdi. He also attended the lectures of Ayatullah (then Ḥududīj al-Islām) Khummānī on ethics and key texts of theosophical tradition such as the lṣafīr al-arba‘a‘ of Mullā Ṣadrā and the Shāfī‘ī ma‘ṣūmān of Mullā Ḥādī Sabzawārī, thereby inaugurating an inti-mate relationship that was to last for the rest of his life. Of almost equal significance were Muṭahhari’s ties to the philosopher and exegete Ayatullah Sayyid Muhammad Ḥusaynī, then the head of the Shī‘a of Kūr, who provided him with the education that stayed with him throughout his life. In 1952, Muṭahhari left Kūr for Tehran, where he began teaching philosophy at the Madrasa-yi Marī, and two years later he also accepted an appointment at the Faculty of Theology and Islamic Sciences of Tehran University. The scope of his lecturing began transcending these two institutions when he started to collaborate first with the professional Islamic organisations that had been established by Mahdī Bāzargān and Ayatullah Tālibkānī, and then, in 1960, with the Andijan-i Māhānī-yi Dīnī (‘Monthly Religious Society’). Many of the lectures which he gave under the auspices of these groups were subsequently published in book form. Muṭahhari was also a leading figure in the Husaynī-yi Iṣkhāq, an in-stitution established in north Tehran in 1965 with the aim of gaining the allegiance of the secularly educated to Islam. The Husaynī-yi Iṣkhāq drew huge crowds to its functions, but Muṭahhari gradually and discreetly withdrew from its work, in large part because of difficulties of outlook, both ideological and political, with ‘Ali Shīrīfī, another of its leading members.

The first overt sign of Muṭahhari’s commitment to the struggle against the Shah’s régime came when he
was imprisoned for forty-three days in the aftermath of the uprising of 15 Khiirdad 1342/6 June 1963. After his release, he participated actively in the various organisations that sought to maintain the momentum which the uprising had created, most importantly the "Society of Militant Clergy". He remained in contact with Ayatollah Khomeyni throughout his fourteen-year exile, visiting him occasionally in Najaf and then, in the months leading up to the triumph of the revolution, at Neauphle-le-Château near Paris. He was accordingly named to the Sha'er-yi Inklâbi-î Islami ("Council of the Islamic Revolution") which administered the country after the overthrow of the Shah in February 1979, in uneasy tandem with the provisional government headed by Mahdi Bázargân. A few months later, on 1 May 1979, Mutahhari was assassinated in Tehran by adherents of Purkân, a group which espoused a radically modernistic reinterpretation of Shi'i doctrine and saw in Mutahhari its most formidable opponent. Mutahhari was eulogised by Khomeyni as "a part of my flesh" and buried in Kûm.

Mutahhari left behind a large and varied corpus of writing, much of it marked by his training as a theologian and philosopher and his devotion to the works of Mullâ Sadrâ. He was also guided, however, by the desire to present Islam as a coherent world-view, to elucidate its doctrine, and to clarify questions that had become controversial or a source of misunderstanding (such as the rights of women in Islam).
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(a) Life: M. Hoda, In memory of Murtaza Mutahhari, Tehran 1982; Muhammad Wa'iz-zâde Khûrâsânî, Sayrî dar zindagi-yi ši'î wa inklâbi-yi Usâid-i Ṣâhid Mutâdâ Mutahhari, in Yâdndma-yi Usâid-i Ṣâhid Mutâdâ Mutahhari, ed. 'Abd al-Karîm Surûh, Tehran 1360 sh./1981, 319-80; 'Ali Râbbâni Khâlkhâlî, Ṣâhidâ-yi Ṣâhibî-yi Râhîmî-yat-i Šâ'î dar yakûsâl-tâ-yi a ברû, Kûrû, 1402/1982, i, 345-52; Muqtâbâ Mutahhari, Zindagi-yi ïdâram, in Harakat (journal of the students at the Tehran Faculty of Theology), no. 1 (n.d.), 5-16. (b) Writings: The following may be noted: for a full list of his principal works, see Uyûlî Fâlajasp wa rashidi-yi râ'îm, i-vi, (1392-50 sh./1953-71); Dâstân-i râstâm, 2 vols. (1339-40 sh./1960-61); Nizâm-i ì�âkû-i san dar Islâm (1345 sh./1966); Khudamât-i mutakabîlî-î Islâm wa Frûn (1346 sh./1967); 'Adî-î tâ'hî (1349 sh./1970); "Hâl-i girjâsh ba mûdâlîgârî (1350 sh./1971); Makaddâmî ba ìjâhâshî-yi Islâmî, 3 vols. (1357 sh./1978). For a complete list of his writings, see anon., Fâhrist-i ìârî-yi wâlîî-î Ṣâhid Mutâdâ Mutahhari, in Yâdndma-yi Usâid-i Ṣâhid Mutâdâ Mutahhari, 435-532. Many of Mutahhari's writings have been translated into a variety of European, Asian and African languages, chiefly under the auspices of the Iranian Ministry of Guidance; the translations vary widely in quality. (HAMID ALGAR)

**MU'TAKALLIM** [see KALAM]

**MU'TAKARIB** (a.), the name of the fifteenth metre in Arabic prosody [see ARUB]. It comprises, in each hemistich, four feet made up of one short and two longs (fa'ûlûn). A certain number of licences are possible, in particular, the omission of the fourth foot, the shortening or even the cutting out of the third syllable of a foot, etc.

**Bibliography:** M. Ben Cheneb, Tâhfiî al-arâbîb, Paris 1954, 87-93. (Ed.)

**MU'TAKAWIS** [see KAFIYA].

AL-MUTALAMMIS, surname given to an Arab poet who lived in the 6th century A.D., belonged to the tribe of Ḳubayyî and was called Ḳafîr b. 'Abd al-Malîsh; another name, 'Abd al-'Uzzâ, given to his father in some sources, appears to signify that this polytheist had been the first of his family to convert to Christianity.

Al-Mutalammis was the maternal uncle of 'Abd al-Malîsh al-Yâsîn, given to his father in some sources, appears to signify that this polytheist had been the first of his family to convert to Christianity.
(Tabakdt fuhul al-shu'ard*, Cairo n.d., 131-2). His works, some fragments of which are cited in a considerable number of sources, were none the less of interest at an early date to the most reputable philologists, notably al-Asma'i, Abu 'Ubayda, Ibn al-Kalbi and ibn al-Sikkit. They were collected in a Dīwān that K. Völlers published and translated into German in 1903 in Leipzig (a more recent edition was published by Hasan Kamil al-Šarqāfī, Cairo 1390/1970). Modern historians of Arabic literature, when they come to cite this poet, devote only a brief notice to him, for he is outshone by his nephew, whose renown is certainly much greater. In one of his poems, he calls for revenge for the latter's death (metre kāmil, rhyme -dī) and naturally attacks 'Amr b. Hind, the affair of the saḥīfa having inspired him to a great extent in his work. He is credited with a certain number of original ma'ānī [see ma'ānī 3] and proverbial sayings derived from his verses, including a hīdīya [q. v.] of 'Amr (metre juṭal, rhyme -mā) provoked by accusations relating to his belonging to the Dūbay'ā or Yashkur (his mother's tribe). R. Blachère (HLA, ii, 295-6) describes him as a "tribal poet" and judges the form of his compositions as "not very mannered". The fact is that, for example, the language of a poem which has attracted the attention of the anthologists (metre juṭal, rhyme -sā) is relatively simple; however, another cited rhyme (metre māniya, rhyme -th) causing him to be accused of prohibition on his returning to Ḳirāk and "devouring the corn" of the land, decreed by 'Amr b. Hind, presents variants and inspires such divergent interpretations that one has the impression that the transmitters and commentators did not understand it. Probably a tribal, hence Bedouin, poet who, however, describes a male camel as a sāy'ārīya, term reserved for female camels (metre tawīl, rhyme -su) and earns the taunts of his fellows who say of him instaṃtawqa 'l-ḏāmala "He made the male camel into a female", but it is true that the verse in question is also attributed to al-Musayyab b. 'Alās (e.g., in LA, root sī-r). Bibliography: The richest source is the Aḥgānī (xxi, 185-8, 198-205; Beirut ed., xxiii, 524-72), whose data was taken and greatly augmented by L. C. Enderis (Cheikho i, 375, iii, 38, 60; idem, Hayawdn, ii, 85, iii, 47, 136, 391, iv, 265, v, 561; Ibn Kutayba, Shīrī, 85-8, 91 = Cairo ed. 131-16, 42; Abū Tammām, Hamāsā, Cairo n.d., 272-5; Ibn al-Kalbi-Casket, Tab. 173 and ii, 258; Mas'ūdī, Muraqqa, index; Maysāwī, Amīrālī, Cairo 1352, i, 412-14 (on the saying saḥīfa al-Mutalammīs); Ibn Nubata, Sarh al-Sayānā, Cairo 1383/1964, 223, 397-400; Baghdādi, Kūtubān, Būlāk ed., i, 446, iii, 73, iv, 214-16; R. Basset, Millet et un contes, récits et légendes arabes, Paris 1926, ii 326-7 (with detailed bibli.): O. Rescher, Abriss, i, 59; Brockelmann, S I, 46-7; Sezgin, GĀS, ii, 173-5. (CH. PELLAT)

MUṬAMAD KHĀN, MUḤAMMAD SHĀRĪF, KHYĀGĀ TAKI (+1049/?-1639), Mughal Indian commander and imperial historian. He was born into an obscure family in Persia, but coming to India, he attained high honours in the reigns of Djiḥāngir and Shāh Djiḥān. He received in the third year of Djiḥāngir a military command and the title of Muṭamad Khān. Subsequently, he joined prince Shāh Djiḥān in his campaign in the Deccan as a bakhshī (paymaster). On his return to court, in the 17th year of Djiḥāngir's reign (1051/1642), he was entrusted with the duty of writing the emperor's memoirs. He attained a higher rank in the service of Shāh Djiḥān and was appointed mīr bakhshī (adjutant-in-general) in the 10th year of the new reign. He died in 1049/1639. He is the author of a history called Ibḥānān-yi Djiḥāngīrī, in three volumes: i. History of Akbar's ancestors; 2. Akbar's reign (numerous ms.); 3. the reign of Djiḥāngīr (printed in the Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta 1865, Lucknow, 128v/1869-70, etc.). Bibliography: Maʿādīr al-unmarā, iii, 431; Tuzuk-i Djiḥāngīrī, 352; JRAS, N.S., iii, 459; Elliot and Dowson, History of India, vi, 400; Ibn Hasan, The central structure of the Mughal empire, repr. Karachi 1967, index s.v.; M. Athar Ali, The apparatus of empire, Delhi 1985, index at p. 355 s.v. Khwjāla Taqi, Storey, i, 557, 560-2, 564-5, 1316. (M. HIDAYET HOSEIN*)

MUṬAMAR (a.), conference or congress. In the modern Islamic context, the term refers to the convening of Muslims from throughout the world in order to deliberate over common concerns. In the course of the 20th century, Muslim conferences emerged as the organised, modern expression of the deeper sentiment of Muslim solidarity.

The idea of convening Muslims in conferences first gained currency in the late 19th century. The advent of easy and regular steamer transport accelerated the exchange of ideas among widely separated Muslims, and made feasible the periodic assembling of representatives. The idea also appealed to Muslim reformists, who sought a forum for the promotion and execution of the internal reform of Islam. Such an assembly, they believed, would strengthen the ability of Muslims to resist the encroachments of Western imperialism.

A number of émigré intellectuals in Cairo first popularised the idea in the Muslim world. In 1900, one of them, the Syrian Abūd al-Rahmān al-Kawkābī [q. v.], published an influential tract entitled Umm al-Kārūj, which purported to be the secret protocol of a Muslim congress convened in Mecca during the pilgrimage of 1316/1899. The imaginary conference culminated in a call for a restored Arab caliphate, an idea then in vogue in reformist circles. Support for such a conference also became a staple of the reformist journal al-Munād, published in Cairo by Raqqīd Riḍā [q. v.]. The Cernaveh Tatar nationalist, Ūmmal-Kurdi (Gasprinski) [see GASPRALI] made the very first concrete initiative in Cairo, where he unsuccessfully worked to convene a "general" Muslim congress in 1907-8.

Al-Kawkābī's book, Riḍā's appeals, and Gaspral's initiative all excited the suspicion of Ottoman authorities. In Istanbul it was believed that a well-attended Muslim conference would fatally undermine the religious authority claimed by the Ottoman sultan-caliph. In particular, the Ottomans feared the possible transformation of any such conference into a Muslim congress convened in Mecca during the pilgrimage of 1316/1899. The imaginary conference culminated in a call for a restored Arab caliphate, an idea then in vogue in reformist circles. Support for such a conference also became a staple of the reformist journal al-Munād, published in Cairo by Raqqīd Riḍā [q. v.]. The Cernaveh Tatar nationalist, Ūmmal-Kurdi (Gasprinski) [see GASPRALI] made the very first concrete initiative in Cairo, where he unsuccessfully worked to convene a "general" Muslim congress in 1907-8.

Al-Kawkābī's book, Riḍā's appeals, and Gaspral's initiative all excited the suspicion of Ottoman authorities. In Istanbul it was believed that a well-attended Muslim conference would fatally undermine the religious authority claimed by the Ottoman sultan-caliph. In particular, the Ottomans feared the possible transformation of any such conference into a Muslim congress convened in Mecca during the pilgrimage of 1316/1899. The imaginary conference culminated in a call for a restored Arab caliphate, an idea then in vogue in reformist circles. Support for such a conference also became a staple of the reformist journal al-Munād, published in Cairo by Raqqīd Riḍā [q. v.]. The Cernaveh Tatar nationalist, Ūmmal-Kurdi (Gasprinski) [see GASPRALI] made the very first concrete initiative in Cairo, where he unsuccessfully worked to convene a "general" Muslim congress in 1907-8.
he convened his own "world" conference during the pilgrimage season of 1344/1926. The leading clerics of al-Azhari in Cairo convened a "caliphate congress" in Cairo in 1926, to consider the effects of the Turkish abolition of the caliphate two years earlier. The conference was supported by King Fu'ad [q.v.], who reputedly coveted the title of caliph, but no decision was issued from the gathering. In 1931, Amin al-Husayni [q.v. in Suppl.], Mufti of Jerusalem, convened a "general" conference of Muslims in Jerusalem, to secure foreign Muslim support for the Arab struggle against the British Mandate and Zionism. And in 1935, the pan-Islamic activist Shakhbūsardān convened a conference of Europe's Muslims at Geneva in order to carry the protest against imperialism to the hearth of Europe. Each of these conferences resolved to create a permanent organisation and to convene additional conferences. But all such efforts were foiled by internal rivalries and the intervention of the European powers.

With the spread of political independence after the Second World War, several Muslim leaders floated new plans for the creation of a permanent organisation of Muslim states. Pakistan took a number of initiatives in the late 1940s and early 1950s, but soon encountered stiff opposition from Egypt, which gave precedence to the O.I.C. With the Arab League. When Djamāl Abī al-Nāṣir [q.v. in Suppl.] of Egypt transformed pan-Arabism into a revolutionary doctrine, Sa'ūdī Arabia sought to counter him by promoting a rival pan-Islamism, and assembling conferences of Muslim activists and "ulama" from abroad. In 1962, the Sa'ūdī government sponsored the establishment of the Mecca-based Muslim World League, which quickly built a wide network of Muslim organizations. Convening in 1964, Egypt responded by organising large conferences of Egyptian and foreign "ulama" under the auspices of al-Azhār's Academy of Islamic Researches. These rival bodies then convened a succession of dueling conferences in Mecca and Cairo, each claiming the sole prerogative of defining Islam. In 1965-6, King Faysal b. Abī al-'Azmā launched a campaign for an Islamic summit conference, which would have balanced the Arab summits dominated by Egypt. However, Abī al-Nāṣir had sufficient influence to thwart the initiative, which he denounced as a foreign-inspired "Islamic pact" designed to defend the interests of Western imperialism.

Israel's 1967 defeat of Arab armies and occupation of Jerusalem crossed faith in the brand of Arabism championed by Egypt, and inspired a return to Islam. This set the scene for a renewed Sa'ūdī initiative. In September 1969, following an arsonist's attack against the Aqṣā Mosque in Jerusalem, Muslim heads of state set aside their differences and met in Rabat in the first Islamic summit conference. King Faysal took this opportunity to press for the creation of a permanent organisation of Muslim states. The effort succeeded, and in May 1971, the participating states established the Organisation of the Islamic Conference (O.I.C.; Munazzamat al-mu'tamar al-islāmī). The new organisation, with headquarters in Jiddah (pending the liberation of Jerusalem), adopted its charter in March 1972. The O.I.C. eventually earned a place of some prominence in regional diplomacy, principally through the organisation of triennial Islamic summits and annual conferences of the foreign ministers of member states. The O.I.C.'s activities fell into three broad categories. First, it sought to promote solidarity with Muslim states and peoples which were locked in conflict with non-Muslims. Most of its efforts were devoted to the causes of Palestine and Jerusalem, although it supported Muslim movements from Eritrea to the Philippines. Second, the organisation offered mediation in disputes and wars between its own members, although its effectiveness was greatly limited by the lack of any force for peace-keeping or truce supervision. Finally, the O.I.C. sponsored an array of subsidiary and affiliated institutions to promote political, economic and cultural cooperation among its members. The political capital of these institutions was the Islamic Development Bank, established in December 1973 and formally opened in October 1975. The bank, funded by the wealthier O.I.C. states, financed development projects while adhering to Islamic banking practices.

The O.I.C. represented the culmination of governmental efforts to organise Muslim states. But it did not end moves by individual states to summon international conferences of supportive "ulama", activists and intellectuals. Sa'ūdī Arabia and Egypt, realigned together on the conservative end of the Islamic spectrum, increasingly co-operated in mounting large-scale Muslim conferences. Their rivals, revolutionary Iran and Libya, did the same. Divisive events, such as the war between Iran and Širāz (1980-8) and the killing of 400 Iranians in Mecca during the pilgrimage season of 1407/1987, produced conferences and counter-conferences, each claiming to express the verdict of united Islam. Leaders of Muslim opposition movements also met in periodic conferences, often on the safe ground of Europe. Less than a century after al-Kawākibī's fantasy, a crowded calendar of conferences bound together the world of Islam as never before. But it remains uncertain whether these often competing institutions would bridge the differences between Muslims or would serve to widen them.

death of his nephew al-Muhtadi [q.v.] and he was never able to build up an independent power base. For most of his reign he remained at Baghdad in Sāmarrāʾ while effective power was exercised by his brother Abū Ahmad, who took the quasi-caliphal title of al-Muwaffak [q.v.]. Al-Mu'tamid was able to appoint his own ważīr, ʿUbayd Allāh b. Yahyā b. Khātān [see Ibn Khādkān], who had previously served his father al-Mutawakkil. After ʿUbayd Allāh's death in 262/877, he was succeeded by Sulaymān b. Wāḥib and then by ʿIsāʾī b. Bulbul. In Ṣaḥwāl 261/July 881 he arranged the marriage of his son, Djal-al-Muwaffawwad as heir-apparent and governor of the west and his brother al-Muwaffak as next in line to the throne and governor of the east, but it does not seem that al-Muwaffawwad exercised any real authority. The threat posed by the Ṣaḥābi and the upheavals caused by the rise of the Saffarids in southern Iran b. Bulbul. In Shawwal 261/July 881 in 262/877, he was succeeded by Sulayman b. Wahb Khakān [see IBN KHAKAN], who had previously served Ubayd Allah b. Yahya b. wazir, Al-Muwaffak, the only member of the Abbāsid family to command the allegiance of the Turkish military.

The limits of the caliph's independence were clearly demonstrated in 269/882-3 when he tried to leave Sāmarrāʾ and take refuge with Abū al-Muluk b. Tūlūn [q.v.], ruler of Egypt and Syria. He set off to meet Ibn Tūlūn's envoys in Ṣakkūla, but al-Muwaffak's right hand man, ʿAbdād b. Makhlad, wrote to Ishāk b. Kūndādī, governor of al-Muṣaffa, and informed him of his followers were arrested and stripped of their estates, and he was returned to Sāmarrāʾ under escort to stay in the Djiwak palace. To add to his humiliation, he was obliged to denounce Ibn Tulun and his brother could keep a closer eye on him. The next spring (270/March 884) he was allowed to return via Baghdad to Samarra while effective power was exercised by his brother Abu Ahmad, who took the quasi-caliphal title of al-Muwaffak [q.v.]. Al-Muwaffak, the only member of the ABBADID prince was then appointed by his father to the life and reign of al-Mu'tamid. His relations with a young slave girl, al-Rumaykīyya, who was herself gifted with considerable poetic talent, have also been the subject of much literary embellishment. It was from the surname of this young woman, Istīmād, that al-Mu'qaffad is said to have adopted his own name, which comes from the same root. She became his favourite wife and presented him with several sons. As to Ibn ʿAmmār, exiled by al-Mu'tamid, he was recalled on the accession of his patron to Seville, from which he went at his own request to be governor of Silves before being appointed grand vizier.

In the year 271/885 of this reign another ABBADID prince was able to annex to his kingdom the principality of Cordova (Kurtuba [q.v.]), over which the Dījahwārdīs had been ruling, in spite of efforts of the king of Toledo, Al-Ma'mūn [q.v.]. The young prince 'Abbad was appointed governor of the old capital of the Umayyads. But at the instigation of the king of Toledo, an adventurer named Ibn ʿUkāša was able in 468/1075 to take Cordova by surprise and put to death the young 'Abbad and his general Muhammad b. Mātīn. Al-Ma'mūn took possession of the town, where he died six months later. Al-Mu'tamid, whose paternal affection had been wounded and pride insulted, tried for three years vainly to reconquer Cordova. He was not successful until 471/1078; Ibn ʿUkāša was put to death and the part of the kingdom of Toledo between the Guadalquivir and the Guadiana conquered by the armies of Seville. Nevertheless, it took all the skill of the vizier Ibn ʿAmmār to conclude peace by paying double tribute with Alfonso VI of Castile when he sent an expedition against Seville.

This was just the time when, through the energy and tenacity of the Christian princes taking advantage of the feuds which were setting the Muslim rulers of the taifa [see MUṢĀVĪ'Ī] in the 5th/11th century is best known; his full and real name was MUḤAMMAD B. 'ABBAD AL-MUṬAMID [q.v.]. B. MUḤAMMAD B. ʿISĀʾĪ B. ʿABBĀD, born in 431/1040—he was placed by his father in nominal command of an expedition against Silves (Ar. Šilb [q.v.]), then in the possession of Ibn Mu'zayn, and this town was taken by assault as was Santa Maria de Algarve soon after (Ar. Shantamurayyāt al-garb [q.v.], now Faro) which was held by Mu'tamid b. Sa'id Ibn Hārūn (444/1052). The young 'Abbādī prince was then appointed by his father governor of these two towns. His elder brother Ismāʾīl having been executed in punishment for his rebellion (453/1063; cf. AL-MUṬAMID), Muhammad al-Mu'tamid became heir-presumptive to the throne of Seville. A little later, the army which he was leading to the battle of Badajoz was defeated by the Berber ruler of Granada of the Zirīd [q.v.] dynasty, was routed by the latter and al-Mu'tamid had to take refuge in Ronda [see RUNDA] to which his father, at first very angry at his failure, finally sent him his forgiveness. When the powerful ruler of Seville died in 461/1070, his son succeeded to a considerably extend-
great deal, it must not be forgotten that by the middle of the 5th/11th century, many Muslim dynasties of Spain were being forced to seek protection and tribute; the temporary neutrality of their Christian neighbours. Shortly before the taking of Toledo [see TULAYTILA], which had far-reaching effects, by Alfonso VI in 478/1085, al-Mu'tamid began to be involved in serious difficulties. On the imprudent advice of his vizier Ibn 'Ammar, he tried to add to his kingdom, after the principality of Cordova, that of Murcia [see MURIHYA], which was ruled by a prince of Arab origin, Mu'ammar b. Ayyub Ibn Tahir. In 471/1078, Ibn 'Ammar went to the Count of Barcelona, Ramon Berenguer II, and asked him for assistance to conquer Murcia in return for a payment of 10,000 dinars; until this sum was paid al-Raghib, a son of al-Mu'tamid, was to remain as hostage. After animated negotiations which ended in the payment of a sum three times as large to the Count of Barcelona, Ibn 'Ammar resumed his plan of conquering Murcia, and soon succeeded in doing so with the help of the lord of the castle of Bīdīj (now Vilches), Ibn Rashīk [q.v.]. In Murcia, however, Ibn 'Ammar soon rendered himself obnoxious to his master by assuming the attitude of an independent ruler, and on al-Mu'tamid's reproaching him he replied by insults to the king of Seville, his wife and his sons. Betrayed by Ibn Rashīk, he had to take refuge with the French king, and on the advice of the lord of the castle of Leon, Saragossa and Lerida. Returning to Saragossa, he endeavoured to assist its ruler al-Mu'tamin Ibn Hūd [q.v.] on his expedition against Segura [see ḪĀMIRA], but he was taken prisoner and handed over to al Mu'tamid, who in spite of the bonds of friendship which had so long linked them together, slew him with his own hand.

Meanwhile, Alfonso VI was no longer concealing his designs on Toledo, the siege of which he began in 473/1080. Two years later, when he sent a mission to enforce payment of the annual tribute due to him from al-Mu'tamid, its members were insulted and the Jewish treasurer Ibn Shālah who accompanied it was put to death because he had refused to accept debased money. He therefore invaded the kingdom of Seville, sacked the flourishing towns of Aljarafe (Ar. al-Sharaf [q.v.], advanced through the district of Sidona (Ar. Shadhūna [q.v.]) as far as Tarifa [see TĀRĪF], where he uttered his celebrated remark expressing his pride at having reached the utmost limits of Spain. The capture of Toledo by Alfonso VI dealt a serious blow to Islam in Spain. The king of Castile soon demanded of al-Mu'tamid that he should surrender those of his lands which had formed part of the kingdom of the Dhu 'l-Nunids [q.v.] (a part of the modern provinces of Ciudad-Real and Cuenca). Throughout Muslim Spain, his demands, which increased every day, made the position very serious. In spite of their reluctance, the Muslim rulers in Spain, led by al-Mu'tamid, were forced to seek the help of the Almoravid sultan Yūsūf b. Tāghfin [see AL-MU'ABD], who had just conquered the whole of Morocco in an irresistible advance. It was decided to send him an embassy consisting of the vizier Abū Bakr b. Zaydūn and the kādīs of Badajoz, Cordova and Granada. An agreement having been reached, not without difficulty, Yūsūf b. Tāghfin crossed the Straits of Gibraltar and on 12 Ragab 479/23 Oct. 1086 inflicted on the Christian troops the disastrous defeat of Talavera [q.v.] not far from Badajoz. We need not recur here how Yūsūf b. Tāghfin, recalled to Africa, could not follow up his victory as the Muslim rulers of Spain had hoped, who through the influence exercised by the Spanish fākūls on the Almoravid, soon lost all prestige in his eyes. After his departure, the Christians began again to harass Muslim lands, and the Christians began again to harass Muslim lands, and to such an extent that al-Mu'tamid had this time to go in person to Yūsūf b. Tāghfin in Morocco to ask him to cross the Straits once more with his troops. Yūsūf consented and landed at Algeciras in the following spring (482/1090). He laid siege to the fortress of Aledo (Ar. al-Ḫiṣīyit) but without taking it; then stimulated by popular feeling and the advice of the fākūls, he came to the conclusion that it would be more advantageous for him to remain in Spain on his own account and proceeded to dethrone and dispossess the princes who had sought his intervention. With this object, he sent an army to invade the kingdom of Seville under Sir b. Abi Bakr, who at the end of 1090 took Tarifa, then Cordova, where one of al-Mu'tamid's sons, Fath al-Mā'mūn, who was in command of it, was killed, Carmona and then Seville, which was captured in spite of a heroic sortie by al-Mu'tamid. The latter was taken prisoner by the Almoravid and sent with his wives and children first to Tanger, then to Meknès and, a few months later, to Aghmāt [q.v.], near Marrākūsh. There he led a miserable existence for several years until his death at the age of 55 in 487/1095.

The sad end of al-Mu'tamid touched all his biographers, who are particularly numerous and extensive in the Middle Ages, patrons of letters and scholarship, liberal and tolerant, but living in an atmosphere of luxury and ease little compatible with the care of a kingdom with frontiers open to envious neighbours on all sides. Not so great a ruler as his father al-Mu'taad, al-Mu'tamid is however a much more attractive figure, perhaps just on account of his misfortunes. He is entitled to a place among the great figures of Spanish Islam, alongside of 'Abd al-Raḥmān III, al-Hakam II, al-Manṣūr b. Abī Amir and, at a later date, Lišān al-Dīn Ibn al-Khārīb.
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diwan of Ibn Zaydun, and his poems are widely quoted in mediaeval sources; 180 monographmed poems and one muwashshah are preserved (Dinán, ed. R. Souissi, Tunis 1975; Studies of the Research Institute of Hebrew Poetry, ii [1936], 23; al-Andalus, xix [1954], 382; Mª Jesús Rubina Mata, Poetas. Antología bilingüe, Madrid 1982).

The extant poems are mostly short; several genres such as madīḥ addressed to a patron are wholly lacking and nature description nearly so. His production thus cannot be compared to that of the major poets of al-Andalus, but his poetry was highly regarded by mediaeval readers. To the period before al-Mu'tamid's deposition belongs all his lighter verse, mostly ghazalīyya, with some khamirīyya, wasf poems and other verses. More sentimental than sensual (Souissi, al-Mu'tamīd et son œuvre poétique, Tunis 1977, 8), the ghazalīyya are not particularly distinctive. They are addressed to both male and female beloveds, especially to his favourite Fumād, including one with an acrostic of her name. His most characteristic early poems are those addressed to al-Mu'taḍid, especially his masterpiece and longest extant poem, the rā'iyya apologising for the loss of Malaga. Also much admired was another rā'iyya addressed to Ibn ʿAmmār [q.v.], recalling their friendship in Silves.
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returned to Seville (Iṣḥābiyya [q.v.]). Al-Mu‘tamīn is reported to have had a strong interest in mechanical instruments and to have written a book (now lost). K. al-Iṣṭikmd wa l-mانazır, on mathematics; we also have a few lines of verse by him and some lines of ornate prose which may be by him.

**Bibliography:** Makkari, Analectes, i, 286, 424, 431-3; Ibn Bassam, Dākhira, ed. I. ʿAbbas, Beirut 1399/1979, iii, 371, 388, v, 39; Ibn Saʿīd, Muğḥir, ii, 390; for the coins, see A. Vives y Escudero, Monedas de las dinastías arábigas y nazaríes, Madrid 1893, no. 1216 (cf. A. Prieto y Vives, Los Reyes de Taifas, estudio histórico-numismático de los musulmanes españoles en el siglo V de la hégira (XI de J.C.), Madrid 1926, no. 269); G.C. Miles, Coins of the Spanish Muluk al-Taʿāwfi, New York 1954, nos. 428-9; D. Wasserstein, The rise and fall of the Party-Kings. Politics and society in Islamic Spain, 1002-1086, Princeton 1983, 94 and n. 29 (with further references).

(2. J. WATERSTEIN)

**MUTAMMIM b. NUWAYRA, a poet, contemporary with the Prophet. He was the brother of Mālik b. Nuwayra [q.v.], chief of the Banū Yarrāb, a large clan of the Banū Tamlm. Mutammīm owes his fame to the elegies in which he lamented the tragic death of his brother Mālik (gathered together at the opening of the 3rd/9th century by Wāqīma b. Mīrṣūl, see Yāḥyā ibn Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Qādir, 158), and these poems have made the latter’s name immortal. The Arabs said there was nothing comparable to these elegies, overflowing with emotion [see Mārkīyya]. They regarded their author as the type of brotherly devotion.

Mutammīm does not seem to have played any prominent part before the Ḥīṣa, he was eclipsed by the striking personality of his brother, and those qualities he never hesitated to pay homage. He is represented as having been of unprepossessing appearance, one-eyed and short in stature. The Bakrī chief al-Hawfazān eulogised the humanity with which Mutammīm treated him during his captivity. Falling in his turn into the hands of the Banū Taḥlib, Mutammīm was delivered by a stratagem devised by his brother, who had adopted the same name as his brother. Like the latter, he is numbered among the Companions, although we never find him in direct relations with the Prophet. He was murdered in the disaster in which Mālik was overwhelmed; a few fragments of other poems suggest he did not write elegies exclusively.

But after the death of Mālik he devoted himself to celebrating his memory and demanding vengeance for his death. Refused by the caliph ʿAbū Bakr, he thought he might have more success on the accession of ʿUmar. He hurried to Medina where he was very well received by ʿUmar. The latter listened with delight to his elegies, regretted that he himself had not the gift of poetry so that he might worthy celebrate his brother Zayd who had fallen in the wars of al-Yamāḥa, but he refused to reverse Abū Bakr’s decision and limited himself to dismissing Khaḥīl b. al-Walīd, a step which probably owed something to the poetical exhortations of Mutammīm.

After this, tradition says that the poet became almost blind through weeping, and that he wandered over the many routes of Arabia, uttering his complaints everywhere. He found himself abandoned by his wives who became tired of his incurable sadness and a wandering life. He left two sons Dāwūd and Idrīsh, who both perished. He survived ʿUmar if, as Ibn Khallīkān says (ed. Wüstenfeld, no. 792), he is really
the author of an elegy on the death of this caliph. **Bibliography:** The principal references are given in Nöldeke, *Beiträge zur Kunst des arabischen *Poet... 95-152.


(H. LAMMENS)


Abu l-'Tayyib was irritated at not finding his merit recognised. Gradually, he looked forward to his retirement, probably to the end of 312/924, perhaps under pressure from the Karmaniai [see KARMATI] who had just taken and sacked Kūfa, Abu l-'Tayyib and his family made a first stay of two years (cf. al-ʾSaʿmānī, *Aṣābāb*, 508b; al-Badī’i, *al-Šuʿb al-muarrab*, i, 19-20; and al-Ladhikīyya, *Latakia* (cf. Mez, *Renaissance des Islams*, 256)). It is impossible to follow him in his wanderings, for his *Diwān*, our only guide, does not present his poems in a satisfactory chronological order. Some pieces of the period are addressed to Bedouin chiefs of the region of Manbij [q. v.] (Wāḥ., 24-5, 38-9, 66-7; Yaz., 12-13, 22-3, 28-9); others are dedicated to the educated classes of Tripoli (Wāḥ., 88-9; Yaz., 19-20) and al-Ladhikīyya (cf. Wāḥ., 116-35; Yaz., 66-78). The poems of this period are hurriedly written and mediocre in quality, but traces of his real genius are already apparent. With the exception of a *martya* [q. v.] or elegy and some impromptu pieces, they are all *kastdas* [q. v.].

On returning to Kūfa, at the beginning of 315/927, Abu l-'Tayyib seems to have decided to devote himself entirely to poetry. At this time, he most admired the gay panegyристes of the preceding century, Abu l-Mutamīm and al-Buṭūrī [q. v.]. Like them and like the majority of his contemporaries, he saw in poetry a sure means of attaining wealth and power. He at once attached himself to a certain Abu l-ʾAdl of Kūfa, to whom he dedicated a short piece (Wāḥ., 1, 25-6). It is impossible to follow him in his wanderings, for his *Diwān*, our only guide, does not present his poems in a satisfactory chronological order. Some pieces of the period are addressed to Bedouin chiefs of the region of Manbij [q. v.] (Wāḥ., 24-5, 38-9, 66-7; Yaz., 12-13, 22-3, 28-9); others are dedicated to the educated classes of Tripoli (Wāḥ., 88-9; Yaz., 19-20) and al-Ladhikīyya (cf. Wāḥ., 116-35; Yaz., 66-78). The poems of this period are hurriedly written and mediocre in quality, but traces of his real genius are already apparent. With the exception of a *martya* [q. v.] or elegy and some impromptu pieces, they are all *kastdas* on neo-classical lines. The influence of Abu l-Mutamīm and al-Buṭūrī preponderates.

In the course of this period of experiment, Abu l-'Tayyib was irritated at not finding his merit recognised. Gradually, he looked forward to his dreams of domination being realised by violence (Wāḥ., 138, ii, 3-7; Yaz., 79). Finally, he abandoned the work of a paid panegyrist and, returning to al-Ladhiqiyah, he began revolutionary propaganda, the nature of which has long been misunderstood. According to Oriental writers (al-Badī’i, *op. cit.*, i, 25-30; Ibn al-Anbārī, *Nuzhat al-ablikh*, 369), Abu l-'Tayyib proclaimed himself a prophet in the Samawa, he was taken prisoner by the troops of al-Ikhshid [q. v.] and then received his epithet of al-Mutanabbi. Krauschenkowsky (Mutanabbi i Abu l’Ala’i. St. Petersburg 1909, 9-11) does justice to these traditions, without however taking full account of some clear allusions in the *Diwān*. The latter contains pieces which prove that beyond the revolutionary oratory he advocated by al-Mutanabbi (cf. Wāḥ., 49-58, 86; Yaz., 28-30, 50). This rising, as usual at this period, must have been political as well as religious. The rising began in al-
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Ladhikyya and then extended to the western borders of the Samawa, where the Banu Kalb constituted one of the two main elements of the Karmatian army. To ensure the loyalty of this army, al-Mutanabbi exploited its principles, which found only too ready an echo among the marauding Bedouins (Wāḥ., 57, II, 22-3; Yāz., 32; al-Sulṭānī, i, 112-13). He adopted some of these principles and presented them in his preaching, so that at this time any agitator was regarded as a Karmatian. After some initial successes, al-Mutanabbi and his Bedouins were defeated; he was captured and imprisoned at Hims (towards the end of 322/933). After a trial and two years' imprisonment (Diwan, ms. Paris no. 3092, fol. 16a), Abu 'l-Tayyib was condemned to retract his errors and then set free.

From his adventure he gained only the epithet of al-Mutanabbi and the conviction that poetry alone would lead him to the realisation of his ambitious dreams.

The poems composed by Abu 'l-Tayyib immediately before and during his rebellion are distinguished by spontaneity of inspiration, by the vigour of the style, which has a much more personal character than in his first "manner". The lyrical opening which breathes his dreams, disillusionments and anger.

As soon as al-Mutanabbi had returned to his profession of panegyrist, he naturally resumed his wandering life (beginning of 325/937). For several years he led a precarious existence, and had to be content to sing the praises of undistinguished bourgeois and minor officials of Antioch, Damascus, Aleppo, etc., who paid him very badly (Wāḥ., 93-206; Yāz., 31-131; Yūsuf, Ḥarīrāt, v, 203). Little life, however, his fame grew. At the beginning of 328/939, we find him becoming court poet to the amīr Badr al-Kharshānī (q.v.) (the Badr b. 'Amār b. al-Duwanī, governor of Damascus for the ex-amīr al-umard b. Rā'īk [q.v.], who had just taken possession of Syria. Of Arab origin, Badr was regarded by al-Mutanabbi as the Maecenas for whom he had been waiting so long. The panegyrics and occasional poems which are dedicated to this amīr reveal a sincere admiration for him and possess a sustained inspiration (Wāḥ., 206-45; Yāz., 132-63). These pieces and that which precede them, after Abu 'l-Tayyib's return to literature, constitute what might be called the third "manner" of the poet. With the exception of a poem hunting in the style of Abu Nuwas (Wāḥ., 201-2; Yāz., 128-9) and a number of impromptu poems of no particular interest, al-Mutanabbi wrote only ḥaṣīdas during this period. He would seem then to have returned to his first "manner", if the work of this period did not show considerable progress in form.

The friendship between Badr and al-Mutanabbi lasted only about a year and a half, and as a result of intrigues of jealous rivals (Wāḥ., 235, II, 13-14; Yāz., 169), Abu 'l-Tayyib, feeling no longer safe, sought refuge in the Syrian desert (Wāḥ., 251-2; Yāz., 168-9). There, the idea of rebelling again took possession of him (Wāḥ., 253-4; Yāz., 170-1). Fortunately, the departure of Badr for ʿIrāk enabled him to leave his hiding-place and resume his profession of panegyrist. He now sang the praises of several individuals of second rank (Wāḥ., 107-8, 284-948; Yāz., 60-1, 194-241). Finally, he succeeded in establishing himself as head of the Hamdānī court in Aleppo, where he became the official poet of the amīr Saḥaf al-Dawla (q.v.) at the beginning of 337/948.

From the literary point of view, the work of this period which runs roughly from the middle of 329/940 to the beginning of 337/948, marks his fourth "manner", to which he remained faithful till his death. It is characterised by a compromise between the pure neo-classical tradition and a freer form which the poet had adopted in the poems of the period of his rebellion. Without rejecting the framework of the neo-classical ḥaṣīda, he reduces the erotic prelude to a minimum, sometimes even replacing it by a philosophical and lyrical opening which breathes his dreams, disillusionments and anger.

Al-Mutanabbi stayed nine years with Sayf al-Dawla. He was genuinely attached to this patron, who in his eyes the personification of the ideal Arab chief, brave, magnanimous and generous. Sayf al-Dawla in his turn recognised the worth of his panegyrist, whom he overwhelmed with gifts and never treated with arrogance. Al-Mutanabbi accompanied him on his expeditions, and on returning to Aleppo sang of his exploits against the Byzantines and the Bedouins of the desert. In the brief intervals of leisure between the campaigns of the Ḥamādān, the poet shared in the leisure of the court of Aleppo, devoting himself to improvisation and writing panegyrics as occasion arose (Wāḥ., 522-37; Yāz., 376-95) or lamenting (mesābī) the death of Sayf al-Dawla (Wāḥ., 388-9, 408-9, 577-8; Yāz., 271-2, 286-7, 427-8). The difficult character of al-Mutanabbi and the repulse which he enjoyed did not fail to gain him implacable enemies. A few devoted friends, like the poet al-Babbagha [q.v.], tried, it is true, to defend him, but their zeal could do nothing against the enmity of the hostile group led by the famous Abū Firās [q.v.]. Sayf al-Dawla at first paid no attention to the attacks made upon his favourite. When he grew tired of the poet's arrogance and his protection ceased, Abu 'l-Tayyib no longer felt his life safe, hence fled secretly from Aleppo with all his family and sought refuge in Damascus (end of 346/957).

Eastern critics are generally agreed that the poems composed by al-Mutanabbi during his stay with Sayf al-Dawla mark the highest point in his work. Although there is a certain degree of exaggeration in this, it is certain that the poet, while continuing his fourth "manner", reveals in the highest degree the mastery which he had acquired in his art during this period. Much more than Abū Firās, with whom he is often contrasted, he was able to depict the glories of Sayf al-Dawla's campaigns against the Byzantines. His verse, it is true, has not the charm of that of Abū Firās, but it is fuller and more epic in style.

From Damascus, Abu 'l-Tayyib went to Egypt and to al-Fustā [q.v.], where he obtained the patronage of the Ikhwāṣīṣī regent Kūfiṣ [q.v.]. Al-Mutanabbi's career now reveals the necessities to which poets in the 4th/10th century had to submit. Deprived of moral and material independence, Abu 'l-Tayyib was forced to sing the praises of a patron for whom in his heart he felt only contempt. The panegyrics which he devoted to him barely conceal his regret at losing the favour of Sayf al-Dawla. They are somewhat forced, and contain points against Kūfiṣ (cf. al-Bāḏrī, op. cit., i, 125-6). The poet perhaps only agreed to celebrate this patron because the latter had promised him the governorship of Saydā [q.v.] (cf. ibid., i, 115). When his promise was not fulfilled, he tried to gain the favour of another Ikhwāṣīṣī regent, Abu Ṣuḥāqī Fāṭik (ibid., i, 131-2), but the latter dying in 250/960 and relations with
Kafur becoming more strained, al-Mutanabbi had once more to decide to fly. On the day of the feast of sacrifice, 20 January 962, after writing a satire on Kafur, he left al-Furat secretly and crossed Persia and Arabia after great trials (cf. al-Badi'I, op. cit., 1, 139-40), he reached 'Irāk, spent some time in Kufa and then settled in Baghdād. He perhaps thought of attaching himself to the famous Buyid vizier al-Muhallabī [q. v.], who had gathered a very brilliant court around him. He had, however, to abandon hope who had gathered a very brilliant group of friends the work he had done till that date (cf. al-Dhahabi, Ta'ārīkh al-Islām, ms. Paris, no. 1581, fol. 265a). The year 353/964 was spent in this fashion. The poet perhaps also visited Kufa about this time (cf. F. Gabrieli, Vita di al-Mutanabbi, 60, n. 4). At the beginning of 354/965, in any case, he left 'Irāk and went via al-Ahwāz to Arrādān [q. v.] in Susiana, where he received the patronage of the Buyid vizier Ibn al-Āmid [q. v.]. Al-Mutanabbi devoted some panegyrics to him (Wah., 265a). The year 353/964 was spent in this fashion. The poet perhaps also visited Kufa about this time (cf. Ibn al-Faradj, op. cit., 14). At the present day, he is still one of the most considerable ever exercised on Arab poetry. Commentated upon by Ibn Djinnī (ed. Al-Ash'arī, al-Samī'ā al-Mawrid, Baghdad 1965), which in some degree rounded by ardent admirers who defended his work in the majority only criticised him as a poet because they expressed a desire to have him at his court. The poet enjoyed a splendid reception. After addressing to the Buyid ruler several panegyrics which are among his best work, Abu 'l-Ṭayyib left 'Irāk for reasons not clearly known, perhaps simply out of homesickness (Wah., 766, ll. 1-3; Yaz., 589). He was returning by short stages from Persia to Baghdād when he was attacked by marauding Bedouins near Dayr al-Ṣūkāl [q. v.] at the end of Ramadan 354/Aug. 965. He and his son were killed in the fighting and all his baggage, including the autograph ms. of his Diwān, was scattered (cf. al-Dhahabi, op. cit., i, 227-39).

Even in his lifetime, al-Mutanabbi had been surrounded by a group of admirers who defended his work in its entirety against the attacks of detractors no less eager to run him down. Among the latter, however, the majority only criticised him as a poet because they objected to his character as a man. The criticism was therefore not distinguished by impartiality and only reflects the opinions of a coterie. It required the death of Abu 'l-Ṭayyib to produce a third class of admirers who were more clear sighted than the first and sufficiently impartial not to fall into the exaggerations of the second (cf. al-Djurdjānī, al-Wasāṭa, 11-12, 45-6). It was the opinion of this new category that prevailed, and when al-Mutanabbi's contemporaries had all disappeared, the educated public remained decidedly favourable to Sayf al-Dawla's panegyrist (except al-'Askarī [q. v.] and Ibn Khaldūn). From the 5th/11th century onwards, the name of al-Mutanabbi became a synonym for "great poet". His literary influence became one of the most considerable ever exercised on Arabic poetry. Commentated upon by Ibn Dhinnī [q. v.] and later by Abu 'l-Ćāla'ī [q. v.], by al-Wabīdī, al-Tibrīzī, Ps.-al-Ukbarī and Ibn Sidūh [q. v.], to mention only the most eminent, the Diwān of Abu 'l-Ṭayyib throughout the Middle Ages and in modern times has been made accessible to scholars and literary critics by lexicographers from Persia to Spain, often more zealous than intelligent. Space does not permit us to estimate what later poetry owes to al-Mutanabbi. We are content to point out that, in different ways, all Arab panegyrists have been influenced by Abu 'l-Ṭayyib. At the present day, he is still one of the most read in North Africa; Syria and Egypt also hold him in very high esteem, and many critical and philological studies full of praise to him. It seems, however, that in the last-named country al-Mutanabbi attracts people at least as much by the boldness of his philosophy and the ardour of his pro-Arab feelings as by his purely literary qualities.

**Bibliography:** This is enormous, and occupies some twenty pages in Sezgin (GAS, ii, 494-97, ix, 290-4; further additions by R. Weipert, in ZGAW 2 (1985), 266-67) and stretches over more than 125 pages in K. and A. 'Awâdī's bibliographical guide Rādū al-dirāsā 'an Abī 'l-Ṭayyib al-M. given in vol. vi/3 (1977) of the Baghdād journal al-Mawrid, an issue in large part devoted to the poet. Note also that Pearson has a special section for him in his Index Islamicius (XXIX/IV).

The abundance of this bibliography is a striking proof of the eminent place occupied by al-M. in Arabic literature from the 4th/10th century till the present day and the interest which has continuously been accorded to him by Arab critics and by Arabists. However, a large part of the mediaeval bibliography on this poet is only known from mentions in the biographical collections or in mediaeval manuscript catalogues; in the latter case, it seems that those works worthy of study have been largely worked over by researchers. The Diwān. Al-M.'s Diwān was made the object, in the mediaeval period, of numerous recensions, of which a considerable number of manuscripts are extant; to the independent copies of this should be added the commentaries in which the poet's works is reproduced in extenso and explained. Amongst editions of the Diwān should be mentioned those of Burās al-Bustānī (Beirut 1860, 1867, 1882, 1887) and of Ābd al-Walāhāb ʿAzzām (Caïro 1363/1944), but there are many others, published at Bulāk, Caïro, Beirut and also at Bombay, Deoband and Calcutta.

Al-M.'s fame—his work being considered as model—stimulated the composition of a number of anthologies by anonymous or declared authors who, from mediaeval times onwards, aimed at making a choice of the poems. Amongst these should be mentioned Ābd al-Kahir al-Djurdjānī (d. 471/1078), al-Mukhtār min dawdwin al-M. wa l-Buhturi wa-Abi Tammān (ed. Maymanī, in al-Tāhir al-adabyya, Caïro 1937, 195-305) and, for the modern period, Sāmī al-Bārūdī, Mukhtār (Caïro 1237-9), F. Bustānī, Rawdāt al-M. (nos. xii-xiii) and A. J. Arberry, Poems of al-M. A selection, with introduction, translation and notes (Cambridge 1967). It is also possible to consider amongst these choices of verses the collection of the Sāḥib Ibn ʿAbbād (d. 385/995) containing al-Amīr al-sā'īrā min shīr al-M. (ed. ʿAlī Yāsīn, Baghdād 1963), which in some degree embodies the poet's popularity.

Commentaries. Al-M.'s neo-classicism, added to the need to supply the reader with explanations not merely philological but also historical concerning the composition of such-and-such a poem, led several philologists to write commentaries on the Diwān, and an incomplete list of these can be found in Hādīdī Khālīfī (Lexicon, iii, 306-12), without course taking into account Sezgin and 'Awâdī. R. Blachère justly highlighted (see the beginning of the article on 'Abīl-. Wāhīdī (468/1075), Sharījah Diwān al-M. (ed. Bombay 1271/1854; Bulāk 1287; above all, F. Dieterici, Mutanabbīi carmina cum commentario Wahhābī, Berlin 1861, and many subsequent eds.)
and of Yazidi (d. 1871), al-'Arf al-tayyib ft shark Diwan Abi 'l-Tayyib (publ. by his son Ibrahim at Beirut 1987, ed. A.R. Sälich, 1992). But there exist others, printed or unpublished, amongst which one of the highest-regarded is that falsely ascribed to 'Utkari (d. 616/1219), al-Tawhid ft shark Diwan Abi 'l-Tayyib (publ. by his son Ibrahim at Baghdad 1974); Ibn Siduh (d. 1261-2), al-Mawrid, al-Tawhid ft shark al-Diwān Ukbari (d. 616/1219), and of Yazidi (d. 1871), al-'Arf al-tayyib ft shark Diwan Abi 'l-Tayyib (publ. by his son Ibrahim at Baghdad 1974); Ibn Khālikān, Wafayāt, Cairo 1310, i, 36-8; and Badrī, al-Šāb al-munī, 'an ḥaṭṭayyīt al-M. (ed. al-Sakka), Shirāz and ‘Abdūl, Cairo 1963; Maḥmūd Shākir, al-Mutanabbi, 2nd ed. (Cairo 1977), vol. ii, contains the important biographies contained in Kamāl al-Dīn Ibn al-‘Adīm, Baghūt al-falāḥ, Ibn ‘Asākir, Taʿrīkh madinat Dimashq, and al-Makrīzī, al-Muṣaffā, all published from mss.).

Modern studies. Al-M. has been the subject of a considerable number of studies both in the East and the West. As well as the standard works on Arabic literature which have sections on him which are sometimes quite lengthy, the works of F. Gabrieli deserve special notice: La eità di al-M., in RSO, xi, 27-42; Studi sulla poesia di al-M., in RCal (1927); La poesia di al-M., in Giornale della soc. asiat. ital., v/1 (1929). But the most outstanding synthesis is the basic monograph of R. Blachère, who, following the chronological order of the poems, combines biography with a literary study. ‘Umm al-mu’āṣirah bi al-M., IVe siècle de l’Hégire. Abou t-Tayyib al-Mutanabbi, Paris 1935. A little after this work’s appearance, the 1,000th anniversary of the poet’s death (354/956) stimulated in 1354/1935-6 the publication of three collective works, one organised under the direction of ‘Abd al-Wahhāb ‘Azzām, Dīkār Abī t-Tayyīb al-M. ba’d alf’am (Baghdād 1936); the second under the auspices of the Institut Français de Damas, al-M., recueil publié à l’occasion de son millénaire (Beirut 1936; cf. A. Fādil, al-M. ft dirāsät al-muṣṭaγżirīn, in al-Mawrid, vi/3, 43-86); and the third was to appear in two numbers of the Şakīfät Dār al-‘Ulām (April-June 1936). There is a list in Sezgin (ii, 485-6) of the articles in these three collections. Sezgin enumerates, moreover (ii, 497 and ix, 393), a considerable number of articles amongst which attention may be drawn to those which deal with al-M.’s language and with his influence on the later poets, in particular those of Muslim Spain, where he enjoyed exceptional prestige; see e.g., al-Tāhir Makkī, Ma‘a ḥaṭ’arāta al-Andalus wa ‘l-M. (Cairo 1974). See also W.P. Heinrichs, ‘The Meaning of Mutanabbi’s Panegyrics of Sayf al-Dawla’, Leiden 1992.

Translations. The Diwan has inspired translators, like von Hammer-Purgstall, Motenebbi, der grösste arabische Dichter (Vieenna 1824), O. Rescher, Der Diwan des Motenebbi nach der Ausgabe ‘Okbatî (Beyrouth 1287) mit Vergleichung der Edd. Jayzāy (Beyrouth) und Wāḥīd (Berlin 1927) (Stuttgart 1940), and A.J. Arberry, who translated into English the selection of poems mentioned above (under Diwan). It is mainly separate poems which have been the subject of translations (see Sezgin, ii, 497).

(R. Blachère-[C.H. Pellat])

MUTARADIF [see KAFIYA].


They constituted a pietist movement striving to adhere strictly to the teachings of ‘Imām al-Kāsim b.
Ibrahim, his sons, and of the early Yemenite Imams al-Hadl, Muhammad al-Murtada, Ahmad al-Nasir, al-Mansur al-Kasim al-‘Iyand and al-Husayn al-Mahdi, while rejecting the doctrine of the Caspian as well as the contemporary Yemenite Zaydi Imams. In implementing the religious duty of hidjra, emigration from the abode of injustice (dar al-zulm) which had been stressed by al-Kasim b. Ibrahim and other Zaydi authorities, they founded ‘abodes of emigration’ where they gathered to engage in worship, ritual purification, ascetic exercises and teaching of their creed. The first of these hidjras was founded already by Mutarrif in Sanā‘, south of Sanā‘ in the territory of his own tribe, the Banū Shihāb. After Sanā‘ had to be abandoned under threat from the Sulayhid Sabā‘ b. Ahmad between 481/1088 and 491/1098, Mutarrix’s successor Ibrahim b. Abī ‘l-Haytham founded a hidjra at Wakṣāh, south-west of Sanā‘, which remained the spiritual centre of the movement until its destruction by Imam al-Mansur Abī ‘l-Allāh b. Hamza in 611/1214-5. Numerous other hidjras were founded by the Mu‘tarrifiyya in various regions of northern Yemen. The Mu‘tarrifī hidjra were a major factor in the development of the modern Yemenite concept of hidjra as a protected enclave in a tribal territory. The persecution of the Mu‘tarrifiyya and destruction of their hidjras by Imam al-Mansur led to the progressive decentralization of the sect. By the 9th/15th century it had become extinct.

The religious doctrine of the Mu‘tarrifiyya was essentially elaborated and systematized by Mutarrif b. Shihāb on the basis of the works of Abī ‘l-Kāsim b. Ibrahim and the early Yemenite Imams, especially al-Hadī. Further sources were some statements ascribed to Abī ‘l-Mizbāth and a short treatise attributed to Muhammad al-Murtada whose authenticity was disputed by their Zaydi opponents. There is no evidence of either Ismā‘illī or philosophical influence, as alleged by these opponents. Since al-Hadī espoused the theocratic doctrine of the Baghdād school of the Mu‘tazzilis against the Baṣrān school, the Mu‘tarrifiyya also repudiated Baṣrān Mu‘tazzī doctrine upheld by the Caspian and later Yemenite Imams. Thus they rejected the virtual autonomy of the attributes of essence to be identical with the divine attributes of hearing, seeing, and perceiving to that of knowing, whereas the Baṣrans considered the attributes of perceiving to be additional to knowing, and they identified the divine will (irāda) with the object willed (mūrad) by God, as against the Baṣrān concept of God’s will as an accident without a substrate. There are, however, also substantial deviations from Mu‘tazzī doctrine in general. The Mu‘tarrifiyya, held, on the basis of a sentence of al-Hadī, the divine attributes of essence to be identical with the divine essence itself and with each other. They explained divine justice as meaning that God initially treats all men equally in six respects: their physical constitution (badā‘), sustenance, life, death, obligation to worship (‘a‘lābād) and recompense. After men display obedience or disobedience by their free choice, God may prefer some to others and withdraw His grace from some. Against Mu‘tazzī dogma, they affirmed that God does, and causes, evil and orders men to perform acts whose performance He prevents. They rejected the Mu‘tazzī doctrines of generated acts of man (ta‘allād) and of the obligation of God to compensate man for undeserved pain inflicted by Him.

The most radical deviation from Mu‘tazzīsm was in cosmology. Repudiating the atomism of kalām in general, the Mu‘tarrifiyya affirmed that God had initially created the world out of three or four elements (water, air, winds (ríjāḥ), fire). The inherent transfigurations and interaction of these elements, rather than the direct action of God, bring about changes in the world. The Mu‘tarrifiyya thus affirmed a natural causality in the world. They described events and effects, whether beneficial or harmful to man, as acts (‘a‘dāl) only in the sense that God has compelled the elements and bodies through their structure to bring them about. God may, however, interfere in the course of the world through miracles in support of His prophets, through granting or withholding help, benefits, guidance, and through responding to prayers.

Bibliography: Earlier attempts to analyse Mu‘tarrifi doctrine on the basis of polemical refutations by R. Strothmann, Die Literatur der Zaiditen, in ISL., ii (1911), 67-9; C. van Arendonk, De Jemenitische secte der Mu‘tarrifi, in Oosterse Genootschap in Nederland, Verslag van het Vijftig Congres, 1927, 23-4, and A.S. Tritton, The Mu‘tarrifiyya, in Mustin, lixi (1950), 59-67, have been rendered partly obsolete by the discovery of an authentic Mu‘tarrifī work by Sulaymān b. Muhammad al-Muhallī, al-Burāhī al-rāth, as analysed in W. Madelung, A Mutarrifi manuscript, in Proceedings of the Vth Congress of Arabic and Islamic Studies, Stockholm 1975, 75-83. For the history of the sect, see in particular Musallam al-Lahbī, Al-‘Awdmil al-mi‘a. On this occasion, Ibn al-Najidjar, al-Misbdhfi ‘l-nahw, has found the widest circulation. Compiled for his son, the treatise became a text-book in the latter, al-Mutarrizi wrote a (la) Sharh al-Misbdh fi ‘l-nahw, has found the widest circulation. Compiled for his son, the treatise became a text-book in the latter, al-Mutarrizi wrote a (la) Sharh
Only the title of another grammatical opuscule, (2) Mukhtasar al-mantik, has existed as an administrative sanjak, entitled (7) al-Mu'tarriq, who made frequent use of tadjnis.

The experiment with the muhassil, again designated kadi-kumkum, began in 1258/1842, the role of which was not revived. Instead, the earlier fiscal practice of sandjaks (arpalik) was revived, on the one hand, with the muhassil [q.v.], and the muhassil (the wezir) would then appoint his collection agent, so that the whole arrangement could be described in terms of mutasarrirf (the wezir) and mutassaf (his agent; Qadirci, Mutesellimlik, 288; idem, Kent, 23-29; cf. Ergenc, 591). Under Selim III and Mahmud II (II), the revenues of many sanjaks and other territories were assigned directly to the company in Istanbul, which would then appoint its own mutessals to collect the revenues (Çadirci, Mutesellimlik, 288; idem, Yönetim, 1216).

When Selim III and Mahmud II began trying, in the interests of centralisation, to supplant local notables with agents of the central government, the term mutasarrirf clearly was used for officials with the rank of vezir who were to be employed in local administration, but for whom positions as governor (waiz) of a province (eydel) were unavailable. Such officials would be assigned to administer one or more sanjaks as mutassaf (Çadirci, Yönetim, 1226). This usage of terms continued in places after the inauguration of the Tanzimât reforms with the Gülêhêne İdare, 1824. However, during the 10th/16th century, the role of mutessaf was not revived. Instead, the earlier fiscal practice of tax-farming (iltizâm [q.v.]) was revived, on the one hand; and local administration was reorganised, on the other hand, with the sandjaks being entrusted for the first time to an official known as the kâ'âm-makâm, who was primarily a military officer. With the decline of the cavalry (saraplı) and the diversion to other uses of the landholdings (timmân, ezânîte [q.v.]) that had been used to support them, a different pattern began to emerge. From the 11th/17th century onwards, the number of vezirf began to increase without any corresponding increase in the number of provinces or eydets [q.v.] to which they could be appointed as beylerbeys or waizs. To deal with this problem, the government began to assign particular sanjaks from the provinces of which they were part and assign them to such individuals as a source of income (arpalik). The vezirf would not take such a position in person, but would send an agent to collect the revenues for him. These agents were known by titles such as müsellim, later müsetislim, or sometimes kâ'âm-makâm, which suggest their functions. Some references suggest that the term mutasarrirf already had been used in this period, as a common noun, rather than a technical term, to refer to the titular holder as contrasted with his collection agent, so that the whole arrangement described in terms of mutasarrirf (the vezir) and mutessaf (his agent; Çadirci, Mutesellimlik, 288; idem, Kent, 23-29; cf. Ergenc, 591). Under Selim III and Mahmud II (II), the revenues of many sanjaks and other territories were assigned directly to the company in Istanbul, which would then appoint its own mutessals to collect the revenues (Çadirci, Mutesellimlik, 288; idem, Yönetim, 1216).

The term soon acquired other uses, too, as the evolution of the local administrative system proceeded. During the experiment with fiscal centralisation and direct tax collection inaugurated in 1254/1838, the mütesellim's historical role in revenue collection was taken over by muhasıls [q.v.] appointed from the capital. After the abandonment of this experiment in 1285/1864, the role of mütesellim was not revived. Instead, the earlier fiscal practice of tax-farming (iltizâm [q.v.]) was revived, on the one hand; and local administration was reorganised, on the other hand, with the sandjak being entrusted for the first time to an official known as the kâ'âm-makâm, while a lower-level administrative district, the kâda’, was set up under the administration of the kâda’ müdrisi (Çadirci, Müttesilis, 260; idem, Kent, 236). A set of measures inaugurated in 1265/1849, marking the most important reforms in local administration since the experiment with the muhasıls, again designated the governor of a province (eydel) as the waiz, who would normally hold the rank of vezirf. The title mutasarrirf was set aside either for a governor of a small eydel who held a lower rank, or for an administrator in charge of more than one sandjak; at least from ca. 1274/1858 onwards, the same title applied to the administrator of a sandjak that was “independent” (mutakkil), meaning that it was subordinate, not to
any eydlet, but directly to the Ministry of the Interior in Istanbul. The administration of a sanjak remained under the administration of a mutasarrif who reported directly to Istanbul, rather than to any province, was Lebanon under the special régime introduced there in 1861 (Young, Corps de droit, i, 139-59; Düstür, iv, 695-701). Meanwhile, the number of eyalets had increased from fifteen to twenty-eight (ca. 1250/1834) and then to forty after another twenty years, while the number of sanjaks had hardly increased at all. The decrease in the number of sanjaks per eydlet implies a tightening of the center's control—another sign of centralisation (Scheben, 95 n. 130).

The most important steps toward systematisation of local administration occurred with the provincial administration law of 1281/1864, which was initially applied only in the specially-created Danube province but was revised for wider application in 1867, followed by the elementary provincial administration law of 29 termi 1287/1871 (Kornrumpf, Territorialverwaltung 1864-1878, 24-5, 74-86, 105-15; Heidborn, i, 157-72; Düstür, i, 608-51; Çadırcı, Kent, 250-2). Under this new system, the provinces were renamed vilâyet, instead of eydlet, the vilâyet was divided into sanjaks or liwa's; the sanjaks into kadas; the kadas into villages (karey). The law of 1287/1871 inserted another echelon, the nahiyes, between the kada and the village. The 1906 law for the Danube province still provided for a kâz-makâm at the head of each sanjak and a müdi老师的 head each kada; but the 1867 law at last gave the title mutasarrif its definitive Ottoman meaning as the chief administrator of a sanjak, using a kâz-makâm for the head of the kada (instead of müdi're; Kornrumpf, Territorialverwaltung 1864-1878, 75-6, 78-82). At this point, other, earlier uses of the term mutasarrif ceased to apply in administrative usage. The practice of treating some especially sensitive sanjaks or liwa's as "independent" of any province and directly subordinate to the Ministry of the Interior continued, however; these "independent" liwa's (al-târia mustakila) remained a familiar category in Ottoman administrative practice.

No further legislation of comparable scope was enacted until the provincial administration law of 17 Rabî' II 1331/17 October 1913 (Düstür, v, 186-216; Kornrumpf, Territorialverwaltung 1878-1913, 118, 122, 129, 137, 140; Findley, Evolution, 15-24). Introducing refinements into the earlier system, the new law retained the mutasarrif as the chief administrator of the sanjak. However, the Fundamental Law of 20 January 1921, passed by the Grand National Assembly (Büyük Millet Meşârisi) in Ankara, revised local administration by taking the empire's sanjaks as the vilâyet's for what in 1923 became the Turkish Republic. The Republic's vilâyet law of 18 April 1927 retained this arrangement, along with many features of the provincial administration law of 1331/1913 (Lewis, 384-6). Long-term continuity thus significantly characterised late Ottoman and Republican local administration. With the transformation of the old sanjaks into vilâyet's in 1921, however, the term mutasarrif passed out of use as a designation for a type of local official.

Bibliography: Başbakanlık Archives (Istanbul), Medeci-Tanzimat Defteri, no. 34, an untitled volume containing laws and regulations on local administration (Istanbul, 570-870; Scheben, 109-16, 281-302; Kornrumpf, Territorialverwaltung 1864-1878, 20, 55; Başbakanlık Archives, Medeci-Tanzimat defteri, no. 34, untitled printed volume, dated at end 15 Rabî' II 1267/1851, containing regulations on local administration, 56-81).

The most important steps toward systematisation of local administration occurred with the provincial administration law of 1281/1864, which was initially applied only in the specially-created Danube province but was revised for wider application in 1867, followed by the elementary provincial administration law of 29 termi 1287/1871 (Kornrumpf, Territorialverwaltung 1864-1878, 24-5, 74-86, 105-15; Heidborn, i, 157-72; Düstür, i, 608-51; Çadırcı, Kent, 250-2). Under this new system, the provinces were renamed vilâyet, instead of eydlet, the vilâyet was divided into sanjaks or liwa's; the sanjaks into kadas; the kadas into villages (karey). The law of 1287/1871 inserted another echelon, the nahiyes, between the kada and the village.

The 1867 law at last gave the title mutasarrif its definitive Ottoman meaning as the chief administrator of a sanjak, using a kâz-makâm for the head of the kada (instead of müdi're; Kornrumpf, Territorialverwaltung 1864-1878, 75-6, 78-82). At this point, other, earlier uses of the term mutasarrif ceased to apply in administrative usage. The practice of treating some especially sensitive sanjaks or liwa's as "independent" of any province and directly subordinate to the Ministry of the Interior continued, however; these "independent" liwa's (al-târia mustakila) remained a familiar category in Ottoman administrative practice.

No further legislation of comparable scope was enacted until the provincial administration law of 17 Rabî' II 1331/17 October 1913 (Düstür, v, 186-216; Kornrumpf, Territorialverwaltung 1878-1913, 118, 122, 129, 137, 140; Findley, Evolution, 15-24). Introducing refinements into the earlier system, the new law retained the mutasarrif as the chief administrator of the sanjak. However, the Fundamental Law of 20 January 1921, passed by the Grand National Assembly (Büyük Millet Meşârisi) in Ankara, revised local administration by taking the empire's sanjaks as the vilâyet's for what in 1923 became the Turkish Republic. The Republic's vilâyet law of 18 April 1927 retained this arrangement, along with many features of the provincial administration law of 1331/1913 (Lewis, 384-6). Long-term continuity thus significantly characterised late Ottoman and Republican local administration. With the transformation of the old sanjaks into vilâyet's in 1921, however, the term mutasarrif passed out of use as a designation for a type of local official.
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AL-MU'TASIM — MUTATAWWI

During the reign of his brother and predecessor al-Ma'mūn [q.v.], Al-Mu'tasim achieved a reputation as a skilful commander in Anatolia and as governor in Egypt. When al-Ma'mūn died in the Byzantine marches in Rabī' 218/August 833, Al-Mu'tasim was recognised as caliph despite support within the army for his nephew al-Ab bás b. al-Ma'mūn (who was, in fact, later to conspire against al-Mu'tasim during the return from the Amorium campaign, and as a result to lose his life in 223/838). The beginning of Al-Mu'tasim's reign was taken up with campaigns against the Khurramiyya [q.v.] in Djibal (218/833), against the Husaynīd Ali, rebel Muḥammad b. al-Kāsim at Tābākān in Khurāsān (219/834) and against the Zutt (q.v.), who defined them against the muḥājirūn, or Jhats in Lower Iraq (219/834), who were now deported to the Byzantine frontier region.

The four main, extended campaigns of the reign were, however, those firstly against the Khurrami leader Bābak [q.v.] in ARRĀN and Adharbaydjan, who performed supererogatory deeds of piety, in 224/839; secondly, in revenge for a Greek attack on Zbāra in the north of Khurāsān, Al-Mu'tasim himself and his commanders Al-Asfāhī and Abū al-Mu'ttasim's closest advisers and confidants. The purge of Al-Mu'tasim's viziers included Al-Fāḍil b. Mawwān [q.v.], who seems to have planted the idea of a move away from Bābdhād in the caliph's mind, until 221/836, and then Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Malik al-Zayyāt [see IBN AL-ZAYYĀT] until the caliph's death. But a dominant influence over Al-Mu'tasim was exercised by the Chief Qaḍī Ahmad b. Abī Duwād [q.v.], under whose stimulus the Mu'tazzi insurrection, the Miḥba [q.v.] began by Al-Ma'mūn, continued not only in Bābdhād but in such provinces as Syria and Egypt also, and involved the imām Ahmad b. Hanbal [q.v.].

Al-Mu'tasim died at Salmār on 18 Rabī' 1/227/5 January 842, and was succeeded by his son 'Abbās b. Ma'in, continued not only in Bābdhād but in such provinces as Syria and Egypt also, and involved the imām Ahmad b. Hanbal [q.v.].
Mutawakkil in ghazw and undertake this last in the lands of unbelief when it is not incumbent upon them nor is an obvious institution in their land". sc. the murtazika, "those entitled to living djund, "those entitled to living allowances" [see q.v.].

During the campaign of 'Abd al-Malik's commander Ubayd Allah b. Abi Bakra against a local ruler of eastern Afghanistan, the Zubil of Zabulistan, in 79/698, volunteers from the Yemeni tribes of Maghridj and Hamdan [q.v.] are mentioned (al-Baladhuri, Ansab al-ahrâf, cited in C.E. Bosworth, "Ubaidallah b. Abi Bakra and the "Army of Destruction" in Zabulistan (79/698), in Isl., 1 [1973], 277). Likewise, Yazid b. al-Muhallab's army assembled in 279/891/2 for an expedition against Tabaristan and Jurjûn included 100,000 Syrian, Irâkî and Kusharînî troops plus ma'âwiyyî slaves (ma'mâlik) and volunteers (al-Tabarî, ii, 1318; Ibn al-Aṣâqîr, ed. Beirut, v. 29).

There was, of course, a disadvantage to commanders having contingents of volunteers attached to their armies in that these volunteers were less amenable to military discipline and could come and go of their own free will, hence could not be relied upon for sustained campaigning or arduous fighting in remote or inhospitable terrains. During the campaign of al-Afshin in northern Anatolia against the Khurrami rebels Bâbâq [q.v.] in 232/846-7, many members of the contingent of volunteers from Basra under the command of Abu Dulaf al-Kasim al-'Affî [q.v.] melted away from the army when the final attack on their own free will might have been expected. [q.v.]; Suppl.] seems to be unduly delayed (al-Tabarî, iii, 1209-11, 1214, tr. Bosworth, Storm and stress along the northern frontiers of the 'Abbasid caliphate, Albany 1991, 62-5, 67).

Volunteers were especially to be found on the frontiers of the Islamic world, where the opportunities for ghâdi [q.v.] against the pagans were greatest, e.g., along the Anatolian marches against the Byzantines, in the Caucasus against the Khazars, in Central Asia against the steppe peoples and in eastern Afghanistan and the fringes of north-western India against the local idolaters. In the caliphate of al-Mahdi, both regular troops and mutawwila were garrisoned at al-Mas JVMIA [q.v.] in Cilicia (al-Balaghj, Futûh, 166). The frontier towns of Transoxania and Khârajîm and their ribâh (or residence) were strong concentrations of râjud within them, and these seem to have been often regarded as a volatile and unruly element, similar in social constitution and function to the 'ayyârs [q.v.]. They were ready to rush off and fight wherever the possibilities of holy war and plunder presented themselves, but were not always welcome (Barthol., Turkistanî, 214-16). In 355/966 the Bûyid amir Ruûn al-Dawla revolted by military force a group of 10,000 ghâdi from Khurramî, who were ostensibly marching westwards against the Byzantines but actually were, he feared, being utilised by the rival Sâmîdî dynasty to destabilise his amirate (Ibn al-Aṣâqîr, ed. Beirut, viii, 569-71).

Where a ruler or commander acquired a particular reputation as a successful war-leader and hammer of the infidels, such warriors would be attracted to his standard in large numbers. This was especially the case with the early Ghaznavids Sebûtîgin, Ma'bûdî and Masûdî [q.v.], whose campaigns down to the plains of northern India, with rich prospects of Indian slaves and temple treasures, always included a large proportion of volunteers from all over the eastern Islamic world (see Bosworth, The Ghaznavids, their empire in Afghanistan and eastern Iran 394-1040, Edinburgh 1963, 114).

The bands of volunteers or 'ayyârs in certain parts of the eastern Islamic world might also turn their energies against internal dissent or heterodoxy. This is clear in the province of Sistan, where bodies of orthodox Sunni volunteers or vigilantes were active against local Khurridîjîtî elements; out of these bands, the Safâfîrîdî brothers Ya'bîbî and 'Amîr b. al-Layîh [q.v.] were to rise to power during the second half of the 3rd/9th century (see Bosworth, Sistân under the Arabs from the Islamic conquest to the rise of the Saffarids (30-240/651-864), Rome 1968, 85, 112 ff.). From around the 5th/11th century onwards, the term mutawwâl/ma mutawwâl tends to drop out of use, and such terms as ghâdi and mudjîdh [q.v.] are used more and more for the concept of volunteer warriors for the faith.

A modern formation from this Arabic root is mutawwa', lit. "one who compels obedience", used in contemporary Saudi Arabia to designate the religious police who enforce the closure of shops during the times of public prayer, oversea morals, etc.

Bibliography: Given in the article. See also RB, C.E. Bosworth, "Ubayd Allah b. Abi 'l-Fadal Qâfar b. Muhammad, 'Abbasîd caliph. He was born in Shawwâl 206/Feb.-March 822, son of the caliph al-Mu'tasîm [q.v.] and a Khîranî slave-girl called Shudja'. There is no sign that he had early political ambitions, and he seems to have lived in obscurity until the death of his brother, the caliph al-Wâhidî [q.v.] in Dhî 'I-Hijjaja 232/Aug. 847. Al-Wâhidî left a young son but no designated adult successor. The succession was decided by a council consisting of the wa'iz ibn al-Zayyât and the chief kâdhî Ahmad b. Abî Duwâd [q.v.], two other bureaucrats and two leading Turkish military men, Ayâtîkh and Wasîf. They rejected Ibn al-Zayyât's advice to appoint al-Wâhidî's son and instead chose his brother Qâfar, who was duly installed as caliph. They probably hoped that he would prove a pliable instrument like his brother had been, but they soon found out how mistaken they were, and al-Mutawakkil soon showed that he had an independent mind and a clear and decided policy. He was determined from the beginning to assert the independence of the caliph and to break the dominance of the Turkish military and the bureaucracy.

He rapidly removed the leading figures and the old régime, Ibn al-Zayyât (executed 233/847), Ayâtîkh (assassinated 235/849) and Ibn Abî Duwâd (dismissed 237/851-2). In their places he appointed new ministers, notably the wa'iz Ubayd Allah b. Yahîyâ b. Khâkîn and his personal favourite al-Fâtîh b. Khâkîn [q.v.]. In 235/849 he also appointed his sons to take over the vast supervisory governorates held by the Turkish generals, al-Muntasîr to Egypt and al-Quhîrî to Transoxania, al-Mu'ayyad to Syria and Palestine, intending that the great men of the next generation should be members of the 'Abbasîd family as they had been under al-Mansûr. Only the Tâhîrîs [q.v.], in Baghdad and Khur rasîn
were left unchallenged and continued to work in partnership with the caliph. Al-Mutawakkil also set about recruiting a new army in order to break the Turkish monopoly of military power, and 'Ubayd Allah b. Khākhān sought to recruit troops from the Kaysī Arabs of Syria, the ābānī of Baghdād and from Armenia. The favour shown to these new elements provoked growing anger among the Turks, who felt their position threatened. Just as al-Mu'taṣim had founded a new capital at Sāmarrā' [q.v.] to house his Turkish army, so al-Mutawakkil sought a new seat where he could establish himself. He tried Damascus briefly in 244/858, but is said to have been deterred by the plague, but probably also because it was too far from the centres of wealth and power in 'Irāk and Persia. He chose instead a site a few miles north of Sāmarrā' in 245/859-60 which he called al-Dā'īfariyya. Despite its proximity to Sāmarrā', this was conceived as an independent town with its own great mosque, palaces and urban centre, the outline of which can still be traced on the ground today.

Perhaps the most controversial aspect of his policy was to break with the 'Umayyids' position which had been the official doctrine of the 'Abbasid government since al-Ma'mūn had introduced the miḥna [q.v.]. In its place, the caliph stressed his adherence to the doctrine of the imsāq, and thus of the traditions of the Prophet and those of other prominent early authorities. In part, this was a symbolic rejection of his predecessors' policies, but he probably hoped also to attract to himself the undisputed popular support which the Traditionalists enjoyed, especially in Baghdād. He appointed a new kādī, Yāḥyā b. Akthām, who was sympathetic to the Traditionalists, introduced discriminatory dress regulations for Christians and Jews [see GHIYAR], and destroyed the tomb of al-'Abd al-Malik and Persia. The centres of wealth and power in 'Irāk and Persia.

The caliph stressed his adherence to the doctrine of theimsāq, and thus of the traditions of the Prophet and those of other prominent early authorities. In part, this was a symbolic rejection of his predecessors' policies, but he probably hoped also to attract to himself the undisputed popular support which the Traditionalists enjoyed, especially in Baghdād. He appointed a new kādī, Yāḥyā b. Akthām, who was sympathetic to the Traditionalists, introduced discriminatory dress regulations for Christians and Jews [see GHIYAR], and destroyed the tomb of al-'Abd al-Malik and Persia.

Despite these political upheavals, his reign was in the main a time of peace. There were continuing disturbances in 'Ādhbarbadjān, where Ibn al-Baṭūṯ rebelled in 234/848-9 and in Armenia in 237/851-2, where a rebellion against increasing 'Abbasid pressure was put down by the Turkish governor Burgāl the Elder [see BURJĀĪR]-Burgāl also led successful campaigns against the Byzantines in 245/859 and 246/860, but without producing any decisive results.

The caliph's decisive policies made him a number of enemies, notably among the Turkish military. To these he added his eldest son al-Muntasir [q.v.], who refused to be deprived of his position as heir apparent, and they came together to assassinate him in Ṣhwawāl 247/Dec. 861. His death deprived the 'Abbasid caliphate of a forceful and effective ruler who might well have re-established the caliph's authority on a firm footing. In the event, his death plunged the caliphate into anarchy.

of his brother, Imam al-Mu'ayyad bi'llah Muhammad [q.v.], at Shahara in Radjab 1054/September 1645, was challenged by three other aspirants, most seriously by his other brother, Abu Tâlib Ahmad b. al-Kâsim (1007-66/1598-1656). Despite some initial regional support for the latter, Isma'il's claim ultimately won acceptance among the 'ulamâ', owing to broad recognition of his predilection for scholarship and his knowledge of the principles of Zaydi governance. Once the succession had been resolved after at least one test of arms (1055/1645), the imam's family closed ranks behind him; his brother Ahmad accepted to become his governor of the important northern city of Sa'da, while several nephews served him well as commanders.

Although Imam Isma'il lacked the martial qualities often associated with Zaydi imâms, it is nevertheless the case that in his time the imam's authority was carried to perhaps its widest extent ever in modern history. Most of this expansion occurred in the south and east, where successful campaigns were conducted against Aden and Labdij (1055/1645), al-Baydâ¥ and Yafi' (1065/1655), Hadramawt (1069-70/1659-60) and even Zufar in 'Umân (1073/1662-3). In these and other military operations the imam's principal commander was his nephew and successor, Ahmad b. al-Husayn b. al-Kâsim [see al-Mahdi li-Din Allah Ahmad].

Imam Isma'il died on 5 Qumâdâh II 1078/1667 August 1676 at Djabal Dawran, south of Sa'da, where he had transferred the imam's residence from Shahara in the north. Essentially a scholarly and religious personality who preferred the company of Imâm Isma'il b. al-Husayn (d. 1087/1674) and his revival of the office of author upon the majority of Zaydi communities, particularly upon the rival northern tribal confederations of the Al al-Mahmûd (Al Hamza) and Al al-Mu'ayyad. Aided by his sons, principally the eldest, al-Mutahhar, his death from plague occurred on 5 Djumada II 1087/15 February 1674.

Bibliography: 1. Unpublished sources. An unpublished partial biography covering the years 1056-72/1646-62 is that by Qurtûzî (d. 1077/1666-7), Tahâfat al-asna wa 'l-abûr. Other ms. sources include Yahya b. al-Husayn (d. ca. 1100/1690), Bahghût al-samân, the continuation to an earlier work (Anbâ' al-zamân) of Ishaq al-Yama'n (d. 1055/1645-6), Ghdzawdt al-Djarakisa, al-La'idli al-mudiyya; 2. Useful published accounts are Ibn al-Wâzîr (d. 1147/1734-5), Tabal ab-l-badî', ed. D. Árastâ, 80-2. (J-R Blackburn)
MUTAWALI (A.), pl. mutawala/mutawallis, mutawlih in colloquial Lebanese, metawali in French, name for the Twelver Shi'is [see ʿASHARIYYA] in the Twelver Shi'ism [see ITHNA] in Damascus, but not, generally speaking, for those residing in Lebanon [see LUBNAN]. The term is also used for Lebanon [see LUBNAN] and of northern Lebanon designated C[see BA] and of northern Lebanon designated C[see BA].

Even after the endeavours of Ahmad Rida, H. Lammens, Muh. al-Amin and others, the etymology of the name is not clearly elucidated. According to the rules, is formed from tawalli/mutawalli or, in accordance with the rules, from tawalli/mutawali. In both cases the name would refer to a relationship of loyalty and adherence to the Ahl al-Bayt [q.v.] (al-ʿIjāf, ii/5 [May 1910], 237; al-Muktataf, xxxvi/5 [May 1910], 425, and the critical notes to this by Shaklb Arslan in al-Muktataf, xxxvii/2 [August 1910], 739 f.). In the version mentioned by Arslan (ibid.), who refers to Muhammad ʿAbdulh, the name is said to go back to mut wa'lmi ʿl-ʾAlī, a kind of war-cry, and as such it is a merely popular etymology (for the various explanations of the name, see also Muh. Kurd AH, Khitat al-ʾĀmil fi al-Fakhl al-ʾĀmil, Djabal ʾĀmil, 31 f.).

It is beyond doubt that the historical presence in Lebanon of the Twelver Shi'is is much older than the time in which the name mutawila came up. Referring to a passage in the Amal al-ʾĀmil [see AL-HUJR AL-ʾAMIL], mutawila authors, particularly in the 20th century, point out again and again that the community of the Twelver Shi'is in Lebanon was established already in early Islamic times. Their existence there is said to go back to the missionary activities of Abu Dharr [q.v.], the Companion of the Prophet; this community thus would be the second oldest after that in the Hijāz (Ahmad Rida, op. cit.; Muh. al-Amin, Khitat Djabal ʾĀmil, ed. 1983, 83 ff.). This assertion was challenged in particular by Shaklb Arslan (see Bibli.).

The novelty which Abu Dharr in recent times enjoys with many Twelver Shi'is (and with Sunnis as well) as an alleged socialist and rebel furthers the spread and the affirmation of the idea that he is a sort of founding father of the Shi'is in Lebanon. This way of representing things is also suitable for rejecting any speculation about an alleged Persian origin of the ma'dāwiya, which is undesirable from the point of view of Arab nationalism (see Lammens, op. cit.). It is true that in Lebanon there never was a centre of Shi'i learning of the same importance as the ʿAtātab [q.v. in Suppl.] in ʿIrāq, but the region of Djabal ʾĀmil throughout the centuries produced a number of important learned families (see the outline map in Momem, An introduction to Shi'i Islam, New Haven-London 1985, 270-1). Members of these families have played an important role in both ʿIrāq and Persia, especially since the 10th/16th century (Hourani and Muruwwa, see Bibli.). However, their influence on the early phase of the Sa'afid period in Persia should not be exaggerated.

Authors from the Djabal ʾĀmil such as ʾArif al-Zayn (d. 1960), Muh. al-Amin (d. 1952) and Muhammad Djāwād Muhīniyya (d. 1979), have had an important impact on the development of Shi'i modernism (Makki, al-Horoka; Muhammad ʿAli Shams al-Din, al-ʾIsláh al-ḥādī, Khalidi, Shaykh Ahmad; Mallat, ʿShī thought).

After the foundation of the State of Lebanon, the Maḍāwiya succeeded in 1926 to be recognised as an independent maqāmah with their own judges and courts (see OM, vi [1926], 87 f.). However, in the following years and again and again occasion came to complain about being being discriminated against in the country's political system and about the economic neglect of their regions. The ʿShī awakening', the formation of Shi'i militias and the influence of Iran on this development play a central role in the outbreak and the course of the Lebanese Civil War since 1975 (see the research by Ajami, Fohl-Schölerlein, Rieck and Norton and the literature given there). Because of the jāfīyya system in Lebanon, giving information about their exact number or about their part in the entire population has always been avoided in the case of the Twelver Shi'is. There are also only vague reports on their part in the population of Lebanese origin living abroad (West Africa, South and North America).


AL-MUTAWALLI, Abū Sa‘īd al-Ra‘d ibn al-Amīn. Shafi‘i jurist, born at Nisabūr in 426/1035 (or 427/1036), died in Baghdad in Shawwal 478/February 1086. In fikh, his principal teachers were the Shafi‘i al-Husayn al-Marwarrudhi (d. 478/1086). In his principal teachers were the Shafi‘i’s counterpart of al-Juwayni, and denotes a Prophetic tradition (or, in general, any report) with the requisite number of concurrent chains that make a report mutawadir, there is no unanimity; it is used as a technical term in two senses: (a) In the methodologies of 'hadith [q.v., and for the term see Vol. III, 228] and of law, the term is the counterpart of khabar al-wadhi [q.v.] and denotes a Prophetic tradition (or, in general, any report) with multiple chains of transmission [see isnad]. Concerning the requisite number of concurrent chains that would make a report mutawadir, there is no unanimity; it is supposed to be a sufficient number to preclude the possibility of possible agreement on an error or of confusion in a forgery. The Kur‘an, e.g., is clearly transmitted by tawādur [q.v.]. The works on hadith methodology do not devote much attention to the notion, whereas most compendiums on usul al-fikh (juridical methodology) contain chapters—sometimes lengthy ones—in it within the section dealing with the hadith (reports). This is only natural, because the notion of mutawadir grew out of discussions of the hadīqiyya (possibility of proof, conclusiveness) of a Prophetic tradition for determining the legal status of an act, or an opinion, as a cost of certifying legal theorists. In fact, a mutawadar tradition was considered by the majority of authorities to yield knowledge (sim) and certitude (sakān) rather than presumption (zann).

There are not too many traditions that qualify as mutawadar, especially not of the mutawddar variety, in which the texts appended to the various texts are identical in wording (the opposite being mutu‘d; for the difference see ISNAD).

In the epistemology of kalām theology (and to some extent, philosophy, see e.g. Ibn Sinā, al-Naṣīḥa, Cairo 1357/1958, 61), the idea of tawādur was extended to all reports on 'ilma‘ wa’sumā‘, the validity of mutawadir reports. In this context, al-Taftazānī simply replies that the possibility that these reports should be mutawadir, is excluded. The second objection is that the reports of every single reporter (‘hadī) represent an opinion only and that an accumulation of opinions cannot be said to afford certainty. This to al-Taftazani replies that often plurality has a power of singleness which is devoid, e.g., of a card made of hair.

(b) In prosody, the term is applied to the rhyme in which only one moving letter intervenes between the last two quiescents. See also kāfiya, esp. at IV, 412b, top.

MUTAWATIR — MUTAYR

1313, 33 ff.; Lisdn al-cArab, vii, 137; Fakhr al-Dm al-RazI, al-Mahsul fi cilm usul al-fikh, ed. ... Mutayr centres on the Tuwal, the "deep" wells of Mutayr, Wabra, Garca (Karca), Lusafa, Lahaba, Dzarya (Karya) culturally and tawdf means limited to assisting pilgrims from foreign lands, also cater very mutawwifs. The circle. On the contrary, they act as bulation of the Ka through the ceremonies required at the circumam-
cation. As soon as the pilgrims arrive in Djidda or in Mecca, charge of what they leave behind them.ervants take charge of the pilgrims. During the whole of the or members of their families and ser-
vice, food, purchases (necessary and unnecessary), during their stay they provide the pilgrims with lodging, ser-
vice, food, purchases (necessary and unnecessary), attend them if they fall ill and in case of death take charge of what they leave behind them.

The mutawwifs of course do not all this for nothing. They are appropriately paid for their trouble and see that, if the pilgrim is rich, their friends and relations can be seen to have moved the focus of their attention to the Ghatan (Kahtan) and in a long series of wars, they contested the pastoral rights of the Banu Khaibar (64) in 1080/1669 in connection with the Sharif Hamud b. 'Abd Allah's expedition to Najd. During the 12th/18th century, they occupied the desert between Mecca and Medina (Doughty, ii, 366). They are first mentioned by Ibn Bishr (64) in the late 12th century, although as late as 1287-8/1870-1 they are recorded as serving the Ghataf around Unayza. Up till the early 12th/18th century, they occupied the desert between Kasim and Medina. However, by the time of Doughty's visit in the 1870s they were already regularly migrating towards Kuwait in summer, this following the eclipse of the Banu Khaibar, the previous rulers of al-Ahsa. In 1239/1823 with the help of the 'Adjimans, they had defeated the Banu Khaibar in the 'Arma plateau. However, later in 1243/1827 they were allied with the latter against Turk P. Sufud. Such quick changes of alliance characterised Bedouin political relationships in those times. By that time they can be seen to have moved the focus of their attention to the east. During the 13th/19th century they opposed the growing power of the Al Sufud, sometimes allied with the Al Rashid, sometimes with the Egyptians. But by the beginning of this century they had joined the Ikhwan movement and were the spearhead of Ibn Sufud's attacks into Hijaz. Dabab Shammar and Kuwait territory. They were prominent in the ill-
fated Ikhwan rebellion against Ibn Sufud, and Faysal al-Diwish ended his days a prisoner of the latter after being handed over to him by the British in defiance of Bedouin rules of sanctuary.

The territory of the eastern Mutayr centres on the Tuwal, the "deep" wells of Mutayr, Wabra, Gar'a (Kar'a), Lusafa, Lajaba, Dqary'a (Karya) Ilyya and...
Dzarya Sifla; extending south they embrace Khufaysa and Tork Turaybi, then west to Kayciyya and Arzawiyya, then northeast along the southern to al-Hafar. They border the 'Adjamān and 'Awāzim on the east, the Suby and Subhūl on the south, and the Harb, Shammār and Zafrī on the west.

Their main traditional enemies in the days of intertribal raiding were the Shammār and Zafrī, the latter taking the brunt of their attacks into 'Irāk in the Khi-wān period. They are counted Ahl al-Qunub "southern Bedouin" like the 'Uṭayba, Harb and 'Adjamān. In fact, they are the northernmost of these, the Shammār and Zafrī being Ahl al-Shīmāl "northerners". Their dialect, of a central Nadjdi type, links them with some sections of Harb and 'Uṭayba, also west-central Nadjdi in origin and present location.


**MUṬAYR — MUṬAZILA**

MUṬAZILA, the name of a religious movement founded at Başra, in the first half of the 2nd/8th century by Wāṣīl b. 'Uthmān b. Abl Wakkās, etc.), the word would have been applied to the sinful Muslim—who should, according to Wāṣīl, be described by the definition of fasik, an "intermediate rank" between that of mu'min and that of kāfir—Wāṣīl was opposed to the consensus of the Muslim for whom, in any circumstances, the sinful Muslim could not be other than "believing" or "disbelieving". To this, the Muṭazila replied that, on the contrary, Wāṣīl's intention was in fact to retain only that which, among Muslims, was the object of a consensus: while they differed as to whether the sinful Muslim should be termed mu'min or kāfir, all, on the other hand, were agreed in defining him as fasik (K. al-Intisār, 118, II. 10-19). In other words, on this question, Wāṣīl was as unwilling to side with the Murjāšī (q.v.; partisans of the first solution) as with the Kādirījītes (q.v.; partisans of the second); he chose to "stand aside" from this debate.

It is an explanation of this kind which today, in particular as a result of the studies undertaken by Nallino (Sul'origine del name deiMu'taziziti, in *RSO*, vii [1916]), is generally accepted: ihtīl would designate a position of neutrality in the face of opposing factions. Nallino drew support for this argument from the fact that at the time of the first civil war, some of the Companions ("Abd Allāh b. 'Umar, Sa'd b. Abī Waḳḳās, etc.), who had chosen to side neither with 'Alī nor with his adversaries, were for this reason called muṭazila. He even drew the conclusion that the theological Muṭazilī and Shammar, after al-'Abbās's death, that is, after the death of al-'Abbās (110/728), that 'Amr b. 'Ubayd—another disciple of al-'Abbās, and a particularly eminent one—decided to join him. After the death of Wāṣīl in 131/748, it was 'Amr who took on the leadership of the group. It is hardly likely that at this early stage of the movement the Muṭazilī doctrine, as it was to be formulated several decades later by Abu 'l-Hudhayl, was already fully developed. No doubt the theses defended here were essentially the same as those previously current in the milieu of the Kadāriyya (q.v.), to which al-'Abbās belonged: rejection of the doctrine of predetermination, affirmation of the absolute responsibility of every individual with regard to his transgressions which could not be in any sense the work of God. It will be noted that, on the question of the name to be applied to the sinful Muslim, al-'Abbās seems to have accepted the notion of an "intermediate rank", although in the event he proposed munafīk ("hypocrite" [q.v.]) in place of fasik ("malefactor" [q.v.]). Similarly, al-'Abbās subscribed to the principle that every repentant sinner will suffer for ever the torments of Hell, an essential element of what was later to be called "the promise and the threat" (al-wa'd wa l-taw'īd).

Did the movement launched by Wāṣīl also have political objectives? Nyberg believed so, on the basis of a singular interpretation of the ihtīl and of the doctrine of the "intermediate rank" (cf. Elf, *s.v. Muṭazila*, at iii, 787-8). This, according to him, in fact be interpreted as denoting a position of a political nature, characterised simultaneously by a declared hostility with regard to the Umayyads and a cautious attitude towards the 'Abbāsid caliphate. Beyond consideration of its more radical elements. Now, Nyberg claimed, this position corresponded exactly to that of the 'Abbāsid movement, to the extent that the doc-
The term of “intermediate rank” would be nothing other than the theoretical encapsulation of the political programme of the ‘Abbasids before their accession to power”. This explains why, “for at least a century”, Mu’tazili theology “remained the official doctrine of the ‘Abbasid court”. This would also account for the fact that Wāsīl* sent envoyg to the different countries of the Muslim world; the object was to spread the propaganda of the ‘Abbasids. This interpretation, as proved now, has no validity. Not only did the first Mu’tazila not support the ‘Abbasid movement, but a large number of them participated in the inscription of ‘Ibrahim b. ‘Abd Allāh [q.v.] in 145/762 against al-Mansūr (cf. J. van Ess, Une lecture à rebours de l’histoire du mu’tazilisme, 120-1). The “propaganda” organised by Wāsīl was, in all probability, of a purely religious nature (ibid., 104-8). As for the supposed amicable relations between al-Mansūr and ‘Amr b. ‘Ubayd, this is probably an instance of a legend invented after the event (ibid., 118-22). It was only on the accession of al-Ma’mūn that Mu’tazilism became, for a brief period, official doctrine.

Historical evolution. The author of the present article is not a historian, and therefore will not venture to describe the history of Mu’tazilism (which extends over a period of approximately five centuries) in detail and in relation with its eternal, political and social. On this subject, and in particular on the earliest periods, some very detailed and informative analyses have been compiled, in recent years, by J. van Ess. While inviting the reader to avail himself of these sources (see Bibl.), we confine ourselves here to a few succinct references.

The great age of Mu’tazilism is not limited, as is often the case, to a single period. It lasted for a continuous and homogeneous association. On the human level, nothing could be more dissimilar, for example, than the two schools of ‘Abū ‘l-Hudhayl and ‘Abū Wasil, two contemporaries of ‘Abū ‘l-Hudhayl, but in his case, on a different point: he absolutely denies the existence of God and of the Last Judgment. And the same is true of ‘Abd al-Djabbār. Al-Nazzam radically re-
The thesis supported by Abu '1-Hudhayl and al-Nazzam, according to which God necessarily (al-azd*), for him, including that relating to his future life, was contradicted by Bishr al-Mu'tamir, author of a famous work by Abu Rashid al-Nisaburi, fortunately preserved, reveals, in matters of cosmology and anthropology, "The questions on which the Basrans and the Baghdabis are opposed" (al-Mu'addaf al-Basriyyin wa'l-Baghdadiyin, ed. M. Ziyada and R. al-Sayyid, Beirut 1979), where primary attention is given to the theses upheld on the one hand by Abu '1 and (especially) Abu Hāshim al-Djubba', on the other by Abu '1-Kasim al-Basri. It is in particular the theory of "states" (aṣūra), conceived by Abu Hāshim, which was violently attacked from the "Baghdad" side (especially by Ibn al-Ikhšid). It is true that, even among the "Basrans", this thesis was not unanimously accepted, far from it; some opposed it with the utmost vigour, including Muḥammad b. ʿUmar al-Ṣaymari (d. 315/927)—although it should be said that al-Ṣaymari was at least as much a "Basran" as a "Baghdadi"—Abu '1-Husayn al-Basiri. As a result, there was constituted in the very midst of the "Baṣra" school a sub-group of supporters of Abu Hāshim, known as Baḥšāniyya (though comprising almost all of the "Djubba'is" mentioned above).

The arrival of the Saljukids marks, in general, the end of this second period (without there being any genuine relation of cause to effect), and, consequently, of the "Golden Age" of Mu'tazilism. Nevertheless, the latter did not disappear.

On the one hand, Mu'tazilis as such continued to exist for a long time. Even in Baghdād, the forced recantation of Ibn ʿĀkil (q.v.) under pressure from Hanbali circles, should not be invested with undue significance. Many Ḥanafis were Mu'tazilis, and, as is known, the Saljukids themselves favoured the Ḥanafī madhhab. Consequently, throughout the last two centuries of the 'Abbāsid caliphate, a fair number of kādis, in Baghdād as in Rayy, were avowed Mu'tazilis (cf. W. Madelung, Religious schools and sects in medieval Islam, London 1985, ii, 135-7). Among these, mention should be made of Abu Ya'qūb Yusuf al-Langhānī (d. 606/1209), who was one of the masters of Ibn ʿĀbil al-Ḥadīd (cf. Sharīʿat al-Baghdadī, lx, 192, ll. 10-11). In Khâraζm, where it was overtly supported by the local princes, Mu'tazilism continued throughout this period as the dominant ideology (cf. Madelung, op. cit., 115-16), to such an extent that outside this area Khâraζmī was understood as a synonym of mu'tazilī (cf. Yākūt, Udabbi, vi, 155, ll. 7-10). Khâraζm was the birthplace of Muḥammad al-Zamākhshāri (d. 538/1144 (q.v.), author of a famous Kur'ānic commentary entitled al-Rṣādīgh, it was also in Khâraζm that the young Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (q.v.) had such violent arguments with the local Mu'tazilis that he was forced to leave the country. It appears that by this time the "Baghdādī" tendency had ceased to exist; according to al-Rāzī (al-Fiqhārī, fīrak al-Muslimīn, ed. A. S. al-Nāshābī, Cairo 1938, 45) the only survivors were the supporters of Abu Hāshim and those of Abu '1-Husayn al-Basiri. But it was only after the Mongol conquest that Mu'tazilism as such finally disappeared altogether.

On the other hand, Mu'tazilī theses have not remained the exclusive property of the school bearing...
Within Islam, these are the Shi'is, Zaydis and, later, Imámīs. Already implicit, to some extent, in the teaching of al-Kāsim b. ʿĪbrahīm al-Rasālī (d. 246/860), Muʿtazilism was decisively adopted as much by al-Ḥasan b. Zaydī (d. 270/884 [q.v.]), founder of the Zaydi amirate of Tabaristān (his brother and successor, Muhammad, employed as secretaries Abu ʿl-Kāsim al-Balkhī and Abū Muslim al-Īsfahānī, one of the Muʿtazilī commentators of the Kurʾān), as by Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn al-Ḥādī ʿīlā l-Ḥakk (d. 298/911 [q.v.]), founder of the Zaydi principality of the Yemen. Among the Imámīs, it is the "Baghdādī" tendency which prevailed, while among the Zaydis of the Caspian region, the ʿDubbāʾī doctrine was followed. The Imám al-ʿMuʿayyad b. ʿĪlam (d. 411/1020 [q.v.]) had been the pupil of ʿAbd Allāh al-BAṣrī and of the ʿAbbāsī. One of the claimants to his succession, known by the curious name of Mānkīdīm (or Mānakīdīm) ʿAṣhādī (d. 425/1034), is the author of the well-known paraphrase of the Shīr b. ʿIṣāl al-Ḍhama of ʿAbd al-Ḍabbār. (On all of the above, cf. W. Madelung, Der Islam in der Weltgeschichte, 1: Glaubenslehren der Zaiditen, Berlin 1965.) This state of affairs had a particularly fortunate consequence, the preservation of quantities of Muʿtazilī writings; it is principally in the Yemen (the Zaydi amirate of Persia having disappeared at the beginning of the 6th/12th century) that there have been recovered, in all or in part, the works of ʿAbd al-Ḍabbār, Abū Ṭalāf al-Mishārīrī, Ibn Mātawawī, etc.

On the Imámī side, Muʿtazilīsm first made an impact at the end of the 3rd/9th century, with the Banū ʿNaḥabīn ʿAbū Sahīl al-ʿNaḥabīn (d. 311/924) and his nephew al-Ḥasan b. Mūsā (d. ca. 310/923), the author of the K. Fīrāq al-Ḥaṣa. It was initially short-lived; the theology of Ibn Bābawayh (d. 381/991 [q.v.]) affirmed, on the contrary, that God creates the actions of men and wills everything which comes into being (including evil). But Muʿtazilī theses prevailed again, this time definitively, with the disciple of Ibn Bābawayh, al-Shaykh al-Mufīd (d. 413/1022 [q.v.]), upholding the theses of the "Baghdādīs", as is abundantly illustrated by his Awaṣāl al-makдумt (sometimes to an exaggerated extent) a symbol of intellectual liberty and modernity (cf. inter alia, Ch. Bouamrane, Le problème de la liberté humaine dans la pensee musulmane, solution muṭāzilite, Paris 1978; ʿAdil al-ʿAwā, al-Muʿtazila wa ʿl-ʾIṣkār al-burāq, Damascus 1987).

Theses. This term will be understood here as applying exclusively to the theses characteristic of the Muʿtazilīs, those by which they are recognised as such, and as a result of which their opponents—Sunni theologians in particular—combatted them. There will thus be no discussion here of their cosmology, based (except in the case of al-Nazzām) on the principles of atomism [see ʿMUḤAṣIM] and the distinction between substance and accident; elaborated, in all probability by Abu ʿl-Hudhayfī, this cosmology was to become, in effect, the common doctrine of all the mutakallimīn, Sunni as well as Muʿtazīlīs. Nor will there be reference to their theses regarding the Imāmīs, their views on this subject also being (almost without exception) identical to those of the Sunnis [see IMAMA].

In his time, Abu ʿl-Hudhayfī believed it possible to propound the distinctive theses of Muʿtazilīsm in the form of "five principles" (al-waḍūʿ al-ʾakhlāṣūn), these being (cf. among others al-Maṣʿūdī, Muḥītī, ed. Pellat, §§ 2254-6): 1. uniqueness of God (al-ʿaṣb), 2. justice of God (al-ʿadl), 3. "the promise and the threat" (al-ʻIṣda ʿl-ʾIṣrāʿīlī), by which, it will be recalled, it is understood that on account of the "threat" uttered against him in the Kurʾān, every Muslim guilty of a serious offence, who dies without repentance, will suffer for eternity the torments of Hell; 4. the theory of an "intermediate state" (al-ṭamanez adh dhāliqa) that occurs at the end of Wāḥī b. Ṭāsī, according to which the same sinful Muslim cannot here on earth be classed either as "believing"
MU'TAZILA

The character of God and the divine attributes

1. A primary thesis characteristic in this context is what could be called the negation in God of "substantive attributes". Like all theologians, the Mu'tazila

habitually describe God by means of His "attributes"; or if at. By this term, following the example of the grammarians, they refer exclusively, for their part, to adjectives, such as "powerful" (kādir), "knowing" (ṣālim), "creating" (khālik), "nourishing" (rāzik), etc., the word ifṣa here being nothing more than a direct synonym of wajf, or even of im. But the question is then posed: by virtue of what does God merit such qualifying adjectives? In the context of what may conventionally be called "attributes of the act" (ṣifat al-faʿl), i.e. adjectives which He merits on account of such-and-such an act accomplished by Him, such as khālik, rāzik, muḥīṭ, mukāsin, etc., it will be accepted without difficulty that such adjectives can be applied to Him on account of something which comes into being, an existent created by Him. But when approaching the "attributes of the essence" (ṣifat al-dhāli al-ṣāliḥ), i.e. adjectives which are applied to Him from all eternity, by the very fact of His nature as God, such as ʿālīm, kādir, ṣāṣī (since it cannot be conceived that God has ever been not knowing, not powerful, not living), the question may be asked whether these other adjectives do not themselves imply, according to the same rule, "existents" which would be their reason for being, and which, through the fact that God merits these adjectives eternally, are necessarily eternal. In other words, God would be knowing from all eternity on account of the presence of Him in an eternal knowledge, etc. It is known that the Sunni theologians—following the example, in particular, of Ibn Kullābqa. v. in Suppl.]—explicitly accepted this conclusion. The ʿAṣāris, for their part, affirm the existence in God of seven (or eight) eternal "entities" (maʿānī) ("beauty", "seeing", "will", etc., it will be accepted without difficulty that such adjectives are at the same time neither identical to God nor other than Him, just as between themselves they are neither identical nor other.

Reasoning in this fashion, it may be noted that the Sunni theologians did nothing other than to apply without restriction two principles which the Mu'tazila also normally held to be true, and which they had possibly been the first to formulate: on the one hand, the principle that every adjective has a cause (ʿilā), a reason for being (such is the primary sense of the word maʿānī) which is nothing other than, precisely, the corresponding substantive; an object is "mobile" on account of the presence in it of an entity of "movement", "white" on account of the existence in it of an entity of "whiteness", etc.; on the other hand, there is the principle of the necessary "analogy of the invisible to the visible" (kiyās al-ghāib al-bālī ʿalīghā), by virtue of which that which is true of the creature is likewise true of God; it is through analogy with man that we know that God is powerful, knowing and living. Hence, if ʿAzīz is necessarily knowing on account of a knowledge (by virtue of the first principle), the same must inevitably apply to God (by virtue of the second principle). Such is the reasoning explicitly invoked, for example, by al-Bākillānī (Tamhīd, ed. McCarthy, Beirut 1957, § 335).

And such indeed was, apparently, the reasoning of

Two centuries after the death of Abu ʿl-Hudhayl, this scheme was still considered pertinent, since it con-

... to "command the good and forbid the evil" (al-amr bi-ʿl-maṣūr wa ʿl-nahy...
Abu 'l-Hudhayl who, for his part, accepted the statement that God is "knowing through a knowledge", "states" and "powerful", although, on account of the significant difference with the evident object of avoiding the conclusion to which adherents of this thesis habitually find themselves drawn, i.e. the admission of a plurality of eternals—in other words as an advocate of the principle of tawhid— he maintained that this knowledge by virtue of which God is knowing is nothing other than God himself. "God", he said, "is knowing through a knowledge identical to Himself (huwa ūsīm bi-ūsīm ḥuwa ḫuwa), powerful through a power identical to Himself, living through a life identical to Himself, and likewise he spoke of His hearing, His sight ... and of all the attributes of His essence" (al-As‘arī, Makdāl, 165, ll. 5-7). This is a paradoxical thesis, which has the effect of simultaneously asserting and refuting the first of the two principles enunciated above; since, while basing each divine qualification on the corresponding substantive, it removes all reality from this substantive by identifying it each time with the divine essence. This is no doubt the reason why this thesis did not have a following and why, instead of taking this artificial detour by way of entities that do not exist, the majority of the later Mu'tazila, equally concerned to maintain the principle of divine uniqueness, preferred to declare directly that God is "knowing, powerful, living, and not through a knowledge, a power and a life" (Makdāl, 164, ll. 13-14; cf. also al-Šahrastānī, K. al-Milād, ed. Badrān, Cairo 1947-55, 62, ll. 2-3). Such would also be the point of view of al-Djubbaṭ (cf. Sharḥ, 182, ll. 13-14; Milād, 122, ll. 5-4).

Between Mu'tazīs and Sunnīs, there are not only differing points of view, there is also a difference in vocabulary. As has been observed, for the Mu'tazila, the word sīfāt, used in reference to God, could denote nothing other than the adjectives ("powerful", "knowing", etc.) which are applied to Him. The Sunnīs, curiously (although the Imāmi theologian Ḥīgham b. al-Hakam [q.v.] had previously used the term in this sense, cf. Makdāl, 222, ll. 1-5 and 369, ll. 1-3), normally understand by sīfāt not the adjectives (for which they tend to reserve the term aswāf) but the corresponding substantives, in other words, those eternal "entities" from which God derives the said adjectives. Whence, on the part of the Sunnīs, the assertion, astonishing at first sight, according to which the Mu'tazīs, since they deny the existence in God of such entities, "deny the sīfāt (cp. cit., 483, ll. 2-7)", whereas the Sunnīs, for their part "affirm the sīfāt" (ibid., 170, l. 12) and call themselves ašhāb al-sīfāt (ibid., 171, ll. 12 and 16) or sīfātīyya (cf. Milād, 145, ll. 4-12).

The truth is that the simple solution proposed, among others, by al-Djubbaṭ did not eliminate all the problems. If the reason that God is, for all eternity, powerful, knowing, living, is nothing other than His very essence, then how is it to be explained that a unique, undifferentiated essence can give rise to distinct qualifications? It is for this reason that Abū Ḥāshim, son of al-Djubbaṭ, was to propose a solution of compromise between pure and simple negation of the substantive attributes and their affirmation: the adjectives applied to God are not simple words applied directly to a pure and plain essence, they are each the expression of something other than the essence itself, which is a "state" (thdbita), unmediated by God, for all eternity, a "fact-of-being-powerful" (katenhū ādīrīn), a "fact-of-being-knowing", etc., which legitimise the corresponding adjectives. With-
dent, looking at their Lord (sii rabbbii naizaratii)\textsuperscript{11}, LXXV, 22-3); but for the Mu'tazila this second formula is to be intepreted as previously proposed by Mujahid (cf. the commentary of al-Tabari): on the one hand, nazra here signifies not "to look at" but "to wait"; on the other, the proper complement of naizaratii is not rabbbii, but a word implied, this being sawabii, so that the true meaning of the formula is: "waiting for the reward of their Lord" (cf. Sharia, 245, ll. 4-5; al-Aqfi'ari, Lam'a, § 76). As for the hadith according to which the Prophet said to his Companions: "On the day of resurrection, you will see (saa-tarawunu) your Lord as you see the moon, on a night of full moon", if the hadith is authentic, which is doubtful (cf. Gimaret-Monnot, 418, n. 40) the verb "to see" (ra'ii) is to be understood here in a figurative sense (a type of which the Kur'an provides many examples), that is, as a synonym of "to be acquainted with" (uluna) (cf. Mugni, iv, 231, ll. 4-17; Shuray, 270, ll. 10-17).

It is necessary, however, to observe closely in what sense the Mu'tazila understand this divine transcendence. Certainly, they adhere as firmly as members of any other school to the letter of the Kur'\-anic formulae stating that "nothing is of His likeness" (XLII, 11). But what they basically understand by this, once more, is that God can have none of the characteristics which are naturally destined to us. He has neither form, nor colour, nor length, nor breadth, nor height, that He cannot be said to be either mobile or immobile, that He has neither parts, nor members, etc. (cf. Makdah, 155-6). This does not mean that there is no resemblance, in any respect, between Him and His creatures. If such were the case, we would be unable to say anything of Him and we could only describe Him negatively. Now God, because He is the creator (cf. below), has made it possible for us to know Him, with a positive knowledge which, here below, is accessible to us only through reasoning. Consequently, it is on account of our experience of creatures, and on account of a necessary "analogy of the invisible to the visible" (hamal al-\\mu\-\'\-\^ahad 'l-\-'\^ahid) that we can know, first, that God exists (because we know that here below everything which comes into being implies that someone makes it come into being), subsequently that He merits certain adjectives: "powerful", because every agent (and God is known to us first as such, as creator) is necessarily powerful, "knowing", because He performs acts "skilfully executed" (af\\^al muhkan), or whoever is capable of producing such acts is necessarily knowing; and so forth. All the adjectives which we apply to God, we first become aware of them in this visible world (fi l-\-'\^ahid), and it is in the same sense that we apply them to God as to man; just as what is proof for us is likewise proof for Him (cf. Gimaret, \textit{Theories de l'action humain en theologie musulmane}, Paris 1980, 281-2).

II. Concerning the justice of God, and the doctrine that He wills and does only that which is good.

The principle of the necessary justice of God is not only one of the characteristic dogmas of Mu'tazila, it may be said without exaggeration to be their fundamental dogma. Even more, than ahl al-\\^ahd wa al-\-'\^ahid (cf. Mugni, iv, 139, l. 4; vii, 3. 1; viii, 3. 1; ii, 4; xiii, 4. 17; Milad, 57, 1. 7).

With regard to this view, that of whatever persuasion, has ever asserted the contrary and described God as "unjust", it is the manner in which the Mu'\-\^azil\-\-\^a conceives this necessary justice of God that characterizes them. For one such as al-Aqfi'ari, God is necessarily just whatever He does; He would be so even if He acted in a contrary fashion. God, according to al-Aqfi'ari, is not subject to any rule; rules are applied only to us, on account of the Law which God has imposed upon us. For the Mu'tazila, on the other hand (and here again there is a form of "analogy of the invisible to the visible"), God is subject, in this respect, to the same laws which apply to man; that which is just or unjust for us—i.e., that which our reason, for its part, tells us to do—is the same for God. This is why, from the Mu'tazila point of view, the necessary justice of God is not only a fact which implies for Him a permanent obligation; in the name of His justice, God is required to act in such-and-such a fashion, since otherwise He would be unjust. Whence arises the question which the Mu'tazila were constantly debating (a question which, for al-Aqfi'ari, would be quite meaningless), which is whether God has the power to be unjust, or, in a broader sense, to act badly; this is a question with no satisfactory answer; since, whether the answer be affirmative or negative, either the justice of God, or his omnipotence, will be compromised.

The necessary justice of God first of all excludes any notion of predestination; it would be unjust on the part of God, say the Mu'tazila, to decide in advance the fate of every man in the Hereafter and to ordain that one will be saved and another damned. It would be quite meaningless, which is whether God has the power to be unjust, or, in a broader sense, to act badly; this is a question with no satisfactory answer; since, whether the answer be affirmative or negative, either the justice of God, or his omnipotence, will be compromised.

As for the other Kur'\-\^anic formul\-\-\^a which we apply to God, we first become aware of them in this visible world (fi l-\-'\^ahid), and it is in the same sense that we apply them to God as to man; just as what is proof for us is likewise proof for Him (cf. Gimaret, \textit{Theories de l'action humain en theologie musulmane}, Paris 1980, 281-2).
contrary notion that God, if He wished, could make all men believe (but He does not do so); that “He has available to Him a grace (tajdid) such that, if He produced it in one whom He knows ought not to believe, the latter would believe” (Makdālī, 246, II 3-4 and 573, II 9-11). This thesis, which only Dījāfār b. Harb subsequently took seriously, was rejected—quite logically—by all the rest of the school (ibid., 247, II 3-14 and 574, II 4-7). The Dījābāris did, indeed, retain the term, but distorted the sense. There does exist, according to them, a divine ‘grace’ or rather ‘graces’ of all kinds, such that, through them, men are led, or helped, to believe (thus the intelligence that God gives them, the “clear proofs” by which He makes Himself known to them, the prophets whom He sends to them, etc.; but there can be no question, as implied by the thesis of Bishr, of seeing here a pure favour which God, arbitrarily, would grant to some and withhold from others; God, in the name of His justice, is bound to grant these ‘graces’ to all equally, since otherwise it would have to be admitted that He deliberately wills the perdition (fāsād) of those to whom He denies them, a notion that cannot be conceived (cf. Mughnī, xiii, 116 ff.).

This same justice of God likewise implies that men have control over their voluntary acts, in other words, that they can be the producers of them; this principle contradicts the thesis of the “coercionists” (al-mudjābiyūn), according to which these acts are created in them by God. Only such an autonomy of the human agent can justify the fact that in this world God imposes a law upon him, and that in the next he will be rewarded or punished according to whether he has observed it or not. Obligation and sanction can only be understood in reference to a responsible being; now, according to Mu‘tazilī thinking, the only one authentically responsible for an act is the one who is the author of it in the full sense of the term, who, therefore, “makes it to be” (yudīdashhu, yudīdhu). To claim—as do the adherents of the theory of kasb [q. v.].—that man can be in some way the agent, or the one responsible for an act, without causing it to be, is meaningless.

While God does not create the voluntary human act, He does at least create in the man the power (kudra, istišā‘a) corresponding to this act. But it could not be the case, as thought by these same adherents of kasb, of a power which only comes into being when the act is put into effect, which God would create simultaneously with this act. For the Mu‘tazilī, the notion of power is linked to that of free choice (ikhtiyār), itself implied, once again, by the principle of divine justice. One who has power is recognised by the faculty which he has of “not choosing that for which he has power” (Mughnī, viii, 188, I 10). A typical formula of al-Dījābarī, as of his son Abū Ḥāşim, was that “whoever has the power of a thing can equally well do it or not do it” (mān ḥakīki ‘l-kādir ‘alā ‘l-ghayr ‘an yuṣī físico ‘an yuṣī físūhū ‘an yuṣī físūhū wa-an lā yuṣī físūhū, ibid., ix, 73, II 8-10). In other words, every power is equally the power of an act and of its opposite (kudrat ‘alā sālih wa-‘alā ḍīnīhū, Makdālī, 230, II 12-13). Hence, the power cannot be other than prior to the act; if it were concomitant with it, owing to the fact that it is at the same time the power of an act and of its opposite, its coming into being would entail the simultaneous realisation of opposites, which cannot be. On this question of the priority (or non-priority) of the power in relation to the act, the Mu‘tazilī adhere to the Mu‘tahharī. The Qurān itself being invoked in support of both arguments (cf., for example, ḿa‘āma‘, ch. vi).

Naturally, it is the duty of God to create in us the powers necessary for the fulfilment of acts which His law imposes upon us. Any form of obligation to the impossible (taklif mā lā yuṣī físū) would be contrary to His justice. The powers in question are specifically among those ‘graces’ which He is required to grant to all those subject to the Law.

Finally, in the next world, God must of necessity reward those who have merited His reward, and punish those who have merited His punishment. There is no doubt that He has the ability to pardon; the Qurān states that He “pardons whom He wills and punishes whom He wills” (II, 284; III, 129, etc.). In fact, there is no possibility that He will pardon anyone who has not merited His pardon; pardon is only conceivable where there has previously been repentance on the part of the unbeliever or the sinner (‘l-māṣīfah bi-‘siyṣrī l-tawba, says ‘Abd al-Dījābarī, Mūtaṣabīb al-Qurān, ed. ‘A. Zarzūr, Cairo 1969, 596, I 13). Similarly, only sinners who have already repented will be able, on the Day of Judgment, to benefit from the intercession of the Prophet (Sharh, 688, I 3). Conversely, God is required to pardon the man who repents; “accepting repentance”, so long as it is sincere, is for Him an obligation (kābul l-tawba waṣūlīh; cf. Mughnī, xiv, 377, II 6 ff.). It is likewise out of the question that God will punish those who have not merited it, since to punish someone on that basis would be contrary to His justice (Sharh, 477, II 15-16). This applies in particular to young children (affāt), irresponsible beings; it is inconceivable that God would punish the children of idolaters (affāt al-mushrikīn) for the sins of their fathers (ibid., 477, I 8). All suffering inflicted by God, in this world or in the next, must be merited; if such is not the case (in particular the sufferings experienced by innocent animals), God will be obliged to grant, either here below, or in the next world, a compensation (‘sawād) commensurate with the suffering experienced (cf. Gimaret-Monnot, 281-3).

Such are the manifold implications of the Mu‘tazilī principle of divine “justice”, interpreted stricto sensu. But the Mu‘tazilī, as already indicated, also understand this term in a much wider sense, as meaning that God only wills or does that which is (morally) good (hasan), and He is necessarily exempt from any act which is (morally) bad (munsazah ‘an kull kabhī). These notions of good and bad are interpreted in the same way as the notion of “justice” in the narrow sense; it is always a question, for the Mu‘tazilī, of that which we ourselves judge to be so, God, here too, being subject to the same rules which apply to us. There exists objective good and bad, acknowledged as such by every being endowed with reason. Thus, our reason makes us spontaneously recognise as acts bad in themselves injustice, deceit, ingratitude; all the more so is God aware of evil, since, by nature, He is omniscient. Moreover it cannot be imagined that He has the need to commit such acts, since, also by nature, He is devoid of need (ghāfūrūn). We are thus assured, according to al-Dījābarī, that God is incapable of doing evil, by virtue of the principle that anyone who recognises an act as bad, and does not need to commit it (and knows that he does not need, which is also the case), necessarily does not commit it (cf. Mughnī, vi/a, 207. II 1-7). It is true that according to the same principle, it could be supposed that God does not do good either, since He does not need to do it! Against such an objection, al-Dījābarī and his successors set out to show that a good act, even on the part of man, can be performed for the sake of its own goodness (li-husnī ‘l-fāṣil), without need on the part of its agent (op. cit., 223, II 17 ff.).

The fact that God is exempt from any evil act im-
plies in particular that He is "wise" (hakim) and not "foolish" (sqfih). This means essentially that, among other things, He is self-sufficient (ghani); that He is just and cannot do or will anything other than what is good; etc. It is only subject of tormenting them, which would be pure income by, among others, (yuadjh al-hikmafi 'l-taklif) (Mughni, xi, 58, l. 163 and 134, l. 1). What then is this end? It cannot be self-interest, since in this case too God is devoid of need. Nor could it be conceived that God has created men and imposed a Law upon them, it is because He had a reason to do so, and the next task is to show, as is now the vain act is, in itself, among the (^abath); this is why, according to the scholars of the hadith school of the绿文本的Mu'tazilis (cf. Sherman, 701, l. 17ff.). This does not mean that, in the Hereafter, the sinful Muslim will not deserve just as much as the unbeliever to dwell for eternity in Hell (except that his punishment there will be less severe). As a result of this, it is said, al-Ash'ari regarded the Mu'tazilites as "effeminate Kharijites" (mudhákhat al-khawrij), because, like the Kharijites, they considered the sinful Muslim to dwell in Hell, without daring however, like them, to describe him explicitly as "unbelieving". (In fact, as has been observed, not all were of this opinion; there were also, even during the "second period", Murdi'ja Mu'tazila for whom the possibility existed that the punishment of sinners might not be permanent.)

IV. Mu'tazzil rationalism.

It is quite legitimate to consider the Mu'tazila as "rationalists". It is, however, necessary to show precisely what is to be understood by this term, and in what respect their rationalism is specific.

They are clearly not rationalists in the sense of those who claim to formulate a system solely by the exercise of reason, independent of all revelation. As has been well underlined by A. Amin, the Mu'tazila are not philosophers (even though, in many regards, their speculations touch on philosophy), but theologians. Intimately involved in the internal debates of Islam, they reckon (just as their adversaries interpret the Qur'anic revelation. But the Mu'tazila are incontestably rationalists, in the true sense of the term, in that they consider that certain awarenesses are accessible to man by means of his intelligence alone, in the absence of, or prior to, any revelation. First, in the strictly theological domain, they say that God can be known to us through reasoning; it is, furthermore, only in this fashion that here below we can know Him (and this is why, according to them, the first of the obligations laid upon man is specifically reasoning to know God). Not only does reason enable us to establish Upper, the capacity of a creator (since this world has begun to exist, and everything which begins to exist implies that someone has brought it into being), it also informs us concerning His nature: that He is powerful (because every agent is necessarily powerful), wise (in that He is the author of acts "skillfully executed"), living (because one who is powerful and wise is necessarily so), endowed with hearing and sight (because every living being free of disabilities is capable of perceiving), that He is not a body; that He is self-sufficient (gani); that He is just and cannot do or will anything other than what is good; etc. It is only
once it has been shown—by reasoning, again—that Muhammad is authentically the Messenger of God (in that his credentials are proved by miracles), that the Qur'anic revelation can be taken into account. This revelation can, in fact, only confirm that which reason has established; there can be no contradictions between one and the other. Such contradictions as there are are only apparent, and can be resolved by an appropriate interpretation (ta'wil) of the revealed text: this applies, as has been observed, to all the Qur'anic formulae which could give the impression that God has a body similar to ours, that He is situated in a certain direction, that He can move from place to place, or that He can be seen, and to anything which apparently challenges the principle of divine justice. It is not, of course, the case that the revelation teaches us nothing that our reason has not already discovered: it is through the revelation that we know that God has imposed a Law upon men, that He will resurrect them, that He will reward and punish others. It remains true that all these facts, not demonstrable initially, must themselves correspond, according to their modalities, to the exigencies of reason, especially where the principle of 'adl is involved.

But the truth is that, on this point, the Mu'tazila do not differ fundamentally from the rival theological schools. All, essentially, proceed in the same fashion, and in fact the essence of kalām (i.e., the theology, of the mutakallimūn) which should, by this reckoning, be termed "rationalist". The Mu'tazila simply gave the example, opened the way (whether theology as a science was really born with them, as they claim, is a point which remains open to discussion). The Sunni theologians also considered that the existence of God is known to us through reasoning, and by no other means. Thus the well-known argument first devised, it is said, by Abu l-Hudhayl (according to Shārkh, 95, ll. 9-12), demonstrating the existence of God by means of the principle of the "adventitiousness" of substances (hadūd al-agwānihi), itself demonstrated by the adventitiousness of accidents, was adopted with alacrity by all Ash'arī and Māturīdī theologians. Just like the Mu'tazila, the Sunni theologians are at pains to impress upon the Qur'ān in their new fashion, such that it accords with their doctrinal positions. It may certainly be reckoned that in a number of cases the Mu'tazila do greater violence to the letter of the Qur'ānic text (for example in the interpretation of huda and iddāl), but this is simply because the Qur'ān, in its literality, is in general support of Sunni theses.

Something else which may legitimately be seen as an element of "rationalism" is the formulation by the Mu'tazila of a substantial system for explaining the world and mankind which, essentially, owes nothing to the Qur'ān, but much—initially—to fragments of Greek philosophy, and later, and more significantly, to their own speculations: the conception of bodies as agglomerates of atoms, the distinction between substance and accident, the explanation of all phenomena belonging to the physical world through the inherence of accidents in the atoms of which bodies are constituted; then, in this context, the genuinely "philosophical" project seeking to define, for example, location and movement; to establish the cause of the immobility of the earth, the nature of fire, or whether such a thing as a void exists in the universe; to understand the modalities of perception through the eye and through the ear; to consider how to define man (mān); what it is to be understood by niḥ and nafs; what are the different forms of will, and whether desire and hope should be included among them; etc. For modern tastes, it is here, without doubt, that Mu'tazili literature appears at its most interesting and most original. But in this case also, such considerations have not remained exclusively characteristic of this school; the Sunni theologians, as already mentioned, adopted them as a whole for their own purposes, and this may furthermore be seen as a characteristic of kalām in general. Possibly such matters simply hold, for the Mu'tazila, a more important status; there seems little likelihood in finding, in all Sunni theological literature, a work exclusively devoted to the "rules of substances and accidents", as is the case with the Tadhkira fi akhām al-dīwānīr wa l-ārād of Ibn Mattawayh (partial, and seriously flawed edition by S. N. Lutfi and F. B. Awn, Cairo 1975).

But it is sufficient to glance, for example, at what remains of the Šamīl of al-Dīwānīr to gain an impression of the interest taken by the latter in these issues. On this point, as on the preceding, the rift is not between Mu'tazila and Sunnis taken as homogeneous wholes, but between those who accept the methods, problems and vocabulary of the šim al-kalām and those who reject them, such as the Ḥanbalīs in the first instance (which is not however true for the kābīd Abū Ya'la' Ibn al-Farrā' [q.v.], as consummate a mutakallim as al-Dīwānīr) or those who, in the very midst of the Aš♯rai school (including for example Abū Bakr al-Bayhākī [q.v.]), maintain loyalty to the inspiration of the asūb al-hadīth.

Where there is a rationalism exclusive to the Mu'tazila, it is in the sphere of ethics. For them, as has been observed, man is also capable of knowing by his reason alone that which is morally good or evil. Spontaneously, they say, he recognises as evil acts unjust, deceit, ingratitude; and recognises as obligatory the deed of repaying a debt, keeping himself clear of harm (değal al-darār 'an nafṣih), or showing thankfulness towards a benefactor (whereby all are obliged to adore God, the supreme Benefactor, adoration representing the highest form of thankfulness). In this context also, the revelation can only confirm that which our reason tells us. Of course, the latter is not sufficient to make us aware of everything that is evil (i.e., forbidden), nor everything that is obligatory; only the revealed Law can inform us that it is obligatory, for example, to perform a prayer to God, according to a certain ritual, five times a day, or that it is forbidden to eat and drink during the days of Ramadān. It could even be supposed that there is a contradiction here between revelation and reason, bearing in mind that, spontaneously, reason makes us recognise as evil (because arduous, therefore harmful) the exercise of the rituals of prayer, and conversely obligatory (because it removes harm) the act of eating and drinking when one is hungry or thirsty. But, in fact, reason understands without difficulty the necessity to undergo a minor harm, as a means of avoiding the major harm which is the punishment promised by God to those who disobey Him. In this manner, even the prescriptions of the Law have a rational basis; if our reason were capable of knowing by itself that the fulfilment or non-fulfilment of a certain act would earn the torments of Hell for all eternity, it would necessarily know, by itself, that the act in question is either evil or obligatory (cf. Gimaret-Monnot, 270-1).

On this last point, the Mu'tazila are, for once, very clearly in disagreement with the Aš♯rai theologians. For al-Dīwānīr, the sole foundation of good and evil, in all respects, is the revealed Law; that which God commands is obligatory, that which He permits good, that which He forbids evil. If deceit is morally evil, it
is because God has declared it so; if He had declared it good, it would be good ...

[Bibliography: Over the past thirty years, with a quantity of new sources becoming available, studies relating to Mu'tazila have progressed considerably, and given rise to a large number of publications, which cannot possibly be listed here in an exhaustive manner. A number of important references have already been indicated in the course of the article.

There does not yet exist a comprehensive study, taking account of recent gains in knowledge, of the history and doctrines of Mu'tazilism, with the exception of the substantial article by J. van Ess in The Encyclopedia of Religion, New York 1987, x, 220-9. The works of Z. Dja'ir Allâh (al-Mu'tazila, Cairo 1947) and A.N. Nader (Le système philosophique des mu'tazilas, Beirut 1956) are out of date. The books by J. van Ess, Une lecture à rebours de l'histoire du mu'tazilisme, Paris 1984, and Theologie und Gesellschaft im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert Hidscha, Berlin-New York 1991, relate only to the "first period" (as far as Ibn al-Rawai'di), and is in the form of a simple outline of what the author expects to develop, and eventually correct, in his Geschichte der frühen islamischen Theologie.

The most important sources concerning the history of Mu'tazilism are the works of 'Abd al-Jabbar, devoted to this school. The Ṭabākāt al-Mu'tazila drawn from the K. al-Mu'ayyad wa 'l-amal of the Zaydi Imām Ahmad b. Yahya b. al-Murtada (d. 840/1437) and published by S. Diwald-Wilzer (Beirut-Wiesbaden 1961) is a recasting (sometimes flawed) of those which figure in the K. Sharh al-'ayyn of al-Hākim al-Dhubin, themselves derived from a work of 'Abd al-Qādir al-Ṭabari entitled Faḍl al-ṣīlah wa-tabākāt al-mu'tazila. F. Sayyid published (posthumously) in Tunis in 1939/1974, under the same title, a volume comprising: 1. the chapter of the Makālat al-Islāmiyyin of Abu 'l-Kāsim al-Balkhi which concerns the Mu'tazila; 2. the entire text of the book of 'Abd al-Qādir b. al-Ṭabākāt; and 3. the section of the Sharh al-'ayyn of al-Dhubin dealing with the later period (or tabākāt 11 and 12). The very valuable chapter of the Fihrist of Ibn al-Nadīm on the Mu'tazila is almost entirely missing in the Flügel edition; it is to be found in the more recent edition of R. Tadjaddud, Tehran 1971.


On 'Abd al-Qādir's theses, the most accessible source is the compendium already mentioned (and to which the present article refers under the abbreviation 'Sharh') by the Zaydi Imām Mānūkī Shāshī, which is a collection of lecture notes (ṣiḥḥa) on the Sharh al-wṣīla al-khamsa of the kāfi 'Abd al-Qādir al-Ṭabākāt; this work, published under the same title of Sharh al-

wṣīla al-khamsa by F. K. Uthmān, Cairo 1965, was erroneously attributed by the latter to 'Abd al-Qādir b. al-Ṭabākāt himself (on this faulty attribution, see Gimaret, in Annales Islamologiques, xv [1979]). Of the enormous theological corpus of 'Abd al-Qādir b. al-Ṭabākāt, al-Mughni fi 'l-ṣuḥūb al-taṣawwuf wa l-'ṣālī, not all has been preserved; of the twenty volumes which it comprised, only fourteen figure in the Cairo edition (1960-5). For the missing sections, a substitute may be found in al-Maḏāmīn fi 'l-ṭaklif by Ibm Mattawayh, a paraphrase of the Muḥāj of 'Abd al-Qādir b. al-Ṭabākāt (two volumes published, Beirut 1965 and 1981).

Among the works concerning 'Abd al-Qādir b. al-Ṭabākāt or the Ṭabākāt school in general, three deserve particular attention: G.F. Hourani, Islamic rationalism, the ethics of 'Abd al-Jabbr, Oxford 1971; J.R.T.M. Peters, God's created speech, a study in the speculative theology of the Mu'tazilis Qāḍī l-Quḍāt Abī l-Ḥasan 'Abd al-Jabbr bn Ahmad al-Ḥamāḍī, Leiden 1976; R.M. Frank, Beings and their attributes, the teaching of the Bastar school of the Mu'tazila in the classical period, Albany 1978.

It may be noted in conclusion that, as a result of the progress of studies since the inception of the new Encyclopaedia of Islam, some of the articles published in the earliest instalments are no longer up to date, and therefore it is recommended that, for the authors concerned, the more recent Encyclopedia Iranica (London 1985-) should also be consulted. This applies in particular to 'Abd al-Qādir b. al-Ṭabākāt and Abu 'l-Kāsim al-Balkhi. (D. Gimaret)
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MUTHALLATH (A.), also MUTHALLATHA, pl. always muthallathâ, triangle; it forms the first
category of plane surfaces bounded by straight lines
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[see IBRAHIM MU-
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MÜTEFERRIKA (r.), the name of a corps
of guards, who were especially attached to the person
of the sultan at the Ottoman Turkish court. The name
is also applied to a member of the guard. Their
occupations were similar to those of the Cawûsîd [q. v.],
not of military character, nor for court service only,
but were used for more or less important public
or political missions. Like the Cawûsîd, the Mütefer-
rika were a mounted guard. The name appears early,
e.g., in a wakfiyya of 847/1443, one İbrahim b. İshâk
is mentioned as being one. In later times there were
two classes, the ǧedîkî or ʿamâtî Müteferrika, and the
fileless. Their chief was the Mûteferrika ʿAğâsi. In
the course of time their number considerably increased; at
the end of the 11th/12th century, the maximum was
fixed at 120 (GOH, ii, 389, after Râghîd), but in
the beginning of the 19th century, von Hammer gives
the number 500 for the total. The Porte needed some-
times to lay stress on the importance of the office in
order to make them acceptable as extraordinary
envoys by foreign governments (GÖH, iii, 329, after
Râghîd).
Among those who occupied this rank was the well-
known first Turkish Islamic printer İbrahim Mütefer-
rika [q. v. and MÜTEFERRIKA, 2. In Turkey].
Although different explanations of the title mütefer-
rika are given, the most probable interpretation is that
these functionaries were not given a special duty but
formed originally a corps used for "various matters".
This is still the use of the word in modern Turkish.
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third magnitude and one of the fifth. The star at the apex (α Trianguli) is an astrolabe ... square, or cruciform chamber and an arched niche in each of the eight outer faces (tombs of Shah KulT Khan, Nar-

...Ra’s al-Muthallath. Libros describes in architecture plan figures and J.W. Allan, Aldershot 1989, 279-80). Further ex-

...buildings of eight equal sides. The irregular oc-

...muthamman baghdadi ("Baghdadi octagon") in Mughal architecture, where it enjoyed a particular popularity.

...with four longer and four shorter sides—which may assume the shape of a square or rectangle with chamfered corners—was termed muthamman baghdadi ("Baghdadi octagon") in Mughal architecture, where it enjoyed a particular popularity.

...With the Kubbat al-Sakhra [q.v.] or Dome of the Rock at Jerusalem (72/691-2) the octagon made an impressive entry into Islamic architecture and, thereafter—true to the commemorative character of the prototype, and because of the symbolism of the number eight, alluding to the eight stages of the Kur'anic Paradise (for the latter point, see A. Daneshvari, Medieval tomb towers of Iran, Lexington, Ky. 1986, 27-30)—octagons were at all periods and in all regions of Islam preferably used for tombs and mausolea [see also MANARA]. An interesting purely secular memorial octagon is the tower built by Akbar in 996/1588 on an ancient Buddhist mound now known as "Cawkhandī" at Sarnath, Benares; according to its inscription it was to commemorate a visit of his father Humayun. Octagonal plans were also popular for (garden) pavilions and pleasure houses; known or extant examples belong to Timūrid, Safavid, Deccani, and, in particular, Mughal ar-

...The most outstanding contributions to the theme of the octagon in Islamic architecture were made by In-

...The most interesting and complex treatment of the...
The ultimate point of elaboration, perfecting the Timurid-inspired tradition of consistent geometrical planning and intricate designs, is reached in three outstanding Mughal mausolea, all developed around the eight-sided Islamic tomb reach here its culmination: the invention can be shown by comparing it with Michelangelo’s last design for the San Giovanni de’ Fiorentini church in Rome (1559) were inscribed in a square ambulatory surrounding the central octagonal chamber.

Bibliography: There is as yet no monographic treatment of the octagon in Islamic architecture. Individual aspects are discussed in the works cited in the text. See, in addition, for the octagonal tombs of the Dihli sultanate, R. Nath, History of sultanate architecture, New Delhi 1978, 84-95; C.B. Asher, The mausoleum of Sher Shah Suri, in Artibus Asiae, xxxix/3-4 (1977), 273-98. For the Mughal tombs, see MUGHALS. 7. Architecture; E. Koch, Mughal architecture: an outline, Munich 1991. (EBBA KOCH)

AL-MUTHANNA B. HÄRITHA, Arab tribal chieftain and hero of the early Islamic conquest of Irak. Al-Muthanna’s tribe, the Banû Shaybăn, was part of the Bakr b. Wa‘il group and had its home on the eastern desert fringes of southern Irak in the late 6th and early 7th centuries A.D. Although the leading clans of Shaybân had been involved in battles against the Persians before the rise of Islam—most notably the famous battle of Dhib Kâr (ca. 611 A.D. [q.v.]—the same clans seem initially to have opposed the Muslim advance into Irak; al-Muthanna, on the other hand, was from the minor Shaybân clan of Sa‘d b. Murr, and it may be that the Muslims employed a divide-and-conquer tactic in dealing with Shaybân, winning in this case a minor chieftain to their side, with whose assistance they were able to overcome other parts of the tribe who remained aligned with the Persians.

The sources tell us nothing of al-Muthanna’s early life, nor do they give us a consistent picture of how he came to join the Muslims. With the collapse of Sasanid control in southern Irak, al-Muthanna, along with other tribal chiefs such as al-Madhîr b. ‘Adî al-‘Idrî, appears to have engaged in raiding settled land. But the sources disagree on whether al-Muthanna’s raids were undertaken independent of the régime in Medina, or whether they were carried out with Medina’s blessings or even on its orders. A few accounts in late authors (Ibn al-Ahwar’s Utq al-ghâba, Ibn Hadjar’s Sinds) portray al-Muthanna as part of a delegation of Shaybân tribesmen who came to the Prophet, and others have him coming to Medina early in Abû Bakr’s caliphate (or even com-
ing at both times); in either case, he is said to have been authorised by the Prophet or caliph to undertake raids against the Persians. But these accounts may be later efforts to portray his raids in 'Irāk as part of a master plan for the Islamic conquests emanating from Medina, rather than as an independent action on the part of al-Muthanna. Against such a centralised view we may note that several accounts suggest that al-Muthanna was unknown to Abū Bakr when his raiding was brought to the caliph's attention. Ibn Sa'd's account of the Shayban delegation to the Prophet makes no mention of al-Muthanna, and the accounts in the Uṣd al-ghibā mention al-Muthanna in the delegations but make another figure the leading character in the negotiations, suggesting that al-Muthanna's name may have been added later to existing accounts.

It seems likely, then, that al-Muthanna's first raids on 'Irāk were made on his own initiative. He must have been persuaded to join the Muslims some time during the Ridda, however, before the arrival of the first Muslim army sent from Medina to 'Irāk headed by Khālid b. al-Walid (early 12/spring 633), for during the wars of the Ridda, al-Muthanna is mentioned among those sent by the Muslim commander al-'Aḍī b. al-Ḥadrānī to prevent the defeated supporters of al-Bahrānī from fleeing to the island of Dārīn in the Persian Gulf in 11/632-3 (al-Ṭabārī, i, 1971).

Al-Muthanna played an important role in the initial phases of the conquest of southern and central 'Irāk after the arrival of the first Muslim armies sent there by Abū Bakr and 'Umar b. al-Kaḥṭāb. Although the narrative sources contain many apparent contradictions and anomalies in reporting al-Muthanna's exploits, the general outlines of their presentation can be summarised as follows. Al-Muthanna served as a subordinate commander under Khālid b. al-Walid during the Muslim conquest of al-Hira and nearby localities (Ullays, etc.). He also appears to have led some raids across the Euphrates into the Sawād, both during the period of Khālid's command and later. When Khālid received Abū Bakr's order to reinforce the Muslims in Syria in early 13/spring 634, he took with him half of the Muslim forces in 'Irāk and left al-Muthanna in command of the remaining half. Al-Muthanna may have come to Medina at this time to plead with Abū Bakr for reinforcements to confront the Persians. Subsequently, the caliph 'Umar b. al-Kaḥṭāb dispatched an army led by Abū 'Ubayd al-Ṭhaḵāfī, who became the new supreme commander in 'Irāk. This army was, however, destroyed by the Persians at the Battle of the Bridge (rather than occasional small skirmishes and raids?) even took place at 'Irāb.

Researchers must await a fully detailed re-examination of the development of the accounts about al-Muthanna's campaign. On the other hand, in the present writer's opinion it must be accepted as certain that al-Muthanna was a historical figure, and that he played a significant role in the conquest of 'Irāk; it is merely that historiographical difficulties for the moment make unclear the exact scope of his activities.

With the rise of a specifically 'Irākī strain of Arab nationalism following the creation of the independent state of 'Irāk in the 20th century, the figure of al-Muthanna b. Ḥarīṭa has become a symbol of 'Irākī national pride. For this reason, public and private monuments and institutions are sometimes named after him in modern 'Iraq. Noteworthy among these was the nationalist club of the 1930s and 1940s, the Nādi al-Muthanna.


MUṬJĪ b. IYĀS AL-ḴANĪ, a minor poet of Kūfī who lived in the last years of the Umayyads and the first ones of the 'Abāsids, making a muḫṭārām [q. v.] of al-dawlatayn.

G.E. von Grunebaum (Three Arabic poets of the early
Abbasid age, in Orientalia, Rome) brought together, in the first part of his study (xvii/2 [1948], 167-204) 77 pieces which were attributed to al-Muti\textsuperscript{b} and also provided an exemplary critical study of the materials given by the biographers, anthologists and other authors of adab works, concerning this poet, whose personality is difficult to establish despite an image which appears superficially to be of perfect clarity but which reveals itself on closer examination as equivocal and strained.

His grandfather, or some more distant ancestor, was called Salm\texttextsuperscript{b} Nawfal, and it happens that Ibn al-Kalb\texttextsuperscript{i}, in his Djambara (Tab. 43) terminates the line to which the poet belongs with this person. His father Iy\texttextsuperscript{a} b. Muslim was sent by 'Abd al-Malik b. Mar\texttextsuperscript{w} with the contingent meant to provide aid for al-Ha\texttextsuperscript{j}id\texttextsuperscript{b} Y\texttextsuperscript{a}uf in his struggle against Ibn al-Zubayr, and then settled at K\texttextsuperscript{\text{"u}}fa, and there is no reason to doubt his Arab lineage. Von Grunebaum in fact wrongly interpreted a passage of the A\texttextsuperscript{gh}b\texttextsuperscript{i} (xii, 96 = ed. Beirut, xiii, 309) and noted that, according to another tradition, Mut\texttextsuperscript{i} was the son of a maw\texttextsuperscript{d} b. Muhammad b. al-Fad\texttextsuperscript{l} al-H\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}him\texttextsuperscript{i} called Mu\texttextsuperscript{m}mad b. S\texttextsuperscript{l}im, in reality the text says that the poet had amorous relations with a certain Mu\texttextsuperscript{m}mad b. S\texttextsuperscript{l}im, who was the son of the s. maw\texttextsuperscript{d} b. al-Fad\texttextsuperscript{l}; he mourned his death in a fragment which has been preserved (no. XXIII; metre jaw\texttextsuperscript{l}, rhyme -\text{\text\text{-d\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}}}

Mut\texttextsuperscript{i} b. Iy\texttextsuperscript{a}, born in K\texttextsuperscript{\text{"u}}fa at an unknown date, which must however have been in the first decade of the 2nd century/third decade of the 8th century, seems to have attempted very early to take up the career of a professional poet, whilst at the same time leading a dissolute life to which he gave, in great part, his place in literary history. The first episode in this career—so far as we at present know—is the dedicating of a panegyric to the prince al-Ghamr b. Yaz\texttextsuperscript{d} (d. 123/740; see S. al-Munadjdjid, Djamdar, Beirut, 1970, no. 287), which is said to have brought him 10,000 dirhams (fragment III; metre k\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}mil mar\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}f\texttextsuperscript{l}, rhyme -\text{\text\text{-\text{\text{\text{"a}}}}}})

This last was a maw\texttextsuperscript{d} of Yaz\texttextsuperscript{d} b. Abd Allah al-H\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}hid\texttextsuperscript{i} who set to music several of Mut\texttextsuperscript{i}'s poems, notably nos. V (metre r\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}m\texttextsuperscript{l}, rhyme -\text{\text\text{\text{"a}}}}), XXXIII (metre k\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}mil, rhyme -\text{\text\text{\text{"a}}}}), LXXI (metre khaf\texttextsuperscript{f}, rhyme -\text{\text\text{\text{"a}}}}) and especially LXXII (metre r\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}j\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}, rhyme -\text{\text\text{\text{"a}}}}), Mut\texttextsuperscript{i} being said to have attracted the attention of al-Walid, perhaps at a moment when he had not yet achieved the throne. Whatever the case, the latter is said to have brought Mut\texttextsuperscript{i} to Rus\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}fa by the horses of the postal service, but other versions have also been put forward. It is said that Mut\texttextsuperscript{i} remained with the caliph until the latter's death, after which he returned to K\texttextsuperscript{\text{"u}}fa. He is then found in the entourage of the 3A\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}lid 'Abd All\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}h b. Mu\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}\textmacron i\. He must have remained in K\texttextsuperscript{\text{"u}}fa in the first years of the 'Ab\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}sid dynasty, since we see him frequenting the salon of Muhammad b. Kh\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}lid b. 'Abd All\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}h al-\textmacron Kar\texttextsuperscript{i}, governor of the town in 132/750. In the reign of al-Ma\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}n\texttextsuperscript{j}ur (136-58/754-75 [q. v.]), since he was attached to the caliph's son al-Dja\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}far (d. before 158/775), on whom he exercised a pernicious influence, he is said to have been given the office, according to a very dubious tradition, of levying the zadaka at Basra, in order to get him away from the young prince. He attracted the latter's anger for having favoured his mother, a partisan as he is presumptive, in 141/758-9, of the future al-Ma\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}hid\textsuperscript{, who, moreover, much appreciated his poetry. It is known that he travelled to Rayy in 145/762, to the presence of Salm b. Kutayba (d. 159/776; see the index to the Mura\textsuperscript{d}j). Subsequently, no outstanding events seem to have been recorded until his death in Djam\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}m\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}d I 169/November 785 at Basra.

Mu\texttextsuperscript{i} b. Iy\texttextsuperscript{a} probably owes the survival of his memory less to his poetic talent than to his membership of a group of individuals connected with zadaka (q. v.). According to what is given in the A\texttextsuperscript{gh}b\texttextsuperscript{i} (xii, 89 = ed. Beirut, xiii, 296), his daughter, a victim of the hunting down of the Manichaean, confessed before al-Ra\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}\textmacron j\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}d\textsuperscript{, that her father had taught her that religion, but that she had renounced it. This affirmation would confirm the information brought against Mut\texttextsuperscript{i} and his companions of Manichaeanism. He is said to have himself written books defending the dualists, but his "Manichaicism"—insofar as the term can be applied to him—was certainly only a facade and consisted of a conduct contrary to the morality of Islam, a nonconformism characteristic of the upper levels of society at that time, a complete indifference to religious precepts, and the current practices of drunkenness, homosexuality and debauchery in general. Abu '1-Far\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}d\textsuperscript{d} al-Isfahani, in no way shocked by happenings of this kind which were quite rife in a certain stratum of society, sums up in three words Mu\texttextsuperscript{i}'s nature, and describes him as zarf, kh\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}mil and m\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}\textmacron id, terms whose meaning, difficult to render precisely, corresponds substantially to a person of refinement (= witty, delicate) and depravity. This poet is rarely cited by himself, since he was in the same, in the minds of the contemporaries and, by taklid, of the succeeding generations, from the group of his friends, of the same stamp, "who formed, it might be said, one soul" (al-Djahiz, Hayaw\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}d, 244-78) and amongst whom may be distinguished the three Hammads (\textsuperscript{\text{"a}}d\textmacron j\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}r\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}d, al-Raw\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}ya and Ibn al-Zibrik\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}n), Walib\texttextsuperscript{a} b. al-Hul\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}b\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}} and Ab\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}n al-Lah\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}k\texttextsuperscript{i}, to mention only the best-known. In sift ing through the lists appearing in the sources, G. Vajda (Les zindiqs en pays d'Islam, in RSO, xvi [1937], 137-229) did justice to the accusations of zadaka brought against these rather pretentious individuals, who flaunted a scepticism which went as far as atheism.

As for Mut\texttextsuperscript{i}'s work, it is certainly varied and probably touched on all the poetical genres cultivated at that time, but it would be imprudent to make a definite pronouncement, given that his di\textmacron e\textsuperscript{\text{"a}}\textmacron n has not been preserved. Of the 77 fragments gathered together by Von Grunebaum, 71 are certainly by this poet, comprising 391 verses out of 412, which can only represent a small proportion of his total production, estimated by Ibn al-Nadim (Fihrist, 162 = ed. Cairo, 230) at about a hundred leaves. Among these fragments, 4 are panegyrics (notably of Ma\texttextsuperscript{n} b. Z\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}\textmacron i\. This last was a maw\texttextsuperscript{d} of Yaz\texttextsuperscript{d} b. Abd Allah the 2nd century/third decade of the 8th century, which has been preserved (no. XXIII; metre jaw\texttextsuperscript{l}, rhyme -\text{\text\text{-d\texttextsuperscript{\text{"a}}}})
verse in various circumstances, a dozen are more or less obscene satires, 3 offend by their vulgarity, some are light as that of Mutt, which requires less majestic metres. One nevertheless notes a remarkable variety of metres used, since out of the 12 are used between one and nine times, but the thirteenth, kaḍaf, is clearly dominant, with 19 attestations. As a whole, the language is simple, somewhat scabrous in some poems but with an unexpectedness in some others, especially when sincere feeling is expressed.

**Bibliography:** The essential study is that of Von Grunebaum, cited in the article, and the major biographical source is Agha' (see Kaysa), ii, 87 ff. (= ed. Beirut, xiii, 274-335). Among other works which can usefully be consulted are: Ibn al-Mutazz, Tāḥāk, 38; Buhturi, Hamasā, 390-1; Dāhib, Hayawān, iv, 447-52 and index; Mubarrak, Kāmil, 770-1; Ibn Khallīkān, i, 166, tr. dr. Sane, i, 474; Marzubānī, Muṣyām, 480; Murtadā, Amāli, Cairo 1325, i, 99-100; Yākūt, Buldān, ii, 318-21; al-Kaṭīb al-Bağhdādī, Taḥzī ḫaḍīr, ii, 325; Shāhbughi, Dīyārāt, 159-66; Nuw prayer, Nihāya, iv, 58-63; Baghdādī, Ḧāżānā, iv, 286. Of modern studies, see Brockelmann, i, 71-2, S i, 108; Rescher, Abris, i, 280-4; A. von Kremer, Culturgeschichte, ii, 368-9; F. Gabrieli, in ROS, xv (1934), xvii (1935); Taha Husayn, Hadīth al-ahrām, i, 182-212; Ţirkitī, Al'an, viii, 161-2; Kāḥbāla, Muṣâfira, iii, 306; Sebgh, Ġās, i, 467, ix, 288.

(Ch. Pellat)

**AL-MUTTĀKI LI ĪLĀH, ABRĀSĪD AL-FADL, ĀBĀSĪD CALIPH, reigned 334-63/946-74, son of al-Muqtadir [q.v.].**

Al-Muttākī was a bitter enemy of al-Mustakfi [q.v.] and therefore went into hiding on the latter's accession, and after Muṣīz al-Dawlā [q.v.] had become the real ruler, al-Muttākī is said to have taken refuge with al-Muṣīz and after his death (356/967) in those of his son ʿĪzz al-Dīn Bakhṭīyār [q.v.]. The Fātimids were growing more and more powerful, and until 344/955 the Sāmānīs also declined to recognize al-Muttākī as the legitimate suzerain. The Hamdānīs were weakened by their wars with the Būyids and the Fāṭimids. In Baghdād, the Sunnis and Shīʿīs were fighting one another and several Shīʿī usages were introduced by the Būyids, who had ʿAlid sympathies. At last the weak and sickly caliph, incapacitated by a paralytic stroke, was forced by the Turks to abdicate in favour of his son ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Tāhir (13 Dhū l-ʿAqād 363/5 August 974). Al-Muttūtī [q.v.] died in Muharram 364/September-October 974 in Dayr al-ʿAqlūn.

The character of al-Muṭṭī hardly emerges from the exiguous mentions of him by historians of the period such as Miskawayh, events in Baghdād being dominated by the activities of Muṣīz al-Dawlā and ʿĪzz al-Dawlā Bakhṭīyār. On his succession to power there, Muṣīz al-Dawlā assigned the caliph 2,000 dirhams a day for living expenses, but chose for him all his household officials; the chroniclers regard al-Muṭṭī as the lowest ebb of the caliphate before events began to revive somewhat under his eventual successors al-Kāfīm and al-Kāfirī (q.v.). Rivals to al-Muṭṭī for the caliphate from the progeny of the preceding caliph al-Mustakfi and his brother ʿĪsa led risings in Asharbayjān (349/960) and ʿIrāk (357/968), but the protection of the Būyids enabled al-Muṭṭī to survive as ruler for nineteen years, a long reign compared with those of his immediate predecessors. Some 12 are used between one and nine times, respectively) in poetry as light as that of Mutt, which requires less majestic metres. One nevertheless notes a remarkable variety of metres used, since out of the 12 are used between one and nine times, but the thirteenth, kaḍaf, is clearly dominant, with 19 attestations. As a whole, the language is simple, somewhat scabrous in some poems but with an unexpectedness in some others, especially when sincere feeling is expressed.


**MUTLAK (A.), passive participle of form IV verb tāl-k, “to lose the bond (kayd) of an animal, so as to let it free” (e.g. Muslim, īqābīd, trad. 46; Abū Dāwūd, Īqābīd, bāb 100).**

In grammar, the term mafāl mutlak denotes the absolute object (cognate accusative), i.e., a verbal noun (either mawāṣar or im al-marr [noun of single instance] or im al-nawāṣ [noun of manner]) derived, notably, from the verb of the sentence and purporting to be accusative to serve as an object, even if the verb is intransitive. The verbal noun may be used alone, often for emphasis, or modified by an adjective or a genitive; it may itself be governed by an elative. The following basic types result: kaḍaf al-kālim (“he sat down for good” [emphasis]); kaḍaf sa’dīm (“quickly”), kaḍaf tāhī (“like a beggar”), kaḍaf samad (“once”, “twice”, “three times”), kaḍaf al-mā (“in the manner”), and asma’a καδάτα (“in the worst manner”).

In the doctrine of wāl al-fikr, the term is applied to the mujahīds of the heroic age, the founders of the mujāhīdīs who are called mujāhīdīn al-muḥājīdīn, an epithet which none after them has borne (see Aṯrāb).

In dogmatics, the term is applied to existence, so
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verse in various circumstances, a dozen are more or less obscene satires, 3 offend by their vulgarity, some are light as that of Mutt, which requires less majestic metres. One nevertheless notes a remarkable variety of metres used, since out of the 12 are used between one and nine times, but the thirteenth, kaḍaf, is clearly dominant, with 19 attestations. As a whole, the language is simple, somewhat scabrous in some poems but with an unexpectedness in some others, especially when sincere feeling is expressed.

that al-wudjud al-mutlak denotes Allah as opposed to His creation, which does not possess existence in the deepest sense.

In ontology, the term is also applied to existence (wujud) in connection with the question of the nature of the latter. Here al-wudjud al-mutlak is opposed to al-wudjud al-mahmîl li l-mawdus (see MANTIK).

In other contexts, the term has the meaning ‘general’ as opposed to tâbi; cf. the definition in al-Djurdjam’s Târîfâ: mutlak denotes the one without specification. Cf. further al-Taibanawi, Dictionary of the technical terms.

On the meaning of tâbi mutlak in prosody, see KAFIYA.


MUTRAN [see KÂHLIL MUTRAN].


At the age of 26 on 21 Râbi‘ I 329/24 Dec. 940 he succeeded his half-brother al-Râdi [q. v.]; by this time the caliphate had sunk so low that five days passed after the death of al-Râdi before steps were taken to choose his successor. Al-Mutâkî at once confirmed the caliphate had sunk so low that five days passed by this time he was driven out by the Daylamî chief Kurînîyya wa ‘l-hadîthiyya; viz. i, 5-131; Mas‘ûdî, Tanbih, 397-8, tr. 503-5; idem, Marâdî, iii, 344-76 = §§ 3506-34; Miskawayh, in Eibli, the Abbasid Caliphate, ii, 72-72, tr. v, 1-7; al-Hamâdi, Talkhis al-baydân fi ‘l-akhdât Mahdi akhir al-zaman; [q. v.]; ed. Weir, 572-4; Le Strange, Baghdad during the Abbasid Caliphate, 56, 195; H. Bowen, The life and times of ‘Ali ibn ‘Isa, ‘The Good Vizier; Cambridge 1926, 364-85; Sourdil, ‘Vizirat al-baydân, ii, 493-4.

AL-MUTTAKI AL-HINDI, author of several works in Arabic, whose full name was ʿALâ AL-Dîn ‘Ali b. Husâm AL-Dîn ʿABD AL-MALIK B. KÂDI KHAN AL-SHÂHÎD AL-KÂDÂRÎ, was born at Burhânûrûp in Gujratî of a respectable family of Djumâpur. He first joined the Cîshî order, as a disciple of ‘Abî al-Karîm b. Shawkî Badjan at Burhânûrî, and afterwards entered the Kâdirî and Shâhîdî orders. His high spiritual life and learning led many people to become his murîd (spiritual disciple). He died a highly respected saint and scholar in Mecca 975/1567 at the age of ninety. He is the author of some twenty works including the following:

1. al-Burhân fi ʿalamât Mahdi ʾâkîr al-zamân, an account of the Mahdi and of his coming at the end of the world.
2. al-Burhân al-ḏalâl fi mawṣûfât al-wâlî.
3. Taḥlíj al-bayân fi ʿalamât Mahdi ʾâkîr al-zamân.
5. al-Hikam.
8. Kanz al-ʿumâmîl fi sunan al-aṣâlîl wa ʾl-afâlîl, an abridgement of al-Suyûtî’s well-known alphabetically arranged work al-Dqâmî al-ahârij containing a collection of traditions from authentic sources, newly arranged according to chapters together with a supplement.

11. *Nicam al-miyar wa 'l-mikyas li-ma^rifat maratib al-
nds*, a short tract on ... of the
Almoravids [see AL-MURABITUN] after he took up
residence at Tinmallal (Tinmel), an isolated village in
51

1. In Islamic law, this means the rescission of a sale or transaction (synonym, *mutdraka*); see for lexical aspects of the term, *TA*, x, 282; *TA*, iv, 535.

2. In mediaeval Eastern Islamic administrativa-
usage, it denotes the contract of service of
officials, in accordance with the term’s further
meaning of “the laying down of conditions for an
officials, in accordance with the term’s further
question feared interference from other officials in
their duties and responsibilities (Sayf al-Dln
Abd al-Samad al-ShlrazI with the same
master in 431/1040. In both cases, the ministers in
charge of affairs, e.g. *wazirs*, they remained subordinate to him and never challeng-
ings of his success. When al-Mu
sent his son to oppose Khumarawayh b. Ahmad b.
Bosworth, 62-3, 74, 230. 

Bibliography: 1. Texts. Tabarl, iii, 1459–61, 1555–2147; Ya
kub invaded

Arabic language and new studies of the subject,
the Almohad period, a more assiduous reading of the
publication of numerous chronicles from shortly after
the return of Ibn Tumart from the East to the Maghrib
and from this Arabic term is derived the term of
“Almohads” by which they are designated in western
literature.

The origins of the Almohad movement. For the life and
works of the MahdI Ibn Tumâr, founder of the move-
ment and originator of the Almohad doctrine, see the
article devoted to him. This study will be confined to
elements of this initial phase of Almohad history
which bear directly on subsequent events, or to
aspects of the Almohad doctrine which have come to
light since the composition of the above-mentioned
article.

As regards the origins of the movement, the
publication of numerous chronicles from shortly after
the Almohad period, a more assiduous reading of the
circumstances surrounding the emergence of the
Almohad doctrine and new studies of the subject,
have recently illustrated in a more precise fashion the
importance of the Berber context in the elaboration of
this doctrine and, above all, in the political develop-
ment of the movement, which did not begin with the
return of Ibn Tumâr from the East to the Maghrib
(510/1116 or 511/1117), but rather with his return to
his Berber origins among the MasmûdI in 517/1123.
The mission of the MahdI, initially proclaimed as an
end of the great ancient Islamic reforms, was transmuted into a political movement seeking the overthrow of the
Almoravids [see AL-MURABITUN] after he took up
residence at Tinmallal (Tinmel), an isolated village in


Egypt in 269/882, while al-Muwaffak effectively ruled from
Baghdâd.

The first major challenge he faced was from the Sa-
fârids. From 255/869 Ya'qub b. al-Layth had been
trying to assert his power in Fârs, but was opposed by a local adventurer Muhammad b. Wâsil al-Tamîmi
and al-Muwaffak. In 262/876 there was a final trial of
strength when Ya'qub invaded Irâk but was defeated
by al-Muwaffak and Mûsâ b. Bughâ at Dayr al-Akûl [q.v.].
This victory left al-Muwaffak and his com-
manders free to turn their attentions to the Sanjâ of
southern Irâk. This rebellion had begun in 258/869,
but it was not until 266/879 that al-Muwaffak and his
son Abu 'l-Abbas [see AL-MUWAFKAD] began a
systematic campaign against them. After four years of
careful amphibious warfare, the rebellion was finally
extinguished in 270/883.

After the end of the Sanjâ rebellion, al-Muwaffak
was much less active. In 271/884-5 he was content to
send his son to oppose Khâmûrawâyâh b. Ahmad b.
Tûlûn [q.v.] in southern Palestine. In 276/889 he left
Baghdâd for al-Djibal, apparently in search of money,
and only returned in 276/891 when he was already
mortall ill. Relations between him and his son Abu
' l-Abbas had deteriorated; in 275/889 he had him ar-
rested, but they were reconciled just before his death in
Safar 278/June 891.

The Atlas mountains. The influence of the Berber setting is also illustrated by the fact that the political organization of the movement evolved simultaneously with the written formulation of the doctrine within Berber circles and by the revelation of the existence of Kharidjite-Ibadi notions among the Berbers of the region where Ibn Tūmart was born (D. Urvoy, La pensée d'Ibn Tūmart in BEO, xxvii [1974], 19-44). According to al-Marrakūshī, Ibn Tūmart, on arriving in Timmndal, began by teaching religious knowledge to the Berbers and composed for them an *askīda* in their own language. Subsequently, the *Murājīda* was written, again for the benefit of the Berbers and in their language. Both of these exist today in Arabic. The fact that a version of the *Muwaṭṭa*? [see Malik b. Ansā], attributed to Ibn Buxāy and transmitted by Ibn Tūmart to ‘Abd al-Mu’min, his disciple, exists today in copies of the very highest quality produced in 590/1193 for the third Almohad caliph, Abū Yusuf Ya’qūb al-Manṣūr, suggests that the works of the Mahdī were originally composed under the influence of and for the needs of the Berbers. The Arabic versions of these works which we possess today were probably written some time after ‘Abd al-Mu’min’s death, for al-Manṣūr, responsible for a reform of the doctrine (J. Schacht, *Deux éditions inconnues du Muwatta*?, in *Studi orientalistici in onore de Giorgio Levi Della Vida*, ii, Rome 1956, 477-92). The composition in Berber of the *askīda* is in accordance with the replacement of *kharīb* and *ināms* in the mosques by religious functionaries capable of pronouncing the *taubād* in Berber, and the increased value given to “Berber matters” by the assimilation of the Mahdī to the Prophet. These elements suggest that the origins of this movement are to be associated with the social, religious and intellectual tensions which stirred the parties, ethnic groups and communities of Morocco in this period, and attention should be given to the question posed by W. Montgomery Watt, whether opposition to Mālikism does not rather reflect the aspiration of the Berbers to assert themselves in relation to the Arabs (Philosophy and social structure in Almohad Spain, in IQ, viii [1964], 46-51). The chroniclers record a period of political stability and economic prosperity under the Almoravids, but, as was often the case in periods of political stability and economic prosperity, this period, and attention should be given to the question of the Ifrīkīyans, Mahdiyya, Sfax and Tripoli seized from the Normans, were the last conquests leading to the creation, for the first time in North Africa, of a single state, ruled by the Almohads.

The Almohad empire attained its highest point of material and cultural success under the successors of ‘Abd al-Mu’min ([q.vv.]), Abū Ya’qūb Yūsuf al-Manṣūr (580-95/1184-99) and Muhammad al-Nāṣir (595-610/1199-1213) [q. v.], in spite of having to devote unrelenting military efforts to retaining the territories conquered in the Maghrib. The Almohad army was invincible. Consisting of Berber troops of the Maṣūmiyya and Zanāta tribes, it was complemented by a large and powerful fleet, which played a decisive role in maritime engagements. Naval dockyards were established in the ports of the Atlantic and Mediterranean ports. Salāḥ al-Dīn tried to obtain the support of this fleet at the time of the siege of Acre in 585/1189, an appeal refused by al-Manṣūr (M. Gaudrefoy-Demobmynes, Une lettre de Saladin au calife almohad, in *Milanges René Basset*, Paris 1925, ii, 279-304). According to Ibn Buxāy, and, Al-Manṣūr subsequently changed his mind and sent the Egyptian sultan 190 ships. In Spain, the temporary halt of the Reconquista coincided with the arrival of the Almohads and the independence probably precarious, of towns and regions which took advantage of the weakness of the Almoravids to cast off their yoke. The Almohad military intervention in Spain began under ‘Abd al-Mu’min, but Almohad authority was never completely established in that country. Almohad sovereignty was first recognised by the cities of Cadiz and Jerez in 541/1146, a recognition followed by the intervention of Almohad troops and the capture of Seville in 542/1147. In 545/1150, a delegation of amīrs from Spain came to Salé at the invitation of ‘Abd al-Mu’min to offer official recognition of Almohad authority. It was during the reign of his son, Abū Ya’qūb Yūsuf, that the major Almohad military involvement in Spain took place. An initial offensive had the object of occupying eastern Spain (568/1172) and of wresting the cities of Valencia, Jaen and Murcia from the hands of their chieftains. It was in 591/1195, at Alarcos [see Al-arāk], that the decisive victory of the Almohads over Castile took place. In North Africa, meanwhile, an Almohad military effort was required in the direction of Ifrīkiya which was threatened by princes of the Almohad family, the Banū Qānānīya [q.v.]. With the aid of their fleet, a remnant of the former Almoravid fleet, they succeeded in establishing themselves in the Baleares Islands,
A base from which they extended their power over Ifnkiya and the central Maghrib. During this period of intense military activity, the Almohads, always aware of the need to reinforce their ranks with new recruits, decided, in 583/1187, to transfer nomadic Arab tribes to Morocco by force. There was thus introduced to the land a factor which disrupted the delicate equilibrium between nomads and sedentary dwellers, between cities and the countryside. The increase in the number of nomads interfered with the habitual life-style of the Berber tribes and forced them to change their routes in quest of new pastures. This action unleashed the process of the formation of the Marinid power [see Marinids], which was to replace that of the Almohads some fifty years later. Although the army of the fourth Almohad caliph, Muhammad al-Nâṣir, liberated the eastern region of the Maghrib and the Balearic Islands from the hold of the Banu al-Nâsr, it was unable to sustain resistance in Spain, where the defeat of Alarcos had contributed to the formation of a powerful coalition of Spanish kings and knights, inspired by the call to crusade issued by the bishop of Toledo, Rodrigo Jimenez de Rada. The defeat of the Almohads at Las Navas de Tolosa (609/1212 [see Al-Andalus]) not only loosened the firm hold of Spanish towns on these areas, it also marked the end of the first period of Almohad ascendancy and the beginning of its decline.

The military weakness which characterised the second period of the political history of the Almohads was accompanied by anarchy, rebellions of towns, defection of allies and, finally, repudiation of the Almohad doctrine by the caliph al-Ma'mun. The rulers of this second phase succeeded one another at a rate accelerated by the weakening of central authority and the decline in the personal status of the dynasty. Sometimes acclaimed as caliphs in Spain but rejected by the Arab tribes but not recognised by the city-dwellers, eight Almohad caliphs, all of the Mu'minid family, are mentioned by the chroniclers: Yusuf b. Abi 'Abd Allah al-Mu'tasim (610-20/1220-32), Abu Muhammad 'Abd al-Wâhid al-Mâkhli (621/1224), Abu Muhammad 'Abd Allah (624-30/1227-32), Contemporary with Abu 'l-Ulî Idrîs al-Ma'mîn (624-30/1227-32), 'Abd al-Wâhid al-Râshîd (630-40/1240-50), Abu 'l-Hasan 'Ali al-Sa'dî (640-6/1240-50), 'Abû Hafs 'Umar al-Mustansir (666-76/1266-76), Abu Dabbûs al-Wâhidî (665-8/1265-68). Despite political instability and the collapse of political and administrative structures, the city of Marrakesh remained a centre of artistic life and of vigorous intellectual activity during the second phase of Almohad history. The regions situated at the extremities of the empire, which had been the last to submit to the Almohads, were also the first to detach themselves. Almohad policy, which consisted in appointing a member of the family as independent governor in the towns and the regions, supplied with troops and a high degree of financial independence, had encouraged and accelerated this process of fragmentation. In 627/1229-30, the Hafsid governor of Ifrikiya had declared the independence of his province, to be followed in 637/1239 by the chief of the Banu 3Abd al-Wâd, ruler of Tlemcen and of the central Maghrib. A campaign of resistance led by the Berbers. This form of organisation also illustrates the concern to honour the first loyal adherents of the Almohads. The office of sahib al-ashgâh, the Almohad sovereign also bore that of amiral-mu'umin, a novelty perpetuated by the Hafsîds, who inherited the Almohad structures, and, periodically, by the Marinids. The administrative machine of the Almohad state was not particularly sophisticated. As Ibn Khaldûn indicates, the Almohads were barely civilised at the outset, and the protocol of the court was not properly established until the end, with the predominance of Andalusian personnel. In response to the administrative requirements of an army, 'Abd al-Mu'min needed troops of trained staff which he personally organised at the court. These functionaries had undergone religious studies but were also skilled swimmers, archers and horsemen. A stratum of such officials was sent out into the provinces, headed by a governor descended from the Mu'minid family who was assisted by an Almohad shaykh.

The administration of the Almohad caliph's court at Marrakesh was initially dominated by a kâtib, personal secretary, who, at the outset, performed the functions of a wâzir. Later, the title wâzir, which denoted a function considered by Ibn Khaldûn as comparable to that of the hâjjîb, did not appear under the Almohads. The office of hâjjîb al-asâfârî was of considerable importance in the Almohad administration of the court, at the holder of this title was responsible for the collection of taxes and other revenues as well as for expenditure, and supervised the other officials of the capital and of the provinces. Like him, the hâkim, chief of police, was an Almohad shaykh.
official religious policy of the Almohad sovereigns, starting with the Mahdi and Abd al-Mumin, was to replace Malikism with the new doctrine, at the expense of existing religious institutions and functionaries. The most renowned victim of this policy was the kādī ‘Iyād [q.v.] of Ceuta, a Mālikī writer and leading protégé of the Murābi‘ūn, who was exiled to Marrakesh after the rebellion of his city and dismissed from his functions. The Mahdi had not, however, undertaken a revision of the judicial code or produced manuals codifying the practices of everyday life according to the new doctrine. Thus Mālikī law continued to regulate the lives of Māghribīs, and Mālikī jurists in the Māghrib, and especially in Spain, continued to practise their functions unhindered. The Almohads also continued to appoint kādīs and retain the post of kādī ‘Iqāda, an office frequently held by Andalusians. At least three of the latter were known Mālikīs (see the list of names of Almohad uazīns, kātibs and kādīs in Hopkins, Medieval Muslim government in Barbary, Appendix ii).

Monetary reform. The Almohads changed the design and the weight of the coinage, and these new dimensions remained the norm in later dynasties. Almohad gold dinārs measured 19 to 22 mm. in diameter and weighed 2.4 g. The inscription took the form of a square inscription of its Almohad predecessors, to the right of which were double dinārs as well as fractions of dinārs to facilitate transactions in gold coinage. It was also under the Almohads that the square dirham made its appearance, to remain the standard form of silver money. Like the Almoravids, the Almohads made no use of copper coinage. No money seems to have been coined in the lifetime of the Mahdi, but his name, as well as that of ‘Abd all-Mūmin and his descendants, always features in the inscription, except for the brief period of the reign of al-Ma‘mūn, who had repudiated the Almohad doctrine. Usually, dates are not stamped on the coins, and the names of mints seldom appear. The quality of the metal used and the standard of workmanship were both excellent, and mints were in operation in the following towns: Bīdāja, Tadghīs, Tūnis, Salā, Fās, Mārrākuš, Miknās, Līghibrīya, Dajyān, Kurrubā, Riba‘ī al-Fath, Tīlīmsān and Sīdīlmāṣa. The Almohad period also saw the appearance in North Africa of millares, silver coins made its appearance, to remain until the end of the Almohad period, giving the impression of a large number of new plants, combined with an effort of cultivation. The diffusion of existing religious institutions and functions remained the norm in later dynasties. Almohad kadi ‘al-ajamāda, and the Almohad caliphs, on the subject of the ransom of prisoners and the sending of missionaries in the very ill-founded hope of stimulating conversion, had been preserved. Five Franciscan friars minor, arriving as missionaries in 1220 in Marrakesh, and seven others who came in 1227 to Ceuta, were put to death by the Almohads (E. Tisserand and G. Wiet, Lettre de l’Almohade al-Murtadda au Pape Innocent IV, in Hespéris, vi [1926], 27-53). The military success of the Almohads and the extension of their empire were observed with great interest in Christian Spain. The ecclesiastical authorities, eager to show sympathy towards Islamic theology with a view to the eventual conversion of the Muslims, entrusted the translation of the creed of Ibn Tūmāt to Mark of Toledo, already known for his translation of Arabic texts, including one of the Kur‘ān (M.-T. d’Alverny and G. Vajda, Marc de Tolède, traducteur d’Ibn Tūmāt, in al-And., xvi [1951], 99-140, xvii [1952], 1-56).

Numerous indigenous Jewish communities, augmented by immigrants from Spain, lived in all the towns, great and small, of the Almohad empire. The first wave of persecutions was unleashed upon them in the initial phase of the conquest (336-43/1141-8). Letters of Jewish merchants originally from this region, discovered recently in the Geniza of Cairo, confirm the fact that many of them were converted to Islam between conversion to Islam and death. Massacres of Jews were perpetrated at Sīdīlmāṣa, Marrakesh and Fez (D. Corcos, L’attitude des Almohades envers les juifs, in Zion [Jerusalem 1967], 137-60, in Hebrew). These measures forced a large number of Jews to leave their country for Christian Spain, Sicily, Italy and the Middle East. This was in particular the case of the future philosopher and physician Maimonides [Abū ʿAbdullāh Mūsā ibn Mūsā], who had left his native city, Cordova, for Fez in 544/1149 or thereabouts, then, in 560/1165, emigrated to Palestine before finally settling in Cairo. It was in this city that Maimonides was accused of having abjured the Islam to which he had been converted in the Maghrib. In fact, the similarity, in philosophical terms, between the Almohad and Jewish creeds explains how a temporary conversion could be envisaged by the Jews. A second wave of persecutions of Jews and converts was instigated by the caliph Ya‘kūb al-Manṣūr, who compelled them, according to al-Marrākuši, to wear distinctive signs, clothing of absurd appearance and of different colours, and destroyed their synagogues. The period of the reign of al-Manṣūr, which also saw the temporary imprisonment of Ibn Rughd and the burning of his books, ended with the temporary disappearance of the Jewish communities of Morocco, an absence which was to last until the end of the 7th/13th century.

Economic life. Surveys of agronomy composed in Spain during the Almoravid period reveal, on the part of the farmers, an intimate knowledge of the land, of fertilisers and of methods of cultivation. The diffusion of a large number of new plants, combined with an effective system of irrigation, contributed to the development of a prosperous agricultural sector. The Almohad period, however, less advanced than in Spain, was well established. The system of land ownership in Spain was not subject to interference on the part of the Almohads, but in North Africa, to facilitate the collection of taxes and the distribution of ikās to the Arab and Berber tribes, the Almohads introduced a land reform, bringing the allocation of land under a single system. The author of the Kitāb relates that this novel-
ty, dating back to 554/1159, was instituted by 'Abd al-Mu'min, who had imposed khardj. on arable land. As for industrial production are illustrated by a list of the manufacture common to Muslim cities were main-

for urban industries, the structures of craft and khardj. on arable land. As obtained under the Almohads. The dimensions of in-

The city of Fez during the reign of the caliph al-Nasir, a manufacturing establishments and workshops of the city: 3,490 weaving-shops, 27 soap manufacturers, 86 tanneries, 116 dye-works, 12 forges, 11 glassworks, 472 water-mills, 135 factories making construction materials, 1,170 bakeries, 400 paper-mills, 180 pot-
terries, 9,082 shops selling various wares and 2 mints. The same list, probably compiled for purposes of tax-
atation, also provides information on other establishments: 89,236 housing-units, 17,040 private homes, 93 public baths and 42 other baths, 80 public fountains, 785 mosques, 467 insns. The beginning of the Almohad period coincided with the great expan-
sion of European commerce in the direction of North Africa. Peace and trade treaties preserved in Euro-

pean archives show that from 1150 onward agreements were signed between the Almohads and various cities of Europe. These agreements, intended to guarantee the security of commerce, became in-
creasingly precise. They outlawed piracy and guaranteed the good-will of the authorities towards traders and their merchandise. The Pisans, always regarded with favour in Ifrikiya, were present in Tunisia in the period of 'Abd al-Mu'min, who signed two peace treaties with Pisa (1133 and 1166) and a trade treaty with it (1157). Two further treaties with Pisa (1186 and 1189) regularised trade with Ceuta, Oran, Bougie, Tunis and Spain. The republic of Genoa had concluded numerous treaties between 1155 and 1164 to regulate commerce with the cities of Tripoli, Ceuta, Tunis, Salé and Bougie. Marseilles signed an agreement for the wine trade with Ceuta, Oran, Bougie and Tunis in 1228. In 1181, a treaty was signed between the kingdom of the Two Sicilies and the Balearics under the princes of the Banū Ghāniya. In 1184 the latter signed a peace and treaty with Pisa and in 1188, with Genoa. Morocco saw the first contacts with a view to commercial penetration from the direction of Catalonia. Contacts were limited to the Mediterranean ports, since piracy, a particular scourge on the Atlantic coast, made com-

mercial relations there more difficult [see KURSAN]. During the 13th century Italians, Provençals and Catalans were in evidence at Ceuta, where he wrote his reply to philosophical questions posed by Frederick II, king of Sicily, to the Almohad caliph 'Abd al-Walid al-Raghib. The Almohad caliphs were no longer opposed to the diffusion of Sūfism. The two central figures of Maghribi Sūfism, Abū Madyan and Ibn Maghīs [q.v.] were protected by the Almohads, and a large number of saints, a hundred at least, were interred at Marrakesh during the Almohad period. A significant corpus of literary production made its appearance, in the domains of poetry, history, geography and sciences, often with the encouragement and participa-
tion of the sovereign.

Creativity in the traditional literary channels benefited broadly from the effects of the demographic displace-

ment and from more regular contacts between regions created by the Almohad occupation. The ar-

ival of the Andalusians in North Africa contributed to literary activity in general, while their influence was particularly apparent in the functions which they occupied in the Almohad administration and at the court.

The study of monuments and the archaeological ex-
cavations conducted since the beginning of this cen-
tury, most of all in Morocco, by H. Terrasse, H. Basset, J. Meunier, G. Deverdun, J. Caillé and A. Hainaut, have brought to light the principal features of the remarkable Almohad architecture. The major period of monumental construction was limited to the first fifty years, an era of prosperity corresponding to the reigns of the first four sovereigns. The monuments—mosques at Taza, Marrakesh, Tin-
mallal, Seville, Rabat, Fez; citadels and fortresses at Marrakesh and Rabat; fortifications at Rabat—are still partially in existence today, although the Almohad palaces, the construction of which is des-
cribed by the chroniclers, have not survived. Almohad architecture combines a puritan simplicity of décor with extraordinary dimensions for the walls and, especially, the minarets. The use of ashlar, dress-
ed stone, brick and wood in construction reveals that in the field of design, as in other areas, the Almohads adopted Hispano-Moorish techniques of construction and had them applied by craftsmen from Spain. At the same time, they retained oriental motifs and tech-
niques as well as local influences. Almohad urbanism, especially visible in the capital Marrakesh but also present at Fez and at Seville, was realised by a series of works of enlargement, management of water, con-
struction of reservoirs and gardens under 'Abd al-
Mu'min, and crowned by an administrative centre constructed under Abū Yusuf Ya'kūb.

The decline. The Almohad historical experience, with exceptional exception of the one hand and dismal decadence on the other, has deeply affected mediaeval and modern Maghribi historiography and thought. In his Mukaddima, Ibn Khaldūn reveals the extent to which his historical vision was inspired by the
Almohad phenomenon: a large number of his sociological and political theories are illustrated by examples drawn from Almohad history (Shatzmiller, *L'histoireigraphie méridine. Ibn Khalduin et ses contemporains*, Leiden 1982, 54-65). For modern historians, the Almohad decline needs to be clearly separated from that of the doctrine, even though the process of their disappearance unfolded simultaneously. R. Le Tourneau and A. Merad see the submission of the state to the Mu'minid dynasty as the principal cause of its disintegration. The appropriation of political power and material benefits in the interests of a dynasty had alienated the Berbers and deprived Berber society of its initial strength. H. Terrasse and Ch.-A. Julien consider Maghribi unity, realised for the first and last time under the Almohads, as a moment of glory, aborted by "the individualism of the Berbers" and "the anarchy of the Arabs". For A. Laroui, Almohad prosperity was built on the riches of an empire, but riches which the Almohads, centred on Morocco, did not themselves produce, and this accounts for their failure. In Spain, the collapse of the Almohad régime was owed to different circumstances. There the opposition of the Mālikī *ulamā* was accompanied by general antagonism. The Almohads did not have in Spain the support of the Berber masses which had provided their power-base in North Africa. The regime was seen as a foreign military occupation. The disappearance of the doctrine is explained by the fact that it never genuinely took root. Almohadism provided neither a corpus of judicial works which could have replaced the Mālikī judicial system nor a response to the spiritual needs of the Muslim community, needs demonstrated by the triumph of Sūfism in the same period. In Spain, Almohadism was useful to those who felt the need to approach religion through logic. But those who were capable of harmonising the rational theology developed by Ibn Rushd with Almohad doctrine constituted a tiny minority. Almohadism only affected the circles in which the movement was born and it remained marginal throughout the duration of the Almohad state, while Mālikī continued to be the dominant force.

**Bibliography:** Documentation concerning the Almohads is very rich in contemporary and later sources, as well as in studies which cannot possibly be listed here in full. A special place in the gamut of contemporary sources is occupied by the fragments published by E. Lévi-Provençal: in the collection *Documents inédits d'histoire almohade*, manuscripts fragments from the 1919 "legajo" of Ibn Rushd with Almohad doctrine constituted a tiny minority. Almohadism only affected the circles in which the movement was born and it remained marginal throughout the duration of the Almohad state, while Mālikī continued to be the dominant force.


AL-MUWAKKAR, a place in the desert fringes of the early Islamic region of the Balkah, in what is now Jordan, some 22 km./14 miles southeast of ‘Amman and 16 km./10 miles northeast of the Umayyad palace of Mshattá or Mughättá (q.v.).

Visible there are the remains of an Umayyad settlement. These include traces of a palace, a tower which may have been part of a mosque, and signs of an extensive irrigation system in the form of sites of three dams nearby plus a fine stone-lined cistern, still much used by Bedouins of the Banu Ṣakhr for watering their herds. When this cistern was being cleaned out in the 1940s, a column and capital were found, the latter with an inscription ascribing the construction work there to one ‘Abd Allah b. Salim for the caliph Yazid (101-570-H); the column has gradation marks show the depth of water (see R.W. Hamilton and L.A. Mayer, Some eight-century capitals from al Musaqq, etc., in QDAP, xii (1946), 63-74; Šalāb al-Dīn al-Munājjud, Dirāsāt fi ta’rīkh al-khāli al-arabī, Beirut 1972, 10-11; the capital is now in the Ṣamān Museum). According to al-Hamāndī, Ṣiyā, Riyād 1398/1979, 334, al-Muwaqkar lay in the territory of the Banū Salfah (q.v.). The site has great attractions for a Byzantine one, on the lim e facing the desert Arabs, but was certainly a favoured haunt of the Umayyad caliphs, as attested in contemporary poetry (see al-Bakrī, Maqam, Cairo 1364-7/1945-51, iii, 1280; Yākūt, ed. Beirut, v, 226; A. Musil, Palmyrena, New York 1928, 283, and the references there to the Aghānī). From a verse by Abū Nāḵayla al-Himmānī (q.v. in Suppl.) praising the caliph al-Saffāḥ (Afgānī, ed. Bālāḵ, xviii, 150 = ed. Dār al-Kutub, xx, 415), it appears that the early ‘Abbasids destroyed al-Muwaqkar together with others of the Umayyads’ desert residences.

There was also, apparently, another al-Muwakkar in Yemen; see al-Hamāndī, op. cit., 124, 249.


MUWAKKIT (see Mīṣāṭ).

MUWALLAD (A.), a word belonging to the vocabulary of stock-breeders and designating the product of a crossing (tuṣāl) of two different animal breeds, thus a hybrid, of mixed blood. It is hardly surprising that it was extended to humans from the time when the feeling arose that the purity of the Arab race had been altered following the conquests, the influx of elements from other stocks and mixed marriages. In a more limited sense, muwallad designates a cross-breed, half-caste or even, as Dozy states (Suppl., s.v.) “one who, without being of Arab origin, has been born among the Arabs and received an Arab education”.

(Ed.)

1. In Muslim Spain. In al-Andalus, the muwallad-ladun constitutes a particular category of the popula
tion, but it is not to be confused with either the Glassarium labeled arabicum nor the Vocabolista contain this word, which Pedro de Alcalá translated as adoptato. Muwallad has given to Spanish maladl and, according to Eguilaz (an opinion rejected by Dozy), malato. The mediaeval Latin transcription was molitates.

The occupation, in 92/711, of the Iberian peninsula by Berber-Arab troops encouraged the appearance of neo-Muslims: muslīmā or aṣlāmā. More precisely still, aṣlāmā was used to designate the ex-Christian convert, whereas the term islamī was reserved for the former Jew. Probably due to the fact that, in historical terms, it is statistically more exact to speak of the occu-
pation of al-Andalus than of the conquest, the major-
ity of the population were covered by a pact (mu’ālad) that was far superior to that of “vanguished people” (waḍ al-i’tadiyy), which implies the impor-
tance of the number of those who “submitted”, susceptible of being transformed into muwālī (q.v.), a fact confirmed by the Wathā‘ik of Ibn al-‘Antāk (q.v.) which stated that “in al-Andalus the waḍ al-i’tdkil of conversion is not considered identical to that of manumission (waḍa’ al-rā’id); the clientage of conversion does not entail personal connections or socio-economic obliga-
tions and its members are clients not of an individual but of the whole community. The judicial authorities only register this clientage (of conversion) in the case where the individual comes to reside “in a land where it is effective”. Consequently, al-Andalus was to have a slightly different evolution from the rest of the Arabo-Muslim empire, for it did not experience the problems provoked by the incorporation of the muwālī of the old Sasanid empire. For Muslim Spain, the question presents itself differently, sc. in terms of muwālādun.

This word, often badly translated (from an ethnocentric angle) as “renegades”, designated the descendants of non-Arab neo-Muslims, brought up in the Islamic religion by their recently-converted parents. Thus they are the members of the second generation (the sons) and, by extension, those of the third generation (the grandchildren). It should be noted—contrary to a current Hispano-nationalist presumption—that the sons of an Arab father and in-
digenous mother did not feel themselves to be and were not regarded as muwallad. Since the sire was Arab, the offspring was also Arab. This explains why a family of mixed stock (such as the Sevillian Banū Haddādī, descendants in the maternal line, through Sara the Goth, of Witiza the penultimate Visigothic monarch) might be the chiefs of the Lakhmid group and upholders of the “hard” Arab policy of exter-
ding the Muslims and local Christians. It is thus time to accept that Ibn al-Kūtiyya was “Arab” and to stop setting him up as a prototype of a group that he in no way represented.

These muwalladun sometimes kept Roman “family names”: Banū Angelino, B. Sabanico, B. al-Longo, B. al-Kafr, B. al-Abbas, B. al-Maṣrūz, B. Martin, B. Gharsiya, Ibn Bashkuwal (q.v.), Ibn Kuzmān (q.v.), etc.

The muslīmā, imperfectly integrated, were not in a
position to claim the effectiveness of their theoretical assimilation (they had to appear not to be seeking their cultural advancement; furthermore, their conversion was invalid if it had been motivated "by the attraction of a reward"). However, their descendants, being born into Islam, were no longer open to such criticisms and could freely claim the complete assimilation to which they had the right. When this did not take place, the muwalladun felt themselves discriminated against (the Arabs called them banu 'l-hamrâ, banu 'l-tobim or the vile rabble (al-adhâl), and they reacted violently.

This reaction developed the name of an ideology, that of Muslim egalitarianism. It should be stressed that no example is known of a muwallad movement advocating a return to Christianity (the rumour, true or false, of the conversion of 'Umar b. Hashûfîn [q. v.] alienated from him all his Muslim allies). Their culture and language were Arabic. It is notable that the leaders of this indigenous party expressed themselves in Arabic, and examples of preserved Romanisms are only exceptionally attributed to them. When the Toledan Ghibrib b. 'Abd Allâh instigated his fellow citizens against the Cordovan state, he did so in Arabic verse. The political model in no way envisaged the re-establishment of a Visigothic state, but the setting up of an autonomous local government. Whether as auxiliaries of the government ('Amrûs in Toledo, Saragossa and Tudela), as collaborating "seigneurs" (the Banû Kašî [q. v.] in the Upper March [see Tawtqîr]) or, on the other hand, as dissidents. There are the Toledan rebellions which resulted in the battle of Wadi Salit (240/854), the uprising of 'Abd al-Rahmân ibn al-Qâjillîkî (261/875), who founded his "capital", Badajoz, Sa'dûn al-Suruûnbâkî at Monsalud, Ibn al-Shâliyqa at Somontin, Daysam b. Ishâq at Murcia and Lorca and, above all, 'Umar b. Hashûfîn at Malaga, Granada and Jaen. The local muwalladun were regarded as a danger to Arab sovereignty, by the Kayûsî Yahyâ b. Sukkûla at Elvira and by Kurrayb b. Khalkûn at Seville, who attempted to eliminate them. Their religious rights were regarded as a "repugnant " (al-muwalladun minhum Bashshâr al-Allâhi, 74: 261/875) or, on the other hand, as "capitulating" (al-muwalladun minhum Bashshâr al-Allâhi, 74: 261/875) and by Kurrayb b. Khalkûn at Seville, who attempted to eliminate them. Their religious rights were regarded as a "repugnant " (al-muwalladun minhum Bashshâr al-Allâhi, 74: 261/875) or, on the other hand, as "capitulating" (al-muwalladun minhum Bashshâr al-Allâhi, 74: 261/875).

They were a group (ka'm) still very close to the autochthonous non-Muslims, and we frequently see them uniting against the Arabs. The texts provide quite numerous references to these alliances: al-muwalladun wa-'l-muwalladm minhum Bashshâr al-Allâhi, 74: 261/875 and by Kurrayb b. Khalkûn at Seville, who attempted to eliminate them. Their religious rights were regarded as a "repugnant " (al-muwalladun minhum Bashshâr al-Allâhi, 74: 261/875) or, on the other hand, as "capitulating" (al-muwalladun minhum Bashshâr al-Allâhi, 74: 261/875). Their leader, 'Abd Allâh al-Baydn wa-'l-toxm, ed. A. Sprenger, Calcutta 1862, s.v.; Hilmi Khallî: al-Muwalladun fi 'l-Isbâyya, Beirut 1945/1985 (W.F. Heinrichs).

In literary studies, muwallad may refer (a) to poets of the "post-classical" era (already in al-Dâhibî, Bayân, i, 71: wa-min šu'âbâ bi-'l-amâr wa-šu'ârâ'ihim wa-'l-muwalladun bi-šu'ârâ'ihim, i, 74: šu'ârâ' al-muwalladun, again mentioning Bashshâr and others). As such, muwalladun is often synonymous with mubâdhâqin [q. v.], although the latter is sometimes restricted in use to the early generation of "modern" poets with muwallad referring to the later generations. It refers (b) to "new poetic motifs extracted from old ones" (al-muwalladun wa-'l-muwalladâ, cf. al-Amîdi, Muwâsâna, i, 6, here used with a negative connotation). Ibn Rashîk [q. v.] gives a brief description of the mechanism of tawûtîd, in which he states that it stands midway between ikhîrâ' "original invention" and sarîkâ "plagiarism" ('Umâd, i, 263-5). Finally, the term is used (c) to denote non-classical proverbs (mašâl [q. v.]) in the great collections of proverbs such as al-Mayâdînî's Mâç'mûn [q. v.].

In the study of language muwallad may characterise a word which is semantically and etymologically similar to another or which has been extended in meaning, e.g., wâdîya for baddâ' from root b-d-h. For the classification of loanwords as muwallad see muwârâba.

In the first place, muwârâba denotes in rhetoric the ability to remedy a gaffe or an offensive phrase by repeating the expression in an attenuated form, if not radically modified, or else by trying to make the per- son addressed believe that he has not properly understood what has been said to him (see Mehrîn, Rûhtûrîk, 123:4; Dozy, Supplément, s.v.). Secondly, the same term appears in the K. al-
Mughrib fi dhikr bilad Ifnkiya wa 'l-Maghrib of al-Bakn (ed.-tr. de Slane, 3rd ed. Paris 1965, Ar. text 106, tr. 201) with a quite separate and special sense, since it denotes at that time (9th/11th century) a usage widespread among the great Berber tribe of northwestern Morocco, the Ghumara [q.v.] and particularly flattering, the author states, for “their wives” amour propre. At the moment when a man who has just married a young men of the locality clandestinely carry off the virgin is about to consummate the marriage, the author states, for “their wives’ amour propre. It often happens that the same woman is carried off several times in succession, especially when she is distinguished by her beauty. The more she is sought out in this way, the happier she is.”

The custom described here does not seem to have been attested elsewhere, but it is difficult not to see a link with the Kabyle limesarhelemhe arba, in which the agglutination of the Arabic definite article - shows the origin of this term, which must have been equally used in Arabic. The noun is the masdar of the verb warab, which means, notably, in the Kabyle forms of speech, “sleep away from home (of a man); to leave any dwelling or place either after an agreement with the subject or with a third party” (J.-M. Dallet, Dictionnaire kabyle-français, Paris 1982, 573), but this meaning applied to a man is totally secondary, since the limesarhelemhe is basically concerned with women and consists for them in returning to their parents, in leaving the conjugal home without having been divorced (Dallet, loc. cit.). One thus learns, in effect, that in Kabyla, a husband had the power, without having to pronounce the divorce formula, to send back his wife, who is then tamwanbolthamwarzbth, she could be brought back again without any other formalities if her parents and she herself were agreeable about this, provided that the return of the wife had not been provoked by some grave fault, such as adultery. In this last case, the wife was ignominiously expelled, sometimes with a shaven head, and there was no longer for her any question of returning to her husband, her return in that case being equivalent to having been divorced (see A. Hanotreau and A. Letourneux, La Kabylie et les coutumes kabyles, 2nd ed., Paris 1893, 181).

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(M. PELLAT) MUWASHSHAH (A.) (muwashshah or muwashsha, pl. muwashshâbât), name of a certain genre of stanzic poetry, which according to indigenous tradition developed in al-Andalus towards the end of the 3rd/9th century. It is reckoned among the seven post-classtical genres of poetry in Arabic [see KÄN WA-KÄN].

Structure. The muwashshah has a particular rhyme scheme and a special final part (khordja). The main body of the poem is always composed in Classical Arabic, while the language of the final part is mostly non-Classical (vernacular Arabic or Romance mixed with vernacular Arabic to a larger or lesser extent [macaronic]; very rarely pure Romance). The stanzas of a poem are all built alike and show a regular alternation of two elements: at the beginning we have lines that rhyme with each other, the rhyme changing from one stanza to the next (“separate rhymes”); they are followed by lines whose rhyme scheme remains the same throughout the poem (“common rhymes”). The number of stanzas, in the vast majority of poems, is five; rarely, one encounters poems with four, six, or seven stanzas. The first stanza is mostly, but not always, preceded by two or more introductory lines (matla') which, with regard to rhyme scheme and metre, always exactly correspond with the lines having common rhyme. The number of lines with separate rhyme is mostly three or four, whereas the number of lines with common rhyme is two, three, and quite often also more; the latter may be of different length and are often quite short. The common-rhyme lines of the last stanza are almost always identical with the khordja. The rhyme schemes of two simple types of muwashshah are the following:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{muwashshah} & \quad \text{muwashshah} \\
\text{with matla'} & \quad \text{without matla'} \\
\hline
\text{a} & \quad \text{b} \\
\text{c} & \quad \text{a} \\
\text{c} & \quad \text{c} \\
\text{e} & \quad \text{a} \\
\text{a} & \quad \text{b} \\
\text{b} & \quad \text{b} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The lines with separate rhymes are sometimes divided into two (more rarely three or four) segments. The segments of a line may be of equal or different length. The ends of corresponding segments within a stanza usually rhyme.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a}.b..c.a & \quad \text{a}.b..c.a \\
\text{d} & \quad \text{d} \\
\text{e} & \quad \text{e} \\
\text{e} & \quad \text{e} \\
\text{f} & \quad \text{f} \\
\text{g} & \quad \text{g} \\
\text{.a}.b..c.a & \quad .a}.b..c.a
\end{align*}
\]

Poems with exceedingly complicated and even irregular rhyme schemes may be encountered. The muwashshah in the following example has eight common-rhyme lines and the separate-rhyme lines have two parts: abdelfd gghkk abdelfd, jggj abdelfd, kikkh abdelfd, etc.

Name and terminology. Different explanations have been proposed for the name muwashshah. The ancient indigenous philologists, followed by J. Ribera and S.M. Stern, derive it from wisha, “an ornament worn by women (consisting of) two series of pearls and jewels strung or put together in regular order, which two series are disposed contrariwise, one of them being turned over the other” (cf. Lane, s.v.). A muwashshah would thus be a poem in which the rhymes alternate in the manner of a wisha. According to I. 'Abbâs, however, the basic meaning of al-muwashshah would be “that which is characterised by a colour different from its normal colour (or by striped pattern), or an embroidered or ornamented garment”; the transposition would thus find its explanation in the comparability of the ornamentation of the material consisting of regularly recurring stripes and the lines of the poems (cf. Ta'rikh al-adab al-andalusi, 220 f.). The muwashshah poet is called wishah; composing such poems is termed tasha (this term is also used as a synonym of muwashshah). A muwashshah with introductory lines (matla') is called “complete” (tâmm), without one matla', “bald” (abra). The terminology for the various parts of a poem is not homogeneous. The one most commonly used today is found in Ibn Sa'id al-Maghribî-Ibn Khâlîdân (Mukaddimâ, iii, 390 ff.): stanza = bayt; separate-rhyme lines in each stanza = ghân; common-rhyme lines = simr. Ibn Sanâ'
al-Mulk, however, uses the term bayt instead of ghusn and qufl instead of simt. While Ibn Sana` al-Mulk has mostly presented 20 Romance kharajas that were characteristically culled from Hebrew muwashshahs (on this, cf. Latino-Peñafiel, 6), Stern also discovered the first Romance kharja in an Arabic muwashshah (and published it, ibid., xiv [1949], 214-18). E. Garcia Gomez followed with Venticinco
farjas romances en muwassahas árabes (ibid., xvii [1952], 57-125). Whereas Stern had always proffered as a mere hypothesis the suggestion that the Romance kharjas might be pre-existing Frauwieder related to the Galician-Portuguese canto de amigo and simply quoted by Arab (and Hebrew) poets in their muwashshahs (cf. Stern, 58 ff.), certain Romance and German scholars (D. Alonso, R. Menendez Pidal, Th. Frings, L. Spitzer), rather considered the kharjas as proof for the existence of a pre-literary “Mozarabic” Frauwieder in al-Andalus. The kharjas would thus be the oldest extant Romance secular poetry. Criticism of this opinion was first voiced by the Romance scholar H. Lausberg. According to him, the kharjas have been composed by the Arab poets themselves “als agudeza- und pathoshaltige Inhaltsrippel” of the muwashshahs (in Arch. f.d. Studium der Neueren Sprachen, ccxxi [1955] 208-90). A further development of this approach was offered by W. Ross. That the poets themselves had pieced together the kharjas was, according to H. Lausberg, confirmed by the fact that these lines are written in a mixed language and reflect the mixed universe of motifs characteristic of the mixed Andalusian culture of the 11th and 12th centuries (ibid., ccxxi [1956], 129-38). This latter opinion, though dormant for some time, has been resuscitated, with a slight shift in emphasis, during the last few years. This happened under the impact of the severe arbitrariness and partial unetableness so often characteristic of the decipherment and/or reconstruction of the kharjas. Especially García Gomez’ book Las jurcas romances de la serie árabe en su marco (Madrid 1965, 2nd ed. Barcelona 1975) met with criticism in this regard. Today, while one side continues to believe that the kharjas are “if not authentic popular songs from Muslim Spain, then at least poems of a popular type” (J.T. Monroe, in Islam: past influence and present challenge, ed. A.T. Welch and P. Cachia, Edinburgh 1979, 168), the other side is convinced that “there are no cases where the readings are sufficiently certain to justify the assertion that, when taken together, such Romance words constitute a poem in Romance” (R. Hitchcock, in La Corónica, xiii [1985], 243). A solid basis for further research is A. Jones’ Romance kharjas (see Bild.), which contains facsimile reproductions, from the manuscripts, of the analysed kharjas.

Prosody. The prosody of the muwashshah is as controversial as the nature of the Romance kharjas. While Spanish scholars (J. Ribera, E. Garcia Gómez) and lately also American ones (J.T. Monroe, D. Switlo) have opined that the prosody of the muwashshah, under the influence of Romance poetry, had at least originally been stress-syllabic, non-Spanish European and Arab scholars are mostly convinced that we are dealing here with quantitative metres (first proposed by M. Hartmann; also S.M. Stern, H. Ritter, W. Hoenenbach, T.J. Gorton, A. Jones, J.D. Latham, G. Scholer, I. Abbás, S. Gházi). To be sure, alongside the unchanged Klhallian metres (vamal, e.g., occurs rather often, also kahfi, mughadth, as well as others), there occur, according to this opinion, also modified Klhallian metres and combinations of feet. Some who maintain this view (Ibn Sana`, al-Mulk, al-Dalasi) seem to have gone in the same way. It has, therefore, been called an extended or expanded `arid. The indubitable fact that there is a strong relationship between the `arid system

The existence of most love poems and panegyrics. Wine poems are also quite common (with the drinking scene often set against the backdrop of a description of nature). The existence of wine poems as well as the critics consider it legitimate to take these quotations over from other poems. The kharjas was used by Sufi poets (e.g., Ibn Sana` al-Mulk) has been resuscitated, with a slight shift in emphasis, during the last few years. This happened under the impact of the severe arbitrariness and partial unetableness so often characteristic of the decipherment and/or reconstruction of the kharjas. Especially García Gomez’ book Las jurcas romances de la serie árabe en su marco (Madrid 1965, 2nd ed. Barcelona 1975) met with criticism in this regard. Today, while one side continues to believe that the kharjas are “if not authentic popular songs from Muslim Spain, then at least poems of a popular type” (J.T. Monroe, in Islam: past influence and present challenge, ed. A.T. Welch and P. Cachia, Edinburgh 1979, 168), the other side is convinced that “there are no cases where the readings are sufficiently certain to justify the assertion that, when taken together, such Romance words constitute a poem in Romance” (R. Hitchcock, in La Corónica, xiii [1985], 243). A solid basis for further research is A. Jones’ Romance kharjas (see Bild.), which contains facsimile reproductions, from the manuscripts, of the analysed kharjas.

Prosody. The prosody of the muwashshah is as controversial as the nature of the Romance kharjas. While Spanish scholars (J. Ribera, E. Garcia Gómez) and lately also American ones (J.T. Monroe, D. Switlo) have opined that the prosody of the muwashshah, under the influence of Romance poetry, had at least originally been stress-syllabic, non-Spanish European and Arab scholars are mostly convinced that we are dealing here with quantitative metres (first proposed by M. Hartmann; also S.M. Stern, H. Ritter, W. Hoenenbach, T.J. Gorton, A. Jones, J.D. Latham, G. Scholer, I. Abbás, S. Gházi). To be sure, alongside the unchanged Klhallian metres (vamal, e.g., occurs rather often, also kahfi, mughadth, as well as others), there occur, according to this opinion, also modified Klhallian metres and combinations of feet. Some who maintain this view (Ibn Sana`, al-Mulk, al-Dalasi) seem to have gone in the same way. It has, therefore, been called an extended or expanded `arid. The indubitable fact that there is a strong relationship between the `arid system
and the prosody of the Hispano-Arabic stanzaic poetry (muwashshah as well as zadjal) has recently led one scholar to propose something like a compromise solution (E. Compère, in JAL, xiii [1982], 76-82, and JAL, xvii [1986], 34-49). According to this, the metres of muwashshah (and zadjal) represent an Andalusian adaptation of 'arād, in the sense that the long quantity of syllables in Classical Arabic prosody is replaced by their stress. The proponent of this hypothesis has to concede, however, that the (allegedly) stressed syllables are graphically long and that the unstressed syllables very often graphically short, so that his metrical determinations often do not materially differ from those of the adherents of the quantitative theory. (For a critique of his theory, cf. G. Scholer, in BeO, xl [1983], cols. 311-32, and A. Jones, in JSS, xxvii [1982], 128-30.) At any rate, it is undeniable that practically all muwashshahs known to date have metres that display a regular alternation of long and short syllables (thus also J.T. Monroe, in LA, xiii [1982], 124). Though rarely, even kāmil and wafrī, which are heterosyllabic metres, occur. Admittedly, one has to allow for certain poetical licences, all of which by the way have their place in Classical Arabic prosody, especially in raddāt (e.g. a less strict handling of hamsa; 'albud, i.e. the lengthening of short syllables; and, vice versa, the shortening of long syllables especially in end position). Finally, one should notice that the aghān and the asmat of a poem have often different metres.
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poems addressed to the Prophet (mostly mucaradas on well-known secular muwashshahs), and the most famous of them all, Al-Shu'abri (d. 668/1269); on him, see Brockelmann, I, 274, 1, 483-4; Stern, op. cit., 89-91. In his Diwan, consisting exclusively of mystical poems, one encounters, in addition to zajals, also muwashshahs, often difficult to distinguish from the former.

Diffusion. Originating in Spain, the muwashshah soon conquered the rest of the Arab countries. Via North Africa where, however, remarkably few independent muwashshahs can be found (if one excludes Andalusian immigrants) it reached Egypt, Yemen and the Orient. A collection of muwashshahs, entitled Dar al-Diraz, whose introduction contains the well-known poetical works of the compiled by the Egyptian Ibn Sanû al-Mulk (d. 608/1211 [q.v.]). In the second part of this work, he presents muwashshahs of his own (55 specimens). While his Diwan does not yet contain any muwashshahs, such can be found, together with kasidas, in many later collections of poetry, e.g. those of Šafi al-Dîn al-Hillî (d. c. 750/1349) and Abd al-Ghâni al-Nabulusî (d. 1143/1731 c. Abd al-Mulk). In North African cities, popular musicians have until recently been using muwashshahs, among them a considerable number of classical Andalusian ones, as libretti for their vocal music (cf. idem, op. cit.).

Imitations and later survivals. In the Diwan of Ibn Kuzmân (d. 555/1160 [q.v.]), which consists exclusively of zajals, a large number of these poems show the formal structure of muwashshahs (so-called muwashshah-like zajals). Several of them are mu'arradât of older muwashshahs (cf. Stern, op. cit., 171-85). Already, much earlier, Spanish Hebrew poets had imitated the Arabic muwashshahs and composed secular as well as liturgical muwashshahs in the Hebrew language. Some specimens date back to the 5th/11th century. The most famous Hebrew muwashshahs are Moshe b. 'Ezra (d. 1135), Yehuda Halevi (d. 1140) and Abraham b. 'Ezra (d. 1165). Very often their poems are mu'arradât of well-known Arabic muwashshahs. Yehuda Halevi, e.g., who was born in Tudela, imitates his compatriot al-Âmâr al-Tujîlî. The importance of the Hebrew muwashshahs lies not least in the fact that they contain the most readily legible and highest-quality khardjas in Romance. The earliest proven Troubadour, William of Aquitaine (d. 1127), who flourished at about the same time as the above-mentioned Hebrew muwashshah poets, uses stanzaic forms that closely resemble the muwashshahs (several times the rhyme scheme aab ba ccb ddd bbb, etc., is found in his poetry). This fact is one of the main arguments of the so-called "Arabic theory" which proposes to explain the genesis of Provençal poetry, at least in part, through Arabic influence. The revival of muwashshahs and other mediaeval Arabic stanzaic forms played an important role at the beginning of modern Arabic literature in the 19th century. The old stanzaic forms were used not only in original poetic efforts, but also in the translation of Western poetry (cf. S. Moreh, Modern Arabic poetry 1800-1970, Leiden 1976, 11 ff.).

The latter expression, traditionally common in Islamic contexts, was extended to include both subjects and citizens of states in the West as well. Only towards the end of the century did writers of Arabic begin to feel uncomfortable with identifying citizens as muwdtin and turned to look for another term. Like “citizen”, muwdtin signifies relation to a place rather than subjection to a ruler. Yet the term seems to carry an implied civic status and rights, relation to a watan has not. What initially characterised a muwdtin was his being a fellow-member of the fatherland, a compatriot (cf. mu’misir, “contemporary”), as distinct from an adnubi, a foreigner. Such a relation, while capable of evoking powerful emotions, carried no necessary civic or political implications. These came to be attached to the term only in recent years, with the gradual adoption in Arab countries of the ideas of individual political rights. Nowadays, while its equivalence with “citizen” in the strict legal sense is universally accepted, the extent of political rights which the word connotes by implication differ from one Arabic-speaking country to another, according to their respective political realities.

Bibliography: For the modern legal use of muwdtin and related terms, see Shams al-Din al-Wakil, al-Mudjaz fi ‘l-djinsiyya wa-markaz al-adjdnib, Alexandria 1966, esp. 60 ff. See also HURRIYYA.

(A. AVAYON)

AL-MUWAYLIHI, the name of a well-to-do family of silk merchants which traced its ancestry back to the town of Muwaylih on the Red Sea coast of Arabia. Two of its members, father and son, became famous as the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries.

1. IBRAHIM, Egyptian political journalist and writer (1844-1906).

When his father died in 1865, he and his younger brother, Abd al-Salim, took over the administration of the family business. In the same year, a long association between Ibrahim and the Egyptian Khedive Ismad‘il [q.v.] began when the latter gave him positions in the Council of Ministers and in the Court of First Instance. In 1868 Ibrahim helped found a publishing house, the first of many such initiatives throughout his career, but in 1872 he suffered a financial setback when he lost the entire family fortune in a speculation on the newly-established Stock Exchange. Once again, the Khedive appears to have played a role by rescuing him from financial ruin. In 1879 Ismad‘il was forced to abdicate and go into exile. In 1879 Ibrahim changed his tack somewhat, writing articles in newspapers and even founded yet another newspaper named al-Mukattam that emerged from a reading of contemporary accounts, one that is often embellished by many apocryphal tales, the dissemination of which he himself often provoked and encouraged.

In Istanbul, Ibrahim was given a formal appointment on the Education Council and made the acquaintance of Munif Pascha [q.v.], the Minister of Education, a contact that provided both Ibrahim and his son with an entry to the famous Fatih Library and its collection of manuscripts. But much of Ibrahim’s time was taken up with continuing involvement in political intrigue, both local and international. He managed to capture a great deal of the flavour of the political atmosphere in Istanbul in his famous work, Mâ hânîül, a series of articles first published in the Egyptian newspaper al-Mukattam (beginning with no. 1903 of 20 January 1895), under the pseudonym Ahad al-Ughtmâniyyîn al-afdîl (“an Ottoman worthy”). Besides describing the governmental structure and court protocol in Istanbul, the series went into great detail about the operations of the secret police and every possible aspect of bribery and intrigue. Ibrahim returned to Egypt in 1895 and published his articles in book form in the following year, but the work was immediately banned and all copies were ordered sent to Istanbul.

On 14 April 1898, Ibrahim began publishing his most famous newspaper, Misbah al-Shark, which was founded by Muhammad ‘Ali in Cairo (“Memoirs”, 1948-51) termed “the best weekly.” Both he and his son Muhammad contributed articles, including commentary on current events, political and social issues, and extracts from works of literature transcribed from the manuscripts in the Fatih Library. The repute of the newspaper reached its height during the publication (November 1898-December 1900) of Muhammad’s series of episodes, Fatra min al-zaman, which, after much revision, were published as Hadîth ‘Is ibn Hisham (1907). During the publication of Muhammad’s episodes, Ibrahim also contributed to the genre, with a series of nine episodes entitled Mir’dâ al-sâlim aw Hadîth Músâ ibn ‘Isâm (June-July 1899, June-September 1900). As Ibrahim resumed his career as political consultant to the Khedive, Muhammad seems to have gradually taken over the editorial functions at the newspaper. Under his control, the pungent critical articles that had so contributed to the paper’s reputation diminished in both quality and number; original articles were replaced by lengthy quotations from Western sources and advertisements. The newspaper ceased publication on 15 August 1903. Ibrahim continued to publish articles in newspapers and even founded yet another newspaper named al-Mudhakkirdt in 1905. However, he fell gravely ill in December of that year and died on 29 January 1906.

According to Muhammad Kurd ‘Ali, Ibrahim al-Muwaylihi was “the greatest writer of his day and a man who could write entertainingly on the dullest subject.” Kurd ‘Ali goes on to disapprove of the way in which Ibrahim misquoted their professor, Muhammad ‘Abduh, but suggested that “some higher authority was behind Ibrahim Bey”. Inclusive critic, brilliant stylist in the traditional mode, and inveterate political schemer, such is the picture of Ibrahim al-Muwaylihi that emerges from a reading of contemporary accounts, one that is often embellished by many apocryphal tales, the dissemination of which he himself often provoked and encouraged.
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The date of his birth is a subject of debate: if 1858, then only fourteen years separate father and son; if 1868, then Muhammad would have begun to work as a clerk in 1882 at the age of fourteen. The more public early part of his life is inextricably bound up with that of his father, a career that involved contacts with many influential men of Egypt at the time and political activity on both the local and international levels. When the Khedive Isma‘îl [q. v.] was forced to abdicate and go into exile in 1879, Ibrahim al-Muwailihi joined him in Italy. Muhammad, nominally in the care of his uncle, ‘Abd al-Salâm, in fact left on his own during the turmoil that preceded the departure of Ibrahim. On 14 April 1885 he was arrested for distributing a leaflet written by his father, and condemned to death. However, the sentence was commuted to exile, and Muhammad joined his father in Italy.

Both al-Muwailihi now participated in the flurry of political activity surrounding the exiled Khedive and, in particular, his complex relationships with his homeland and the Ottoman Sultan. Muhammad and Muhammad were heavily involved in newspaper publication, most notably al-Ithîhâd (see 1. above). Eventually, Ibrahim was invited to the Ottoman capital, and when, after sending his son, Muhammad, to assess the situation, he had assured himself of the Sultan’s good intentions, he himself moved to Istanbul in 1885. Both al-Muwailihi were now given access to and the Ottoman Sultan, Ibrahim and Muhammad were particularly able to transcribe a number of famous works of Arabic literature, including those of his favourite poet Abû al-‘Alâ ‘Alâ al-Mâṣârî [q. v.], that were later published on the pages of Misbâh al-Shârî. In 1887 Muhammad left his father in Istanbul and returned to Egypt. He resumed his career as a journalist, producing articles for a number of newspapers; in al-Mukâṭtâm, for example, he wrote – using a variety of pseudonyms (such as “an Egyptian who knows his country” and “al-Badi‘” [q. v.]) – about a number of political issues of the time, most especially the Nationalist Party. It was during this period that Muhammad al-Muwailihi made the acquaintance of the philosopher and statesman Ahmad Shawârî [q. v.], and ‘Uthmâl al-nafs, a collection of philosophical essays published posthumously in 1932.

Within the development of modern Arabic prose narrative, the significance of Muhammad al-Muwailihi’s Hadith ‘îsâ ibn Hîjâm lies in its function as a bridge between the classical genres and the emerging tradition of modern Arabic fiction: the former evidenced by the evocation of the masâkimât of Bâdi‘ [q. v.]; the latter, by the use of a similarly named narrator, ‘îsâ ibn Hîjâm, and the beginning of each episode in the newspaper with a passage of extremely rhymed nasîd (rhyming prose); the latter through the accurate and sarcastically critical portrait of Egyptian society during the British occupation. The excursions of ‘îsâ and his companion, the Pâshâ, through the byways of the Egyptian legal system and later, as observers of a provincial ‘umdâ and his venal companions, through the seeder parts of a rapidly westernising Cairo, provided a vivid and powerful social commentary that stood in marked contrast to the philosophical and romantic-historical focus of the incipient and imported novel genre in Arabic at this period. While Muhammad al-Muwailihi’s work was clearly neo-classical in form and style, and while his views were mostly conservative, Hadith ‘îsâ ibn Hîjâm focused relentlessly on the foibles of Egyptian society, and, by so doing, paved the way for the emergence of later works which formed the beginnings of the novel genre in Arabic.

The final issue of Misbâh al-Shârî (15 August 1903) notes that publication would have to be temporarily suspended due to the editor’s illness, but no further issues appeared. Muhammad al-Muwailihi gradually withdrew from society, something that some writers attribute to a public scandal (the so-called Amm al-Kaff (“Year of the Slap”)) in which he found himself embroiled in 1902. Following the death of his father in January 1906, he rarely appeared in public, although he did serve as Director of the Wâdi Administration. The rest of his life was spent in retirement, from which he would only emerge periodically as a name in a newspaper in order to express his views about topics that aroused his ire. His last published article (in al-Abnâm, 30 December 1921) is typical: under the title Sauw min al-u‘lâ (“Voice from Retirement”) he gave his reasons for retiring, and proceeded to express his feelings about the second expulsion of Sa‘îd al-Zâjdâl [q. v.] from Egypt. A few weeks after finishing the editorial work on ‘Uthmâl al-nafs (“Cure for the Soul”), he died in Hulwân on 28 February 1930.

Bibliography (in addition to that in 1. above): R. Allen, Al-Muwailihi’s Hadith ‘îsâ ibn...
Hisnam. A study of Egypt during the British occupation, Albany 1974; idem, Poetry and ... laid down for him in his father's last wishes: to preserve and justify the popularity of the Amirid regime by peace lived in the second half of the 2nd/8th century. lmran, eminent (q.v.)...D Moses), Mu lmran = include Musa (by confusion with Musa b. Rasdil, it is possible that he held an administrative function or traded profitably on the basis of inherited or acquired wealth; alternatively, this assistant may have been involved in the management of the revenues which he earned from an estate called Ziyadan, which had been bequeathed to his ancestor Ziyad, which had been bequeathed to his ancestor Ziyad, who was also the maternal grandfather of the grammarian and K^ur^an reader Is^a b. ^Umar al-Thakafi (d. 149/766 [q.v.]) and of his brother H^adjib. Al-Djhiz, whom he had helped out of an awkward situation in his youth with a gift of 50 dinars (al-^adl), the theologians who agree with the Murtada followers of Abu Thawban (the Murtada) regarding the adherence of militants to a particular school which the heresiographers have subsequently sought the company of Abu '1-Hudhayl [q.v.] or al-'Hudjaym, who was also the maternal grandfather of the school of al-Mansur had actually left his son and successor Abu Marwan to manage this transition. Whatever the true position, all these speculations seem to a large extent superfluous, since Muways never committed himself in print to writing and was probably content with expressing his opinions in the course of discussions in which he took part; hence arise, no doubt, the inconsistencies which have been noted.

Bibliography: To the references cited, add Djhiz, Hayawdn, Baydn, *Bu^hala*^, indices; Mubarad, Kams, 259; Tahari, iii, 943; Pellat, Millen, index; J. van Es, Mu^mati b. ^Umar, in *Recherches d'Islamologie*, Louvain n.d., 337-58.

AL-MUZAFFAR, the honorific lakab by which the second of the 'Amirid dictators of Muslim Spain is best known, the son of the celebrated al-Mansur [q.v.], Abu Marwan. *Abu al-Malik* Abu Marwan on a campaign in Spain. It has been possible to fill this gap, thanks to the discovery of accounts of the hajibate of al-Muways in the Djkhiba of Ibn Basam and the Bayan of Ibn lakab, the honorific title by which the *Abd al-Malik was invested with the office of jihat by the caliph Hisnam II, on the death of his father, on 28 Ramadan 392/10 Aug. 1002, and ruled as absolute master the territory of al-Andalus until his death from angina as he was setting out on an expedition against Castille on 16 Safar 399/20 Oct. 1008. The relatively short period of the hajibate of 'Abd al-Malik al-Muways was, until quite recently, almost unknown for lack of documents, and in his *Histoire Dozy had to pass it over almost in silence, in spite of his importance in the history of the early 11th century in Spain. It has been possible to fill this gap, thanks to the discovery of accounts of the hajibate of al-Muways in the Djkhiba of Ibn Basam and the Bayan of Ibn lakab and the chapter devoted to him by Ibn al-Kha^bi in his *Amal al-d^alam*. The result is the discovery that the septennium of *Abd al-Malik was for Muslim Spain a period of peace and prosperity of a regular golden age, just on the eve of the first upheavals which preceded the collapse of the Umayyad caliphate; the chroniclers compare this period to the first week of a marriage (sab^-arans; cf. Dozy, *Suppl.*, i, 626-7).

Al-Mansur had actually left his son and successor an empire not only completely pacified and solidly organised but also enjoying an economic prosperity hitherto unprecedented. *Abd al-Malik aimed at following scrupulously the line of conduct laid down for him in his father's last wishes: to preserve and justify the popularity of the 'Amirid régime by peace
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at home and the continual harassing of the Christian foe beyond the marches (thughur). Every year of Muzaffar's rule was therefore marked by a summer expedition (qa'a) or a winter one (ghazat al-nasr). In 393/1003 he led his armies against Catalonia (bidad al-
Irangi), laid waste the country round Barcelona and destroyed 35 strongholds before returning to Cor-
dova; in 395/1005, an expedition was led against Castile at the hands of the Muqaddam, which he seemed to have approached but now retreated from in 397/1007 took place, against Catalonia, the expedition known as the "victorious" (ghazat al-nasr). Muzaffar forced his way into Clunia and carried off a vast booty. This triumph earned for him from the nominal sovereign the title of "Victor" (al-Muẓaffar) which henceforth replaced his previous lakab of Sayf al-Dawla. In the course of the winter of 398/1007-8, there was an expedition undertaken which ended in the capture of a castle of San-Martín which has not been identified. The last expedition undertaken by him as mentioned above came to nothing, but at least enabled him to die like his father on the way to wage war on the infidel. At home, al-Muẓaffar maintained intact the strong administrative organisation which dated from the reign of his great-grandfather. Ibn Hayyân; or a winter one (sd^ifd) which henceforth replaced his previous lakab of Sayf al-Dawla. Later, Salah al-Din was to go back on the plan which was prudently foiled by Salah al-Din's father Yusuf b. Ayyûb.

It was only after Nūr al-Dīn's death in 569/1174 that Salah al-Din assumed full power. Henceforth he entrusted Tākī 'l-Dīn with important commands, and finally with key positions in his domains. In 571/1175-6 Tākī 'l-Dīn was governor of Damascus, and as such, accompanied by his son al-Malik al-Mansūr [q.v.], still a child at the time, he assisted Salah al-Din during his campaigns in Syria. Meanwhile, two of Tākī 'l-
Dīn's relatives, Karakāsh and Najm al-Dīn Ibrahim, were on campaigns of conquest in North Africa, which lasted until 582/1186. The actual exploitation of the resources does not permit to decide to what extent Tākī 'l-Dīn himself wanted to make conquests in Ifrikiya at the expenses of the Almohads but could not pursue them as he wished because of other com-
mitments. The chronicle of his son al-Malik al-
Mansūr is reticent on answering this question (Midmār, 34-8, 53-7, 68-72, 164-8, 292-4, 309-30. The report for the year 578/1182 is missing in the Mīdmar). In 573/1177 Tākī 'l-Dīn was present at the battle of Ramla [q.v.], ill-fated for the Muslims. He bravely resisted the Franks, but lost his youngest son Ahmad (Kamīl, xi, 442), which made him into an implacable hater of the Christians, if Abū Shāma's words are to be believed (Kamīl, xi, 442). The last expedition led by his son Shāhshāh, favoured by Salah al-Din, had been a prisoner of the Templars for seven years, until he was set free against a high ransom and the liberation of all the Templars taken prisoner. In 574/1178 Tākī 'l-Dīn received from Salah al-Din his first dominions in northern Syria, among which were the frontier town of Hamāt and its surrounding places, strategically important with respect to Aleppo, then still in Zangid hands, and to Antioch which was in the hands of the Franks. In 575/1179 Salah al-Din turned Tākī 'l-Dīn's tactical competence to his advantage when, following the other's advice, did not negotiate with the Franks about the surrender of the fortress of Bayt al-Ahzān; instead, with the money provided for the surrender (100,000 dinārs), he mustered troops (Mīdmar, 24-31). As so often before, Tākī 'l-Dīn, master of the art of the surprising siege, the fortress, showed unusual courage, bravery, urge to attack and loyalty to Salah al-Din. He almost died of an injury sustained at this occasion. Shortly before, he had won his greatest victory in the main strategic task entrusted to him, namely to defend the northern frontier of the Ayyubīd realm against the Franks of Antioch and the Rūm Seljūqs in Anatolia. With 1,000 men only, he had succeeded in defeating near Hīrān Rābān the Rūm Seljūqs' Aslān II [q.v.] who was at the head of 20,000 men (Ibn al-Ahthî, xi 458).

The Midmar (43, 60, 95, 105, 106, 110-12, 136, 143, 151, 153) mentions Tākī 'l-Dīn's military assistance to Salah al-Din in the following cir-
cumstances: Salah al-Din's campaign against Shāh Arman b. Leon, king of Lesser Armenia (576/1180-1); his return to Hamāt; the preparation in 577/1181-2 of the campaign against Karak [q.v.], occupied by the Templars, and his taking part in Salah al-Dīn's fruitless siege of the fortress in 578/1182; the march of the sultan's army to Damascus; the siege of Tiberias and Baysān [q.v.]; the campaigns against al-Ruhā (Edessa) and al-Raikā in al-Dquzara; the siege of al-
Mawṣil and the conquest of Naṣīb; the march against Sinda, on which his son accompanied him, and the return to Harrān via Hamāt after the con-
pulsion of the town; the siege of Amd in 579/1183; the surrender of Aleppo to Salah al-Din; the return to

Provençal, Rapht, 1934, 97-104; Makkari; Naḥf al-
After all these military exploits, Taki ‘1-Din was enthroned with the vice-royalty of Egypt in Si‘a‘hân 579/1089-November 1183 (Mid‘mar, 154-8; taklid [q. v.] and context; Bark, 233-5; Rawdatayn, ii, 51-3: investiture of the wâ‘iyâ [q. v.]). He also received several iṣâ‘â’s [q. v.] (his son al-Malik al-Mansîr, who accompanied him, reports on their revenues, see Mid‘mar, 154-5). He was also responsible for the education of Salâh al-Dîn’s son and designated successor al-Malik al-Afdal [q. v.], who was in Cairo. Yet problems arose between tutor and ward. One after the other was summoned to Damascus (Mufarridî, iii, 308-9 contains several of Salâh al-Dîn’s messages to Taki ‘1-Dîn regarding Egypt). Disappointed and full of bitterness, Taki ‘1-Dîn considered whether he should not join his mamalîks in North Africa instead of keeping unconditional loyalty to Salâh al-Dîn. He arrived in Damascus in 582/1186, where the sultan redistributed crown properties and the most important leading functions. Taki al-Dîn complied with Salâh al-Dîn’s plans and, as compensation for Egypt, he received in northern Syria and al-Djazîra as his possessions Mamlidî, Ma‘arrat al-Nu‘mân, the former Artukid town of Mayyâfârîn [q. v.] and Kafar Tabb (Mufarridî, i, 117-18; ii, 401-2).

The regions under Ayyûbid control were now connected and directly in the hands of one and the same dynasty. Eastward they stretched beyond the Euphrates. It was in Salâh al-Dîn’s interest to control and secure this area, so extremely important for recruiting and supplying troops. Al-Mawsîl still was in the hands of alatently hostile vassal, and there was the hidden danger of the Ildefiizids [q. v.], of the Kûn Salûqûd and of the jamal-i ‘adilî Mamlidî. This Mamlidî of al-Nâsr li-Dîn Allâh [q. v.], who, like Salâh al-Dîn himself, was engaged in an expansive policy in northern Mesopotamia.

At the battle of Hitjîn [q. v.] in 583/1187, Taki ‘1-Dîn commanded the right wing, and in the same year the victory of 4 Aakkâ [q. v.] and the conquest of Tibînî and siege of Tyre occurred (Rawdatayn, ii, 119; Path, 73-4; Ibn al-Athîr, i, xi, 541-2). In acknowledgement of this loyalty, Taki ‘1-Dîn was given the ports of Djbâlal and al-Lâdhiikyâ [q. v.] which had been reconquered from the Crusaders (Ibn Shaddîd, Sîra, 89, 94). Thus Salâh al-Dîn had put into Taki ‘1-Dîn’s hands all the resources and communications which he needed himself for his campaigns against the Crusaders in northern Syria. Taki ‘1-Dîn had become the most powerful member of the dynasty in that region and in al-Djazîra. His position of power was only equalled by that of Salâh al-Dîn’s brother al-Malik al-‘Adîl [q. v.], the viceregent of Egypt.

The advance of the German Emperor Frederick Barbarosba’s army induced Salâh al-Dîn to send Taki ‘1-Dîn to the north in order to watch the Crusaders. Before his departure, Mamlidî of Suwaydâ’ and Hânî (Path, 290), possibly while marching on Mayyâfârîn, but then to have the troops arrive in time and not to permit that any event whatsoever occur in the region of Diyar Bakr during his mission, which was not without danger (Path, 325-3). A final conclusion, perhaps with no data, may be reached after all:

This passage is lacking in the Haydarabâd edition, to lay siege to Khîlal (Path, 402-3, 405); different version in Kâmîl, xii, 62-3) and, as a result of this, to attack Malâ zigird, 40 km. north of Khîlal. The Artukid and Ayyûbid troops were thus tied up. The outcome was catastrophic. Taki ‘1-Dîn died during the siege of Malâ zigird on 19 Ramdân 587/11 October 1191 (Path, 401-2; Mufarridî, ii, 375-9; Nawâ‘ird, 197-8; Kâmîl, xii, 63).

It seems that the troops from the Mawsîl, Sinjîr and Djazîrayn Ibn ‘Umar were also tied into circumstances independently of Taki ‘1-Dîn’s situation. Djazîrayn Ibn ‘Umar was besieged by a local ruler; Gökbûrî, for reasons of his own, was not in a position either to send troops to ‘Âkkâ. These reasons were probably the collapse of Saldjûk power in Persia and the attempts at expansion in northern Mesopotamia by the caliph al-Nâsr li-Dîn Allâh. The disaster of Taki ‘1-Dîn’s expedition in al-Djazîra forced Salâh al-Dîn to enter into negotiations with the Crusaders. Taki ‘1-Dîn’s troops accepted his son al-Malik al-Mansîr Muham mad [q. v.] as his successor.

It is not easy to assess Taki ‘1-Dîn’s personality. He was certainly brave, courageous, daring and led to the loss of this town, not only to Salâh al-Dîn, but also to Taki ‘1-Dîn, who had been absent at the strategically decisive phase; he thus became the scapegoat.

The Muslim defence of the town was indeed unsuccessful because the troops so urgently requested from al-Djazîra failed to arrive. According to the historiographers, Salâh al-Dîn’s secretary ‘Imâd al-Dîn al-Djazîraynî and Abu Sûmâ [q. v.] in the first place—and also including Ibn al-Athîr who, though being anti-Ayyûbid, relies in this respect on al-Ishâfînî’s Fatîh—it was mainly Taki ‘1-Dîn’s fault that the troops requested did not appear; he thus caused Salâh al-Dîn’s defeat (Path, 322, 358, 402-3; Rawdatayn, ii, 186). But they overlooked—or did not want or else not dare to see—that Taki ‘1-Dîn’s reasons for staying away were altogether different from those of the vassals of al-Djazîra, namely the Zangids of al-Mawsîl, of Djazîrayn Ibn ‘Umar and of Sinjîr, as well as of Muzaffar al-Dîn Gökbûrî of Irbil, and that these reasons cannot be connected.

However, it still requires investigation whether Taki ‘1-Dîn, loyal until then, instead of recruiting troops in the Artukid states of Âmid (Diyâr Bakr) and Mardîn [q. v.], as Salâh al-Dîn had ordered him, attacked the vassals there in order to enlarge, against the sultan’s will, his own sphere of influence in the potentially hostile region of the Artukid vassals, who, in the preceding year had refused military service, and tried to find means for financing the troops destined for Salâh al-Dîn by distributing Artukid land property as iṣâ‘â. He first conquered the towns of Suwaydâ’ and Hânî (Path, 290), possibly while marching on Mayyâfârîn, but then to have the latter town against the ruler of Khîlal (Mir‘ât, fol. 245b. This passage is lacking in the Haydarabâd edition), to lay siege to Khîlal (Path, 402-3, 405); different version in Kâmîl, xii, 62-3) and, as a result of this, to attack Malâ zigird, 40 km. north of Khîlal. The Artukid and Ayyûbid troops were thus tied up. The outcome was catastrophic. Taki ‘1-Dîn died during the siege of Malâ zigird on 19 Ramdân 587/11 October 1191 (Path, 401-2; Mufarridî, ii, 375-9; Nawâ‘ird, 197-8; Kâmîl, xii, 63).

It seems that the troops from the Mawsîl, Sinjîr and Djazîrayn Ibn ‘Umar were also tied into circumstances independently of Taki ‘1-Dîn’s situation. Djazîrayn Ibn ‘Umar was besieged by a local ruler; Gökbûrî, for reasons of his own, was not in a position either to send troops to ‘Âkkâ. These reasons were probably the collapse of Saldjûk power in Persia and the attempts at expansion in northern Mesopotamia by the caliph al-Nâsr li-Dîn Allâh. The disaster of Taki ‘1-Dîn’s expedition in al-Djazîra forced Salâh al-Dîn to enter into negotiations with the Crusaders. Taki ‘1-Dîn’s troops accepted his son al-Malik al-Mansîr Muham mad [q. v.] as his successor.

It is not easy to assess Taki ‘1-Dîn’s personality. He was certainly brave, courageous, daring and led to the loss of this town, not only to Salâh al-Dîn, but also to Taki ‘1-Dîn, who had been absent at the strategically decisive phase; he thus became the scapegoat.
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impulsive, and as harsh against non-Muslims as pious
in practising the shari^a. In Alexandria he studied
hadith with famous traditionists (Takmila, i, no. 150).
His important foundations (wakj) in Cairo, in
Fayyum and in al-Ruha (Wafaydt, iii, 456, no. 501)
were famous. He had the lower and upper town of
Hamat, his residence, walled and the citadel on a hill
near the curve of the Orontes fortified. He wrote
poetry (quoted in Mir^dt, fols. 245b-246b), and his
diwdn was appreciated by Ibn al-Dawadan and Abu
'l-FidaD (Kanz al-durar, vii, 91; Ta^rikh, iii, 84).
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1869; Abu Shama, Kitdb al-Rawdatayn, i-ii, Cairo
1287/1870-1; Ibn al-Athir, al-Kdmil, xii, Beirut
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1972; Ibn Khallikan, Wafaydt, Beirut 1968, iii; Ibn
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From Saladin to the Mongols, Albany 1977; M.C.
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(ANGELIKA HARTMANN)
AL-MUZAFFAR B. CALI, commander (hdajib)
high in the service of the local ruler of the Bata5ih
[q. v.] or marsh lands of lower clrak, clmran b. Shahin
[<?.#.], and then petty ruler there during the second
half of the 4th/10th century. After c lmran's death in
369/979, al-Muzaffar set aside his sons and set up a
grandson, a minor called Abu 'l-Macali (373/983-4).
He himself in practice exercised all power, although
he set up further puppet rulers of the line of clmran
until his own death in 376/986-7, after which alMuzaffar was succeeded in the BataPih by a nephew
under the title of Muhadhdhib al-Dawla as tributary
to the Buyid ruler of Fars and clrak Sharaf al-Dawla
b. cAdud al-Dawla.
Bibliography. Ibn al-Athir, ed. Beirut, ix, 30-1,
50.
(ED.)
MUZAFFAR AL-DIN SHAH KADJAR, Shah of
Persia, the fifth ruler of the dynasty, was born at
Tehran on 25 March 1853, and was the fourth son of
Nasir al-DTn Shah [q.v.]. His mother was Shukuh alSaltana, a daughter of Fath CA1T MTrza and a granddaughter of Fath CA1I Shah. Two older sons of Nasir
al-DTn were appointed wall ^ahd before Muzaffar alDTn, MucTn al-DTn being the first in 1849. On his

death on 6 November 1856, Muhammad Kasim
received the title, but he too died as a child on 29 June
1858. It was then that Muzaffar al-DTn became wait
c
ahd. (The designation of Muhammad Kasim was
rather unusual, for his mother was not a Kadjar
princess.) At the age of twelve Muzaffar al-DTn was
appointed Governor of Adharbaydjan. It was
believed, for a time, that his elder half-brother
Mascud MTrza (Zill al-Sultan) or a younger one,
Kamran MTrza (Na5ib al-Saltana) might be tempted
to contest Muzaffar al-DTn's succession, but no
challenge was forthcoming when Nasir al-DTn was
assassinated on 1 May 1896. Muzaffar al-DTn was
crowned in Tehran on 8 June 1896, and he died there
after suffering much illness on 6 January 1907. He
was married several times. The wife who gave birth to
his heir Muhammad CA1T Shah [q.v.] on 21 June 1872
was Umm al-Khakan. She was the daughter of
Muhammad TakT Khan (AmTr KabTr) and clzzat alDawla, a sister of Nasir al-DTn Shah; but Muzaffar alDTn had divorced her before he became Shah. On his
death he left at least five more sons and twelve
daughters.
Muzaffar al-DTn's reign was not a happy or auspicious one. When he came to the throne Persia was in
a very difficult situation. The country was the focus of
intense and growing rivalry between Britain and
Russia, central government control over the outlying
provinces was weak, and less and less tax revenue was
reaching the Treasury. Corruption and venality were
widespread in both central and provincial government. The army had fallen into serious decay, and the
only effective and reliable body of men was the Cossack Brigade which had been established by Nasir alDTn in 1878. Soldiers from that force escorted Muzaffar al-DTn from TabrTz to Tehran on his father's
assassination, and their role in maintaining a minimal
degree of law and order in the capital was crucial, but
during Muzaffar al-DTn's reign the number of men in
the Cossack Brigade never exceeded 1,800. Little sustained and effective administrative, economic or
educational reform had been achieved, and a small,
but steadily growing, number of Persians were beginning to realize the extent of their country's backwardness and to call for change.
Muzaffar al-DTn's character and personality were
ill-suited to the tasks of governing so troubled, and
potentially turbulent, a country. He was by nature
shy, timid and vacillating. He was also sentimental
and inclined to be rather superstitious. Several people
who knew Muzaffar al-DTn well remarked upon "his
nervous disposition", and this was in no way reduced
by the manner of his father's death. Muzaffar al-DTn
suffered poor health from an early age, and his sense
of hypochondria was well-founded. His most serious
illnes was a recurrent kidney infection, but he also suffered from several other conditions, including a weak
heart. Despite this, he shared the love of many of his
ancestors for riding and hunting and was a good shot.
His education was largely traditional, and he had a
great fondness for classical Persian poetry and a great
love for Persian gardens. As a youth at TabrTz he had
had some European tutors, and while he learned
French he was never very confident using that language.
When Muzaffar al-DTn ascended the throne he
rapidly became aware of the depleted state of the
Treasury, and in 1897 he accepted one of the Sadr-i
A c zam's (AmTn al-Dawla) schemes for administrative
reform, namely, the employment of Belgian officials
to re-organise and run the country's Customs service.
The first of those experts arrived in March 1898 (see
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A. Destree, Les fonctionnaires beiges au service de la Perse (1898-1915, Tehran-Liège 1976). The reforms introduced were certainly effective, but they were also unpopular. The central government soon began to receive greater income, but the merchants gained little benefit from the higher dues which they now had to pay, while members of the religious classes objected to Christians levying taxes on Muslims. For many Persians, the growing number of Belgians in the country, and the wider range of tasks which they began to undertake, were further evidence of their country's unwelcome subservience to foreign powers. Even the efforts of the Belgians could not meet the government's need for more money and two substantial loans were raised from Russia in January 1900 and April 1902. These further strengthened the view of many Persians that the Shah was prepared to sell their country to foreign powers.

Some of the money raised by the Customs reform, and the two loans, was used to make good serious arrears in pay which were owed to some members of the army, but much of the money was also used for the payment of inflated pensions to corrupt officials. One of the other sources of wasteful expenditure was the responsibility of the Shah, for Muzaffar al-Din had, like his father, developed a fondness for visiting Europe; he made three journeys there in 1900, 1902 and 1905. While there were medical reasons for these visits, they were, nevertheless, extravagant and expensive; they also gave the Shah opportunity to indulge both his curiosity in mechanical inventions, and his sometimes lavish generosity. The first journey, but not apparently the others, resulted in a travel diary similar to the two produced by his father, Safi-ol-Molk: the Shah made a second visit to the European continent in 1901, several later editions, Tehran and elsewhere; see G.M. Wickens, Shah Muzaffar al-Din's European tour, A.D. 1900, in E. Bosworth and Carole Hillenbrand (eds.), Qajar Iran: political, social and cultural change, 1800-1925, Edinburgh 1983, 34-47).

Muzaffar al-Din's first journey was supposed to include time in England, but the sudden death of one of Queen Victoria's children meant that part of the journey had to be abandoned. When the Shah did reach England in August 1902, the visit was marred by King Edward's refusal to bestow the Order of the Garter on the Persian monarch (see Sir Denis Wright, The Persians amongst the English, episodes in Anglo-Persian history, London 1985, ch. 14). In February of the following year, a special British envoy, Lord Downe, conferred that honour on the Shah in Tehran. The timetable of the 1902 European visit was drawn up to meet Muzaffar al-Din's express wish not to be in France on the 14th of July.

Between his second and third visits to Europe, Persia experienced a severe epidemic of cholera (see R.M. Burrell, The 1904 epidemic of cholera in Persia: some aspects of Qajar society, in BSOAS, II/2 [1988], 286-70). When the disease reached Tehran in late June 1904, Muzaffar al-Din quickly left the city for a camp in the hills near Tâlîkârân. After cases of cholera were confirmed in the vicinity of that camp, Muzaffar al-Din immediately sought to flee the country; and it was only under intense pressure from the Sâdîr-i A'zâm and his two British doctors that the Shah was persuaded that such a course of action was likely to be as politically dangerous to his tenure of the throne as it was medically unnecessary, and the scheme was abandoned. The outbreak of cholera also meant that many Belgian officials, as well as British ones along the Persian Gulf coast, were active in trying to enforce measures which would limit the spread of the epidemic, and this too increased their unpopularity with many Persians.

As well as raising foreign loans and increasing the revenues from the Customs administration, Muzaffar al-Din's government also had resort to another economic device used by his father, the sale of commercial concessions to foreign entrepreneurs. Some of these brought little benefit to Persia, but it should be remembered that it was Muzaffar al-Din who, on 28 May 1901, signed a petroleum exploration concession with William Knox d'ArCY which later led to the emergence of the country's oil industry.

There is clear evidence that the standard of provincial government in Persia declined during the reign of Muzaffar al-Din. In Adharbâyjân, the wali 'âdîd governed in a very rapacious and greedy manner, as did his half-brother, Shû'â' al-Saltâna, who held the governorship of Fârs on several occasions (that province had ten changes of government between 1896 and 1907). By 1905 it was difficult for the government to find officials who were willing to take up administrative posts in turbulent provinces such as Luristân and 'Arabistân. Further evidence of growing unrest and lawlessness is provided by a series of anti-Bâbî attacks in several provinces.

It was against this background that the events of the Constitutional Revolution of 1905 and 1906 unfolded (for their sequence, see DUSTûR. iv. Irân). The initial demands for administrative, economic and military reforms could have been met by an active and vigorous Shah and they need not have involved any serious challenge to the monarchy's claim to absolute power. But as has been noted, to expect such a response from an ailing and fearful Muzaffar al-Din was (see S. A. Beal, passim, in E. Bosworth and Carole Hillenbrand (eds.), Qajar Iran: political, social and cultural change, 1800-1925, Edinburgh 1983, 34-47).

Persians were beginning to demand that Persia should have an elected Parliament and a written Constitution. The speed of political events in Tehran in the later months of 1906 was remarkable. The rush to create a Parliament and to enact the Kânit-i Asâsî (the Fundamental Law) was influenced by fears on the part of the "Constitutionalists" about the deteriorating health of the Shah and the likelihood that his successor Muhammad 'All would quickly seek to reassert the authority of the monarchy. Both anxieties were to prove well-founded. Muzaffar al-Din died barely a week after he had signed the Fundamental Law on 30 December 1906, and the new Shah quickly showed himself to be a man more akin in character and temperament to his grandfather than his father.

Bibliography: In addition to references in the text, see the Bibli. to dustûr. iv. Irân; hûkûma. ii. Persia; and kadîr. (R.M. Burrell) Muzaffar Shah [see gužarât]. Muzaffar Shams Bâlkhî, mediaeval Indian Sufî master.

Born of a family from Bâlkh in Afghanistan, the date of his birth is unknown, but may have been in the decade of the 720s/1320s. After an education in Bâlkh, he joined his father in Bihrâr Şarîf. His intellectual disposition led him to become a disciple of Şarâf al-Dîn Ahmad Manârî (d. 782/1381) [see MA'RûDîM AL-MULK] instead of Ahmad Čarpêmish, his father's poetically-inclined but less well-educated guide. Muzaffar was sent back to Bâlkh again for further studies, and then the Tughluqîd Sultan Fîrûz Şâh appointed him lecturer in the royal madrasa. After a conversion experience, he returned to Bihrâr, where Şarâf al-Dîn Manârî continued his spiritual formation. He reached the stage when he felt liberated from all worldly attachments, except from his wife, but exclaimed to his guide that he would divorce her.
Approving of the sentiment, but not of the idea, Sharaf al-Dīn announced that...

...enjoy his inheritance for only a brief space. First, Shah Yahya made himself master of Isfahan at the in-

Djalayirids [q.v.]. Firdawsī's ally, the ruler of Lur-i Buzurg [q.v.] in 776/1375 on the death of the Djalayirid ruler Shaykh Uways, before the onset of this practice was taken to expand his dominions by profiting from the

Following a protracted siege, and Mubariz al-Dīn was

Mubariz al-Dīn's deposition, this practice was retained. His cousin the great

the famous city in Khurasan) to Marwast and

...Bam was occupied a few years later by the Kartid [q.v.] malik of Herat, but was

...he repulsed an attempt on Yazd by the Indjuids of Kirman and Yazd. He had, however, been faced with repeated bids by the Indjuid Shaykh Uways, before the onset of

In 776/1375 Shah Mahmud was host to Shah-i Shudja

...returned from an unsuccessful campaign against Shah-i Shudja

...he repulsed an attempt on Yazd by the Indjuid Shaykh Uways, before the onset of

...he repulsed an attempt on Yazd by the Indjuid Shaykh Uways, before the onset of

...he repulsed an attempt on Yazd by the Indjuid Shaykh Uways, before the onset of
vitiation of its populace and even tried to take Shiraz also. He was shortly expelled from Isfahan, however, and Zayn al-Abidin put his own governor in the city. A far more formidable threat was posed by the Caghatays of Transoxiana under Timur-i Lang [q. v.], to whom the dying Shāh-i Shudžā had written a conciliatory letter and whose sovereignty was in 787/1385-6 recognised by Sultan Ahmad in Kirmān. On Timur’s first invasion of southern Iran in 789/1387, Zayn al-Abidin fled towards Īrāk, only to be captured by Shāh Mansūr and incarcerated at Shushār. Timur replaced him in Shirāz with Shāh Yahyā, while Sultan Ahmad and Sultan Abū Ishāk ruled in Kirmān and Sirdjān respectively as the conqueror’s subordinates. These arrangements were overturned by Shāh Mansūr; he took advantage of Timur’s withdrawal to advance from Shushār and wrest Shirāz from Shāh Yahyā, who fled once more to Yazd. Shāh Mansūr’s aggressive activities soon provoked a coalition against him, consisting of Sultan Ahmad, Shāh Yahyā and Zayn al-Abidin, who had meanwhile escaped from prison and ensconced himself in Isfahan. But the allies were unable to act in concert, and their defeat in Safar 793/January-February 1391 permitted Shāh Mansūr to occupy Isfahan and blind Zayn al-Abidin. Shāh Mansūr’s efforts to construct an alliance against Timur were unavailing. He spent his last months devastating his territory, and at length fell fighting against Timur’s forces in 795/1392-3. The other members of the dynasty had been well received by the conqueror, but in Radjab 795/May 1393 an order was issued for their execution; Zayn al-Abidin and Sultan Shibli were spared in view of their blindness and taken to Samarkand. Of the Muzaffarid territories, Fars and its relatives’ territory, and at length fell fighting against Timur’s forces in 795/1392-3. The other members of the dynasty had been well received by the conqueror, but in Radjab 795/May 1393 an order was issued for their execution; Zayn al-Abidin and Sultan Shibli were spared in view of their blindness and taken to Samarkand. Of the Muzaffarid territories, Fars and Isfahan became the principality of Timur’s son ʿUmar Shāykh, and Kirmān was conferred on the amīr Edīgū Barlās. Later, in the confusion following Timur’s death, a son of Zayn al-Abidin named Sultan Muṭaṣīm attempted to seize Isfahan, but was killed in 810/1407-8 or 812/1409-10 (Faṣḥī-ʿī Khāfir, Miṣrkall-ī Faṣḥī, ed. M. Farrūkh, Tehran, 1339 š.j./1960, iii, 184, 197).

The Muzaffarids took pains to display an unimpeachable orthodoxy. Mubariz al-Dīn acquired a reputation for dour enforcement of public morals, and during his conflict with the Indjūids sought a legitimate basis for his power. In 755/1354 he did homage (kowtūt) to the representative of the puppet Abbāsīd caliph at Cairo, al-Muʿazzid, whose name he inserted in the ḥabba and on the coinage, and received a diploma of investiture; it is possible that he had previously negotiated with a scion of the Abbāsīd dynasty in India, though our sole source for this episode, Faryūnādi’s continuation of Shābabkārāt’s Madīmaʾ al-ansāb (ed. Mir Ḥāshim Mubaddihī, Tehran 1363-4/1984, 316), may be confused. Shāh-i Shudžā in turn obtained a diploma from Cairo in 770/1369-70.

Cultural life flourished under the Muzaffarids. Khāfir Kirmānī [q. v.] dedicated to Mubariz al-Dīn his Gauhar-nāma. Shāh-i Shudžā was himself a man of talent who composed verse, and was the patron of poets, notably Ḥāfīz [q. v.], and scholars such as al-Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Djurdjani [q. v.]. Yet if the Muzaffarid era appears as a golden age for men of letters, it is difficult to reject the comment by Timur’s biographer Shāmī (i, 135), admittedly a hostile witness, on the damage done to the agrarian economy of southern Iran by the princes’ incessant feats.

The text is too long to be typed out in full. However, it appears to be a historical and legal document discussing Islamic law and contracts, specifically dealing with agricultural leases and sharecropping. It references works by various scholars and jurists, including al-Mu'izz al-Din Muhammad ibn al-Muzaffar at Yazd and Kirman, and covers topics such as the legal rights of the landlord and tenant, the allocation of profits, and the responsibilities of each party during and after the contract term.

The text also mentions the town of Muzaffarpur in northern Bihar, which was a great centre for indigo growing during the 19th century and under the Mughals, and eventually passed to the Sharqwal rulers of Muradhur, on the border of Nepal.

In summary, the document is a detailed historical and legal analysis of agricultural contracts in Islamic law, providing insights into the rights and responsibilities of landlords and tenants.

Bibliography:
- (P. Jackson) **MUZAFFARPUR**, a town in northern Bihar State of the Indian Union (lat. 26° 7' N., 85° 24' E.), and also the name of a District of which it is the administrative centre; the District covers the ancient region of Tirhut between the Ganges and the southern border of Nepal. The region was attacked in the 8th/14th century by the Muslim rulers of Bengal; in the next century it passed to the Şârqi rulers of Jâwânpur [q.v.], and then to Sikandar Lodi of Dihîl. The town of Muzaffarpur enshrines the name of its founder, the Emperor Akbar’s commander Muzaffar Khan, ditdon or head of revenue and finance [see Tiwan. v] and then governor of Bengal and Bihâr in the later 10th/16th century, and under the Mughals Tirhut was a sarkar of the jâba of Bihâr. Under British rule, there was some unrest around Muzaffarpur during the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857-8; during this same century it became a great centre for indigo growing.

The town was, until the creation in 1912 of the province of Bihâr and Orissa, within Bengal. In 1951 the population of the District was 10% Muslim. The town had in 1951 a population of 127,045, and is now the seat of the University of Bihâr.


**MUZANI, ABU IBRAHIM ISMAIL B. YAHYA (in *Fihrist*, *Ibn Khallikan*, etc.). His pupils spread al-Muzani’s *Mukhtasar* (Fihrist, i, the *Fihrist*, iv, 47, on the *gurât*. Al-Subkl (i, 245) also had seen: 7. *Kitâb al-Sâkhr* (also *H. Khalifa*, no. 10,315) in which al-Muzani propounded 40 questions and which was handed down by al-Numâtî (d. 288-901); al-Subkl gives a few quotations; 8. *Kitâb Niâyâyat al-khâtîsâr* (*’lot’, a very brief work giving for the most part al-Muzani’s own views; quotations are given by al-Subkl).


(W. Heffening*)
produce from one particular area of the leased land.

Unilateral cancellation (faskh) of this agreement is permitted to the provider of the seeds only to the time they are actually sown; otherwise cancellation may occur (as in any other idžara) (1) through the death of one of the contracting parties (unless the immature crop is still in the ground, in which case the contract persists until it is mature: the heirs of one party cannot enforce the other to clear the land until the crop has ripened); or (2) through legitimate excuse (ṣudhār), e.g., if a judge orders the sale of the land to pay a debt.

Bibliography: Ahmad Abu 'l-Fath, K. Al-Muṣāmātī fī l-ṣa‘īrāt al-islāmiyya wa l-kawsān al-miṣriyya, Cairo 1340/1922, ii, 453-61; 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Djazīrī, K. Al-Fīkh 'alā l-madhhab al-aḥrās, iii, 1-20; Shams al-Dīn Ahmad B. Kūdār, Naṭa'īd al-afkār fī kashf al-rumūz wa l-awārī, Cairo 1356, viii, 32-45; Muṣā'im fīk Ibn Hazm al-Zāhirī, Damascus 1385/1966, ii, 930-4; Qamāl al-Dīn al-Zaylī, Nasb al-niyya li-ahdāh al-hidāyā, iv, 179-81; E. Pritsch and O. Spies, Klassisches islamisches Recht, in Orientalisches Recht = Handbuch der Orientalistik, 1. Abt., Ergänzungsband III, Leiden and Cologne 1964, 229; Ibn Farīs, Muzdwaaja (M.), paronomasia, a play on words consisting in the "coupling" (root z-y-d) of two terms which are similar in external form or in meaning and linked by the conjunction wa-. For example: (hayna-ham) hārd t.wa-mardī "between them there are disagreements", where the two elements have an independent existence; the same applies, in particular, to the formulas used to express totality: al-kabīr wa 'l-saghir, al-kathīr wa 'l-kālil, al-sahl wa 'l-ṣālīh, etc., or additionally, expressions such as al-ghānīna wa l-iyāh "booty and return (safe and sound)"

Every writer concerned with stylistic expression may take advantage of this procedure and enrich as he pleases the arsenal of cliches at his disposal; as a whole, these go back to the period when Arabic was an exclusively oral and hence expressive language. But even in dialect, where a more vivid use of muzdwaaja might be expected, the puns thus formed seem rather formalised. L. Brunot (see Bibli.) has listed about a hundred examples among which there are some which derive from the classical language, such as (dār l-ṭa'ī b-al-ṭa'ī w-l bībhīn "he held an extravagant marriage ceremony", corresponding to the expression al-ṣālih wa-ḥaṣihrī "his apparent and hidden faults", in which each of the elements has preserved a valid meaning and may be employed separately, unlike the terms of the dialectal expression, which have lost their original sense. In addition, the "tandem" formed by muzdwaaja, while being fundamentally an intensive form, sometimes possesses a form totally different from the sum of its components. Thus lā sāh wa-lā bādh "neither Saturday nor Sunday" = "without a pause"; k-bb-hml wa-sa-mām "with the loads and the camels" = "in great quantities". This is also the case, for example, with māfarīn-mānīs (main bābāh) "he is the spitting image of (his father)" (lit. sneezed on).

But here, we are confronted with a particular form of muzdwaaja known as ḫuṣa. This figure of speech is essentially constituted by the repetition of a qualifying term to which there is added a mental, i.e., the deliberate alteration of a radical consonant, usually the first, but never the third. The phenomenon is very well described by al-'Askāri (Ṣinā'ātayn, 194) with regard to repetition: "When the Arabs introduce a qualitative (ṣifa) and wish to reinforce it (tauskūd), they are unwilling to repeat it purely and simply; therefore they change one letter (kasr) and place the word thus formed after the first. For example, they say 'uṯīnān nāṭafān ("very thirsty"); not wishing to repeat 'uṯīnān, they replace the ṣīn with a rām. Similarly, basān basān ("wonderfully attractive"), shayyān tayyān ("a veritable demon"), etc. The first element of the new lexical unity is called muḥāṣ or muḥāba, and the second tāḥi; sometimes the group is strengthened by a third, as in basān-basān-basān; only the first has a genuine existence, but basān has curiously, given birth to a denominator verb, abahāa "to be fair of face".

In principle, a true ḫuṣa must obey three conditions: (1) It should be performed by simple juxtaposition, without a conjunctive particle; (2) It is characterised by a second element formed by a modification of R; and (3), it is denied independent existence in the Arabic lexicon.

The first condition poses no difficulty, since the presence of a particle transfers the couplet into the category of muzāwāda examined above. The phoneme replacing R is a labial (b or m), a nasal (n) or a liquid (l) in 80% of cases. It happens sometimes that the metaphor (R > R') points to a second radical which already exists, as in fidāḥ-muddāḥi "one who abuses with his slanders", so long as this "root" does not itself derive from a tāḥi detached from its muḥāṣ. In this respect, an interesting example is presented by ḥāḏ-ʔ-nārīghi "very hungry", which the Li discusses at length, concluding, erroneously, that the word nārīghi is independent. In fact, this is a true case of ḫuṣa, but nārīghi has been taken for the second term of a couplet quite naturally expressing thirst after hunger; once detached, this tāḥi, considered as meaning "to be thirsty", gives rise to a substantive, which in figures in a muzāwāda: al-ʔuṣ-ा l-nārīghi "hunger and thirst", and even to a verb nārīghānaa "to be thirsty".

Finally, two qualifications which have at least R in common possess similar or complementary senses give the impression of constituting a ḫuṣa since, being not contradictory and mutually exclusive, they are simply juxtaposed: muḍarrāb-muḍarrāb "very experienced" given jāmīl-mīnīd "of the utmost thoroughness", ḥāḏ-ʔ-dānīghi "of public notoriety". These are not true cases of ḫuṣa.

Bibliography: Ibn Fāris, Al-Sāhibī fī ḥīf al-lughā, Beirut 1383/1964, 270; idem, K. al-muzdwaaja, ed. R. Brunn, in Orientalische Studien Th. Nöldeke... gewidmet, Giessen 1906, i, 225-48; Askari, K. Sinā'ātayn, Cairo 1952, 194; Abu 'l-Tayyib al-Halabi, K. al-ʔība, ed. Izz al-Dīn al-Tanūkhī, Damascus 1380/1961; Suyūtī, al-Maṣārī, Cairo n.d., i, 244-51 (which cites Ibn Fāris, ḥīfā, Abū ʿUbayd, al-Gharib al-musannaf, al-Kāālī, Thālab, Ibn Durayd, al-Dhānrā, etc., and gives a certain number of examples); M. Grunert, Die Alliteration im Alt-Arabischen, Vienna 1888; A. Fischer, Träume per metonym im Ṣinā'ātayn, in Streifemb-Festgabe, Leipzig 1924, 46-58; L. Brunot, La muzdwaaja dans les dialectes citadins du Maroc, in Milange L. Masiqmon, Damascus 1956, i, 251-82; Ch. Pellat, Un fait d'expressivité en arabe, l'iba, in Arabica, iv/2 (1957), 131-49. (Ch. Pellat) Muzdwaaja is also a technical term in rhetoric, again denoting "coupling", but of two themes conveying comparable effects by means of two parallel expressions, as in these verses of al-Buhturī (Diwan, Cairo 1329, 317):

idha ḥtaraq bawməa fa-fādat dima'auhā tadhakkarati l-kurbā fa-fādat dumu'auhā.

"When (the knights) fight one day and their blood flows freely, ...
they remember their kinsmen and their tears flow freely’.


Muzayna, an Arab tribe. They were reckoned by the genealogists among the sons of ‘Amr b. Udd b. Tabîkhlâ, of ‘Adnân; the nishâ is Muzâni. At the time of the Prophet Muhammad, when Muzayna first became visible to the historian, it seems to have resided south of Medina and consisted predominantly of poor nomads; some members of the tribe may have resided in small villages in the area. It seems fair to assume that they were dependent on Medina for market goods and, perhaps, occasional employment as herdsmen or labourers. An anecdote about the Prophet reflects Muzayna’s close ties with Medina, and with the Prophet. According to it, the latter assigned residences (manâzîl) and places of prayer (masjîdîn) to every clan of the nomads (al-‘arab) except for Muzayna; when they came to ask him why, he said, ‘My place of prayer is your place of prayer; you are my nomads (badu) and I am your settlement (badâr)’. This suggests that the Muzayna were seen as virtual nomadic extensions of the population of Medina itself. The tribe had some famous poets, notably Zuhayr b. ‘Abd al-Muttalib and Mu’âb b. ‘Abd al-Muttalib. The tribe also produced two anonymous poets during the Hudaybiya and Hunayn. At the conquest of Mecca (A.H. 8), Muzayna is said to have contributed 1,300 warriors (or, according to Ibn Hîghâm, 1,003) out of a total of 10,000 troops, in any case one of the largest single tribal contingents; only the Ansâr, with 4,000, and Dhuhaylân, with 1,400 (but al-Wâkidî says only 800), participated more. At Hunayn, where the Muzayna were allocated a quarter along one of the pilgrim roads from Medina to Mecca, they fought to the death in remembrance for their failure to support al-Husayn b. ‘Abî. At the decisive battle of the Camel (A.H. 36), and in A.H. 65 thirty Muzânîs from Kufa were among the ‘Penitents’ (ta’awwûbân) who fought to the death in remembrance for their failure to support al-Husayn b. ‘Abî. At the decisive battle of the Camel (A.H. 36), and in A.H. 65 thirty Muzânîs from Kufa were among the ‘Penitents’ (ta’awwûbân) who fought to the death in remembrance for their failure to support al-Husayn b. ‘Abî. At the decisive battle of the Camel (A.H. 36), and in A.H. 65 thirty Muzânîs from Kufa were among the ‘Penitents’ (ta’awwûbân) who fought to the death in remembrance for their failure to support al-Husayn b. ‘Abî. Incidental mentions of the Muzayna quarter during the rebellion of al-Mukhtar (A.H. 66) and of Shâbih (A.H. 76) suggest that they lived on the edge of Kufa or a little apart from other settlements of the town. Thereafter, we read nothing more of the Muzayna of Kufa; presumably they were assimilated to other groups in the vicinity.

Muzayna appears to have taken no significant part in the conquest of Syria, but some may have been recruited under ‘Uthmân to help garrison Egypt. Later, or may have come directly from the Hijâz, the Shâbihî scholars Abû Irâhîm Ismâ’îl b. Yahyâ al-Muzâni [d. 264/878]) were active in Egypt; but the Muzânîs of Egypt were always a small group, far outnumbered by the South Arabian immigrants (Khwâlân, Ṭudjîb, Ḥadrâmawt, Ma’âfîr, etc.). A settlement of Muzayna tribesmen in Spain, at Baena, ca. 60 km southeast of Cordova, may have come from Egypt, or may have come directly from the Hijâz.

The majority of Muzayna appears to have remained for centuries near its home territories in the Hijâz following the rise of Islam. Reports of the severe drought of A.H. 18, by which they were hard hit, reveals that Muzayna was still living near Medina and that the tribe still seems to have consisted mainly of nomadic Muzânîs, although some members of the tribe lived on the edge of Kufa or a little apart from other settlements of the town. Some Muzayna tribesmen came from the vicinity of Medina at the beginning of the first civil war. In A.H. 145, the Medinans and some local nomadic tribes, including Muzayna, backed the rebellion in the Hijâz of the ‘Afîd Muhammad b. ‘Abî Allâh [g.e.] ‘the Pure Soul’ (al-naṣîf al-sukîyâ), and a number of Muzânîs were taken hostage by the government. The 4th/10th century geographers mention some places south of Medina, and several farther to the east and north-east along the pilgrim road from ‘Irâk, as being in Muzayna territory or as being settlements (manâzîl) of Muzayna, and Muzayna also appears to have made up part of the population of Medina at this time. Increasingly, however, former Muzayna settlements south of Medina were taken over by the Tâbîbîs or by the South Arabian tribe of Harb, which entered the area beginning in the late 3rd/9th century. Ibn Sa’dât al-Andalusî (d. 685/1286-7) states that in his day, the region just south of Medina was no longer Muzayna territory. Like many other tribes between Mecca and Medina, Muzayna joined the Harb tribal coalition; unlike many others, however, Muzayna preserved its old name and its identity as a separate group or clan within Harb. In the later 10th/16th or first half of the 11th/17th century, a significant part of Muzayna-Harb migrated northwards from the Hijâz into Sinai, where they joined the ‘Ukâylat and Sawâlîha tribes to form the Tawara confederation. Muzayna’s territories lay in the southern part of Sinai, where they
MUZAYNA — MUZDAWIDJ

lived from the produce of the few oases (Nabk, Dhahab) and from sparse flocks, as well as from transport services. The remnant of the Harb-Muzayna left to the area near Medina during the early 19th century, making their way to Wadi al-Rima and Kasim between Muhammad and the Wahhabis in the later 20th century. For details, see Smadar Lavie, The poetics of military occupation: Mzine allegories of Bedouin identity under Israeli and Egyptian rule, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1998, with references to other accounts of the Muzayna in the later 20th century.

(F. M. Donner)

AL-MUZDALIFA, a place roughly halfway between Mina and Arafat where the pilgrims returning from Arafat spend the night between 9 and 10 Dhu 'l-Hijjah, after performing the two evening salât. On the next morning they set off before sunrise and climb up through the valley of Muhassir to Mina. See Ramsay, The return from Muzdalifa now takes place on the night of Muzdalifa now takes place on the night of Muzdalifa, 10 Dhu 'l-Hijjah, after performing the two evening salâts, according to another statement, comprises the whole stretch between Arafat and Mina, both included, so that al-Mudawidj (A.), a technical term of among philologists, consists in the form of one is changed to make it resemble that of the other. For example, in this hadith (Ibn Abi Thalib, Sunan, Cairo 1313, i, 246), the word maṣūra' is explained as the day of Arafat and Mina, both included, so that the object of the Muzdalif, according to another statement, comprises the whole stretch between Arafat and Mina, both included, so that the object of the Muzdalif, according to another statement, comprises the whole stretch between Arafat and Mina, both included, so that

(Bibliography: Ibn Hîjâm, ed. Wüstenfeld, 77; Ibn Sa'd, i/1, 41; ii/1, 125, 129; Tabari, i, 1105, 1755; Āzârki, ed. Wüstenfeld, 36, 130, 411 ff., 415 ff., BCA, i, 11; ii, 24; iii, 76-7; Bakrî, ed. Wüstenfeld, 243-4; Wellhausen, 1959; Burton, Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to el-Medina and Mecca, London 1853, iii; Snouck Hurgronje, Het Meekâansche Feest, 134-8; Wellhausen, Reste arabischen Heidentums, 81-2, 120; Juyonboll, Handbuch des islamischen Conjurerwesens, 57. (F. BUHL))

MUZDAWIDJ (A.), a technical term of philology, rhetoric and prosody. It means among philologists the use of two terms in which the form of one is changed to make it resemble that of the other. For example, in this hadith (Ibn Abi Thalib, Sunan, Cairo 1313, i, 246), the word maṣūra' is explained as the day of Arafat and Mina, both included, so that

(Bibliography: Djurdjani, Tafrijat, Constantinople 1307, 142; Tahâniwâ, Kashshaf istildhdt al-funun, Constantinople 1317, i, 199, 672; Garcin de Tassy, Rhetorique et prosodie des langues de l'Orient Musul., Paris 1873, 375; G. E. von Oppenheim, Al-Mu'dâwîdjd (A.), a technical term of philology, rhetoric and prosody. It means among philologists the use of two terms in which the form of one is changed to make it resemble that of the other. For example, in this hadith (Ibn Abi Thalib, Sunan, Cairo 1313, i, 246), the word maṣūra' is explained as the day of Arafat and Mina, both included, so that

(Bibliography: Ibn Hîjâm, ed. Wüstenfeld, 77; Ibn Sa'd, i/1, 41; ii/1, 125, 129; Tabari, i, 1105, 1755; Āzârki, ed. Wüstenfeld, 36, 130, 411 ff., 415 ff., BCA, i, 11; ii, 24; iii, 76-7; Bakrî, ed. Wüstenfeld, 243-4; Wellhausen, 1959; Burton, Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to el-Medina and Mecca, London 1853, iii; Snouck Hurgronje, Het Meekâansche Feest, 134-8; Wellhausen, Reste arabischen Heidentums, 81-2, 120; Juyonboll, Handbuch des islamischen Conjurerwesens, 57. (F. BUHL))

MUZDAWIDJ (A.), a technical term of philology, rhetoric and prosody. It means among philologists the use of two terms in which the form of one is changed to make it resemble that of the other. For example, in this hadith (Ibn Abi Thalib, Sunan, Cairo 1313, i, 246), the word maṣūra' is explained as the day of Arafat and Mina, both included, so that

(Bibliography: Ibn Hîjâm, ed. Wüstenfeld, 77; Ibn Sa'd, i/1, 41; ii/1, 125, 129; Tabari, i, 1105, 1755; Āzârki, ed. Wüstenfeld, 36, 130, 411 ff., 415 ff., BCA, i, 11; ii, 24; iii, 76-7; Bakrî, ed. Wüstenfeld, 243-4; Wellhausen, 1959; Burton, Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to el-Medina and Mecca, London 1853, iii; Snouck Hurgronje, Het Meekâansche Feest, 134-8; Wellhausen, Reste arabischen Heidentums, 81-2, 120; Juyonboll, Handbuch des islamischen Conjurerwesens, 57. (F. BUHL))

(M. Bencherenn*)

| MYJSORE [see MAHSUR]. |
| MYSTICISM [see TAAwWUF]. |
| MYTILENE [see MEDILLO]. |

MZAB (Mzab), a region of the Algerian Sahara which currently corresponds to the wilaya of Ghardaia (Ghardjay). It extends over an area of approximately 8,000 km², between latitudes 32° and 33° 20' N. and longitudes 0° 4' and 2° 30' E. It has the appearance of a vast stony plain, declining in altitude from 700 m. in the west to 300 m. in the east, intersected by deep and tortuous valleys, whence its name of Chebka (גְּבַּקָּה = network) of the Mzab. This enormous expanse, travelled by the nomadic tribes of the Chaanba, Mehadma, Said Otba, Mkhadma, Sa'di 'Utha, contains five centres of sedentary population. First of all there is the Pentapolis, the heart of the Mzab, with its five cities founded by the Ibadis [q.v.] in the 5th/11th century which are strung out along the valley of the wadi Mzab over a distance of some 12 km, from east to west: El Ateuf, Bou Noura, Beni Isguen, Melika and Ghardaia (al-Ghardaya). It extends over an area of 500 km² from the latter as the crow flies (600 km by road). In the 11th/17th century, two new ksour (sing. ksar, כְּסָר, pl. קְסָורים) were founded: Guerrara (Garara), 85 km to the north-east, then Berriane (Banyan), 40 km west of Ghardaia. Situated on the meridian of Algiers, it lies 500 c. 50° from Ghardaia. Finally, the most recent establishment, the oasis of Zelfana, is a site for the sedentarisation of nomads around an area irrigated by deep artesian wells. The climate of the Mzab is arid with very little rain-fall (20 mm) has been recorded 60 mm over 50 years, with extreme values of 1 mm, recorded in 1895, and of 176 mm. in 1923. Temperatures are mild in winter (11° being the December-January average), although frost sometimes occurs, and even snow in exceptional circumstances. In summer, they rise to an average of 34° C. for July, with a maximum of 50°. The daily amplitude can then be in excess of 20°. The dryness of the atmosphere and the intensity of evaporation prevent the growth of any vegetation other than a variety of coarse grass (שִׂדָּה) which flourishes briefly after rainfall, a few tufts in the base of the wadis, and, especially, irrigated crops in the oases. All life is thus dependent on hydraulic resources. These are the flood-waters of the wadis which, diverted by dams, directly irrigate the date palm plantations and add to the subterranean water-level. In former times, the waters of the wadi Mzab (the name is linked by popular etymology to the Arabic midâh "gutter"), the wadi Nsara or the wadi Metlili used to flow to distances of a 100 and 200 km before disappearing, but the retention-dams constructed for the benefit of the date palm plantations, to encourage filtration and the building up of subterranean stocks, have tapped considerable volumes of water. The subterranean level is now about 80 m below the surface, and the height of the water varying considerably according to time of year and place. On the other hand, limestone rocks dating from the Cretaceous period contain water-bearing levels, of the type known as "Albian"; the ceiling is at a depth of 400 m in the Pentapolis, supplying wells at a depth of 80 m, which implies pumping only on the surface. In Guerrara and Zelfana this water flows naturally, under strong pressure, which ought to facilitate the irrigation of vast areas, but it is also very hot (45° to 55°) and full of impurities causing scaling or furring-up, which poses formidable problems of exploitation.

The Mzab makes its first appearance in history with the Arab conquest. The Khâridjides, many of them Ibadis, fleeing from persecution on the part of the Umayyads as well as on that of the supporters of 'Ali, arrived in the Maghrib, founded communities in the Djabal Nefusa [q.v.], in Wadi Righ and in Wadi Mya, and probably within a fairly short time converted certain Berber tribes of the Mzab, in particular the ancestors of the Sa'id 'Utha, currently Mâlikîs, whose nomadic itineraries linked Wadi Mya, Mzab and Sersou, where Tâhîr [q.v.] was for a century-and-a-half the capital of the Ibadî kingdom of the Rustamids [q.v.]. In 296/909, the last Rustamid imâm took refuge at Isedraten (Sedrata), a confederation of ksour founded at the end of the 1st/7th century, probably some eight km from what is currently Ouargla (Wârgûlân). But the prosperity of the Wadi Mya attracted too much envy: an entrepot and a northern gateway to the desert, dealing in gold, slaves, cereals, leather and dates, the oasis was too accessible to outside interference, to such an extent that from the beginning of the 5th/11th century the Ibadîs began to establish new communities, in the heart of the labyrinth of the Chebka, among their "Beni-Moçâb" (בְּנֵי Mo'âsâb) co-religionists. Tajnîn/El Ateuf was founded in 402/1012, At Bounour/Bou Noura in 437/1046 or 440/1048, At Tisjen/Beni Isguen in 440/1048 or 445/1053 and Taghdaryt/Ghardaia in 445/1053 or 478/1085. Regarding At Amlight/Melika, the sources are more contradictory: a first ksar was constructed at the base of the slope, around 442/1050; having been destroyed, it was rebuilt on the summit, either in the 6th/12th or the 7th/13th century. In the 11th/17th century, the gâma'a of Ghardaia decided to prohibit any new construction upstream in the valley of the wadi Mzab, to protect its date palm groves from the damage caused by lack of flood-water, such damage having already been inflicted on the trees of Melika and El Ateuf (the groves of Beni Isguen and of Bou Noura, in the neighbouring valleys, were less affected). Under the pressure of demographic growth, it became necessary to find new settlements further afield: Lagaga/Guerrara, in 1630, in the valley of the wadi Zeqir and Berriane in 1090/1679 in that of the wadi Nsara. Isedraten was destroyed in 467/1075, and the majority of its inhabitants reached the Mzab, the others taking refuge at Ouargla.

The population of the Pentapolis was estimated in 1896 at 18,892 inhabitants; in 1954, the number had risen to 25,541; and in 1966, to 46,630, to which should be added the 40,975 inhabitants of the other towns of the Mzab. In the census of 1987, the wilaya of Ghardaia comprised 216,140 residents, including 35,351 for Guerrara and 21,361 for Berriane. To the 111,350 of the Pentapolis (Ghardaia: 62,251, Beni Isguen-Melika: 21,744, Bou Noura: 18,642, El-Ateuf: 8,713), may be added the Daya ben Dahoua (5,621), which gives a total of 116,691 inhabitants for the Mzab. Metlili has a further 23,616 residents, Zelfana, 4,345, and four other small settlements, including Sebseb, accommodate a few thousand more. This spectacular demographic increase, by
no means untypical of northern Algeria, has shattered the ancient urban structures. The five ksour, formerly enclosed within their ramparts, are now linked by a virtually continuous strip of urban construction, extending from upstream of Ghardaia to Bou Noura, Paris 1987) has changed little, except materially. More or less rectangular axes are imposed on these new suburbs, but the most coveted ones encroach upon the date palm groves, where the vast gardens, formerly afforded sitting room for the wealthy, are increasingly threatened by modern housing needs. The residential confederation which links the Pentapolis, Berriane and Guerrara, demonstrates the cohesion of this heterodox Berber society. Although Berber-speaking Ibadis represent only about 60% of the population of the Mzab, they remain the dominant elements. The Maliks, formerly sedentary or nomadic Arabs tolerated only in peripheral sectors, have been reinforced by migrants from the north, temporarily or permanent; providing administrative services and industrial manpower. But Ibadis society, whether confined within its ramparts or, apparently, more accessible in the new suburbs, remains in fact closed to them. Social constraints, such as were described by M. Mercier in 1932, have evolved little, and the fundamentalist drive which has overtaken the whole of Algeria has done nothing to diminish the anxiety of the "desert puritans". However, while the situation of women (see A.-M. Goichon, La vie feminine au Mzab (Paris 1927) has changed little, except materially (electricity, running water, gas and household appliances), the field of activity open to men has expanded considerably. The ancient and strictly codified exile of Mzabite grocers in the north having been vigorously opposed but not brought to an end during the Socialist period, the spiritual traditions of enterprise has been applied to new sectors. The two largest industrial units, the plaster-works and the tube factory of Noumater (an industrial zone situated 20 km. south of Ghardaia, near the airfield), as well as the central distribution of electricity and gas, are dependent on the state. But private investment finances long-distance commerce—a Mzabite tradition—as well as the transportation and manufacture of consumer goods: principally textiles (carpets, linen, canvas, woollens, hosiery, including Algeria's first establishment for the production of socks, at Guerrara), and also plastics and metals, while the construction industry is particularly buoyant. The various trades benefit from a skilled and inexpensive workforce, while the local reinvestment of profits also supports the maintenance of the date palm grove, which following the agrarian revolution and the suppression of the khamsia [see Muzara'] had often been neglected.

The date palm groves of the ksour have often been considered as a luxury. They are in fact a necessity, not only for the production of food, since they could never claim to feed the entire population of the valley, but for other vital purposes. The only vegetation in this world of stones, they provide shade and shelter for fragrant gardens, the summer residences of the wealthy and places of recreation for city-dwellers fleeing the pressure and the stifling alleyways of the town. Furthermore, the date-production of the more recently established plantations, such as those of Daiba ben Dahoua or Zelfana, is by no means negligible, and vegetables and fruit (lemons, pomegranates, medlars or figs) are much prized locally. In 1987, 4,266 farmers were counted among the sedentary population, and 953 farmers or stock-breeders among the nomads of the awīda, i.e., close to 13% of the working population.

Thus the Ibadî society of the Mzab, which has sought to preserve its religious and consequently its social identity by means of a radical retreat into an arid and inaccessible desert, has succeeded in finding the means of survival in organised and lucrative commercial activity. Despite its isolation and the absence of any local resources other than energy (the gas of Hassi R'mel = Háší Rmél), it has shown remarkable aptitude in adapting to the contemporary industrial world. But demographic and urban expansion threatens the unity of its population and of its architecture—the jewel of the Sahara—while rising standards of living, new material needs and the influence of the media threaten its religious cohesion and the traditional structures which provided its former vitality.


(M. ROUVILLAIS-BRIGOL)

The Berber dialect of the Mzab (tagaunt/lamazigh) has been the object of several studies which are old, but by no means outdated; if the requirement is for concrete information and not theorising. In the first place there is the monograph of R. Basset, Étude sur la zenatia du Mzab, of Ouargla and of the Oued Rit, Paris 1893, followed by Lounis, Grammaire mozabite, Algiers 1897; E. Masqueray, Comparaison d'un vocabulaire du dialecte des Znaga avec le vocabulaire correspondant des Chaouia et des Beni Mizdab, in Mission scientifique, v. (1878), 473-553; J. Biair, Notes d'éthnographie et de linguistique nord-africaines, Paris 1924, 165-265; from 1946 onward, the Fichier de Documentation Berbère has recorded the results of research carried out in the Mzab.

It is worth noting that the 'Akidā which provides the
basis of the religious education of the Ibadis of the Mzab, of Djibra and of the Djibal Nafusa has been written down in Berber and in Arabic lectes, then translated into Arabic (see Motylinski, L'Age des Abadistes, Recueil de Memoires... Algiers 1905, 505-45). But it is Arabic which the Mazibites used for their religious or historical books, which constitute the greater part of their written literature (see Motylinski, Les livres de la secte abadite, Algiers 1885; H. Basset, Essai sur la litterature des Berberes, Algiers 1920, 64-7); worth mentioning in particular are the Kitab al-Sini wa-akhhbar al-zuma al-Abu Zakaryahy2 (5th/11th century [q.v.]), tr. E. Masqueray, Chronique d'Abou Zakaria, Algiers 1879; the K. Tabakdt al-mashayikh of al-Dardjimī (7th/13th century [q.v.]), supplemented by the K. al-Draoudt of al-Barrādī (8th/14th century [q.v]); the K. al-Syar of al-Shamakhtī, Cairo undated. A work dedicated to Kurānīc exegesis is the Kitab al-Nayf (al-Nil) wa-ajla? al-Adill of the shaykh Abī al-Azizī (d. 1808 at Beni Isguen), which has been given a lengthy (8 vols.) commentary by ʿAtfiyāsh (1820-1914 [q.v.]) in his Shahr K. al-Nil wa-ajla? al-Adill, Cairo 1905-43 (see also the list of his works in the article devoted to him in EP).

The individuality of the legislation of the Mazibites has, for its part, attracted the attention of scholars, including the following: Zeyrs, Legislation mozabite, Algiers 1886; M. Morand, Les gaulous du Mazb, Algiers 1910; M. Mercier, Etude sur le waqaf abadite, Algiers 1927.

A French protectorate since 1853, the Mazb was annexed in 1862, and the rules of administration which had been in force there were not retained. In each town there were two ʿqāma: the ḫalka of the ʿazzaš, or of the tolba (from a pl. ʿuluba?) and the āqāma of the ʿawāmm. The first had the primary function of determining, in ittiṣāfāt, the scale of corporal or other punishments executed by the āqāma of the ʿawāmm, which became, before the independence of Algeria (1962), the essential organ of municipal administration.

(M. Mercier)

NAʿĀM (ʿām) (singular -a, pl. -ām, naʿām) collective noun designating the ostrich (Struthio camelus) without any distinction of sex. The only representative of the family of struthionids, of the sub-class of raptors orrunners, the ostrich, sometimes called "ostrich-camel" (Greek στροθόα-χάμας, Persian ʿustamurqūd "camel-bird", Turkish devekushu "camel-bird"), at present lives only in equatorial and southern Africa, although some were still alive in the deserts of Syria, ʿIrāk and Arabia until the first quarter of our century; it is said that it was from the most ancient times familiar to the Arab nomads of these countries, as it was to the Bedouin tribes of the Maghrib and to the Touareg (in Tamashek, enhil pl. inhil, fem. tanhelt pl. tinhul). In Mesopotamia, where the sub-species Str. cam. syriacus was known, the Sumero-Akkadian tablets mention it generally (Sumerian においてのプラグマテクス, Akkadian larmu). The Bedouins had the leisure to observe in detail this large biped with the silhouette of a camel, and its inability to fly caused it not to be regarded as a bird but as a near neighbour of the camel family. An abundant terminology (some fifty adjectives) defined, among the people of the desert, the external characteristics, bearing and habits of the ostrich whose plumage, meat and eggs were quite sought after; fixed by the poets of the tribes, this linguistic baggage was preserved in the works of the Arabic-speaking encyclopedists, naturalists and naturalists (see Iblī.). The sexual dimorphism of the ostrich was much noted by numerous epithets applied to each sex according to its characteristics. The male (talākā), larger and stronger than the female, is commonly called zālīm (pl. zālīn, zilmān, azīma) "oppressed", for, according to the Bedouin fable, his ears were cut short when he was attempting to have horns; despite such an explanation, it seems that one should see in zālīm an intensive with the meaning of "very dark", an attribute of its plumage, similarly as with its other adjectives ḥašm and ḍayyāh. As it takes its turn sitting on the eggs, as well as the three or four females of its harem, it is surnamed abu ṭ-aḥbayd "father of the egg" and abu ṭaḥlaysīn "father of thirty [eggs]", as a parallel to the sitting hen, who is umm al-bayd and umm ṭaḥlaysīn "mother of the eggs", "mother of thirty [eggs]". In the mating season, the male becomes ḥašbī "red-thighed", for the skin of his thighs and his beak turns on a coral hue; the female always remains ṭamīdī or ṭamīdī "grey" or bird "yellowish" due to her ashen plumage, whereas the male is ʿakhradj "mottled black and white" and ʿakkaf (same meaning). One of the most striking characteristics of the ostrich's anatomy is its long, thin and bare neck, which earned it the names ḥayk, ḥaykam, ṭawīb, ʿakhrāb, ʿakhrāb, ṭawīb, ṭawīb, ṭawīb and, for the female, ḥayyān; a group of ostriches otherwise used to be called ḥašī al-ḥayk "long-necked ones". The smallness of the flat head with the sparse, wiry hair of the ostrich and the hardness of its skull were also described by the words ṭamū and ṭaʿ enam, while it is called ṣaadīm due to its strong beak, elongated like the muzzle of a camel and often slightly curved. The absence of an external ear, common to all birds, led the Bedouins to believe that the ostrich did not have ears and was consequently ʿašāmīn, ʿašālīm, and totally lacking in the sense of hearing (asakī); it supplemented this, according to them, with its faculty of sight and a very subtle sense of smell, hence the simile ʿašāmīn min al-naʿāmīn "with a better sense of smell than the ostrich". As a means of defence and safeguard, the ostrich only has at its disposal the rapidity of its flight (zaqāqī), always with its face to the wind, being able to equal the swiftness of a horse spurred red into a triple gallop; this aptitude for running has caused many adjectives with the same meaning to be attributed to it, which today have fallen out of use, such as ḥašī, ṭaḥīf, ḥašī, ʿašakī, ʿašakī, ṭaḥīf, ṭaḥīf, ṭaḥīf, ṭaḥīf, ṭaḥīf, ṭaḥīf, ṭaḥīf, ṭaḥīf, ṭaḥīf, ṭaḥīf, ṭaḥīf, ṭaḥīf, ṭaḥīf, ṭaḥīf, ṭaḥīf, ṭaḥīf, ṭaḥīf, ṭaḥīf, ṭaḥīf, ṭaḥīf. Most of them quadrilateral words and proper to each particular tribe. Many of them were also applied to the camelids, a fact establishing the constant relationship between ostrich and camel. Both have feet with a flat sole (ṣamīf) and very hard horny nails (mansīn). On their upper feet the young female camel and young
female ostrich have the attribute of kalūṣ in common.
The young ostrich is not lacking in descriptive titles, the most current being raʃād, daysakā and rafād. The ostrich emits sounds, and the cry of the male (SHA) has a different tone from that (ZM) of the female; from the latter, al-Hariri (g. v.), speaking of the ostrich, derived the name al-camamara “flautist” (32nd majāka, Cairo 1929, 345). In the mating season, the male ostrich, like the camel, has a high-pitched voice (haddāqi), making different raucous sounds with its complex shrill cry (nak); when it is frightened. Despite being oviparous (dhahā), the female ostrich does not make a nest; she is content to scratch and flatten in the sand a shallow hole (udhi, idhi, udhushwa, udhiyya, madhī, balad) which is sufficient to accommodate her clutch (zam) of six to eight eggs in general. As several females of the same male pool their eggs in the same breeding place for security and to make it easier to sit on them, the Bedouins used to attribute this behaviour to the stupidity (khwād) of this large bird, which seemed to desert its own eggs for those of other ostriches on the basis that it was afraid to let go, left to the sun’s heat to take care of the incubation, when “this simploten” of a male did not take its turn; for them, one could not be abnak min na’āma “stupider than an ostrich” or ashrad min na’āma “more cowardly than an ostrich” or adjalil min baydat al-balad “viler than the egg [of an ostrich abandoned] in the sand”. Besides, to the credulous and superstitious spirit of the Bedouin, the ostrich was that mount of the demon ogre (gšl q.v.) of the desert, the terror of travellers. Further, the mania of the ostrich for swallowing indiscriminately all kinds of small objects made them believe that it digested without difficulty stones, metals and even the glowing cinders of a hearth, all being rejected (tarihā) with its dung (samm). Added to these beliefs is the tale according to which the hunted ostrich believes that it screens itself entirely from the view of its pursuer by hiding only its head behind some rugged ground.

At all times, the plumage of the ostrich was, for man, a coveted object; the most sought after was that of a large male (khah, khafaf) with black and white contrasted (adjar) plumage, which could be compared with a thick-pile carpet (hamil, hamula, hamlula) due to its fineness, brilliance and softness. Headdresses and princely ornaments, full-dress military uniforms, streamers and banners and, finally, fantasies of Western feminine fashion of “La Belle Époque”, when the plumage industry flourished, all paid such tribute to the species of struthionids that it led almost to its disappearance; acclimatisation, domestication and degeneration have saved it from extinction. Arab authors on hunting such as Kushāqīn (g. v.), al-Asādī and Ibn Manghī (g. v. in Suppl.) mention, in their treatises, the different methods used in hunting the ostrich. Of these, the most widespread was by pursuit (tarad); it needed resourceful, swift mounts, specially trained for this race with the support of greyhounds (salikīye). It was this kind of hunting that was practised in the Algerian Sahara, to the south of Laghouat, in the middle of the last century by General A. Marqueritte; his detailed and spirited account is enough for us to imagine the atmosphere of the Arabs’ cavalades in pursuit of the ostrich, since the pre-Islamic period, of which there is an echo in some ancient poems. In the Middle Ages, the ostrich was also hunted with the coursing of the saker falcon; al-Asādī devotes a chapter to this flight which was practised in the middle of summer. It required five saker falcons got ready and trained upon an artificial ostrich made of gathered sticks baited in places for catching the birds; one of the falcons had to seize its head, two the neck and two the thighs. The assistance of one or two greyhounds was necessary in order to carry back the prey once it was bound. The secret of success was to force the ostrich, by a skilful manoeuvre of the beaters, not to flee face to the wire, and the falcons had to be launched into flight as soon as the fleeing bird was in sight; at the same time, the supporting dogs set off on course as fast as their legs would carry them, closely followed by the falconers at full speed. A less supporting and less tiring method, that of the herdsmen without mounts, was to accustom a flock of ostriches to the sight of black rags hooked on sticks fixed in the sand whose periphery was copiously sprinkled with something that ostriches like. Seeing them fond of the bait and familiarised with the black rags, the hunter himself dressed in black, would take up an immobile position in the midst of this set-up and, armed with a club, could easily knock out the imprudent birds who came within his reach. Another procedure for capturing them was to light, not far from a flock of ostriches, going around the flames stupefied the creatures and suppressed for a moment their instinct for flight, which allowed the hunter to approach them without trouble and seize them.

As game, the meat of the ostrich is recognised, in Islamic law, as being licit consumption, but it does not seem, according to the authors, that the Arabs appreciated it as much as that of the large, wild quadrupeds. As for the Maghribi, al-Umārī (8th/14th century) and then Leo Africanus (9th/15th century) report that the population of Constantine freely captured young ostriches in large numbers in order to fatten them and put them on the spit. Among the Touaregs, the nobles abstained from eating the meat of the ostrich, but the imshab and slaves were fond of it, as were the sedentary people of the towns of the Sudan who bought it from the nomads. In the 10th/16th century, al-Mahalli further mentions in his Tuhfat al-mulūk (apud E. Fagnan, Extraits, 171) the abundance of ostriches and their eggs between Fās and Tiemcen. This remark confirms the interest shown, even from the prehistoric period, in ostrich eggs. The deposits in the sand of collective clutches, which could reach thirty eggs and more, were assiduously visited; a single egg constituted a substantial dish for several people, its weight equivalent to two dozen hens’ eggs. To outwit the distrust of the sitting birds, the collector would content himself with lifting one or two eggs at a time, at the time when they were going to forage. The empty shells (tarka, pl. tarādī) after the hatching of the chicks and those that were emptied (kayd) for the consumption of their contents, were carefully recovered and fashioned to serve many uses (receptacles, oil lamps, braising pans, etc.). Introduced in the mosques at first as a decorative element, these shells became the subject, in Islamic period, in ostrich eggs. The deposits in the sand of collective clutches, which could reach thirty eggs and more, were assiduously visited; a single egg constituted a substantial dish for several people, its weight equivalent to two dozen hens’ eggs. To outwit the distrust of the sitting birds, the collector would content himself with lifting one or two eggs at a time, at the time when they were going to forage. The empty shells (tarka, pl. tara'īdī) after the hatching of the chicks and those that were emptied (kayd) for the consumption of their contents, were carefully recovered and fashioned to serve many uses (receptacles, oil lamps, braising pans, etc.). Introduced in the mosques at first as a decorative element, these shells became the subject, in Islamic period, in ostrich eggs.
In the East, ancient therapeutic lore accorded specific properties to certain anatomical parts of the ostrich: al-Kazwini and al-Damiri mention some of them to us. It is known that the gall, considered to be a violent poison, became an efficacious antidote for every other mortal poison, and, prepared as an eye lotion, constituted a beneficial remedy for blindness.

On the other hand, the marrow of the long bones could, by absorption, cure consumption. The melted fat, used as an unguent, reabsorbed tumours, while the dung (gum) burnt and ground into powder healed ulcers. The roasted meat facilitated the elimination of wind, bad mixtures of humours, warts and itching.

Some fragments of ostrich egg shell thrown into the water of a cooking pot on a fire had, it seemed, the property of accelerating boiling considerably. Even more extraordinary, indeed magical, was the fact that the blade of a sword or dagger made of iron, having stayed in the ostrich's gizzard, was unalterable and unbreakable. Finally, a scrap of ostrich skin cut in the shape of a fish floated as soon as it was plunged into a bottle of vinegar. Until quite recent times, the people of the Sahara held in high esteem the marrow of the ostrich bone for, inserted into the ear afflicted with thoroughbred horses and camels. There is no information seem to make allusion to it. The first is attributed to al-Djahiz (Fr. tr. Ch. Pellat in Arabica, i [1954], 159), according to which the ostrich figured among the imports from Arabia along with thoroughbred horses and camels. There is no way of knowing if the author means to speak of the import of feathers or young ostriches that would have had measures of corn. In the same condition, the distribution of alms in corn to the value of a head of cattle (badana) stayed in the ostrich's gizzard, was unalterable and unbreakable. Such legislation has no longer in practice any justification, due to the fact of the total disappearance of the great running bird of the Near East, whom the poets voluntarily take as a model to boast of the speed and endurance of their mount. In current language, the ostrich has given rise to some metaphors applicable to certain human characters. Thus, one of who devotes himself whole-heartedly to an occupation, it was said rakba gisah na'ama "he rode the wing of an ostrich", in allusion to the rapid but useless beating of its wings when it runs. The man who says one thing at one time and another thing at another time, did nothing but "join together the mouflon and the ostrich" (gismah l'-urwi wa l'na'ama) because of the profound difference of their respective living areas in these mountains, and desert.

In botany, the name ostrich is given to three plants. The first, al-na'äm, a nettle, is the pellitory of Judaea (Parietaria judaica). The second, called kisht bi'al-na'äm "the ostrich's cucumber", its real name being al-hanzal, is the colocynth (Citronimus colocynthis), of whose fruits the ostrich is particularly fond. Finally, habb al-na'äm, which bears the name al-Masdyid wa 'l-matdrid, Baghdad 1954, 217-24;
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Further, the Kurgan kasida parts of the contain numerous references to balladry and found its way into Bedouin poetry. The nasib tashrifī, al-Idk fi fīk al-lughā, Cairo 1929, (who calls him an-Nabrawi); 684, S II, 180 with the quotations extracted from later authors, they characterised as “the most comprehensive and methodically most superior work of this philologically-orientated botany” (Ullmann, Nat., 66). His information is based on older written sources, on oral information from Bedouins, and, occasionally, on personal observation. The book consisted of two sections, one being an alphabetical inventory of plant names (and thus the first alphabetically-ordered specialised dictionary), the second one containing monographs on plants used for specific practical purposes (kindling; dyeing; bow-making); there also is a very interesting chapter on mushrooms “and similar plants” (to the latter belong the parasitic broomrapes (Balanophoraceae)). The chapter (included in Lewin’s edition, see below) gives important information on the gathering, use, and growth of a number of mushrooms. Abū Hanīfa’s work was long considered lost, but subsequently parts of it were discovered in different libraries. Together with the quotations extracted from later authors, they led to several partial editions: B. Lewin, The Book of Plants of Abū Hanīfa ad-Dīnawārī, Part of the alphabetical section (al-fāṣ), edited from the unique MS. in the Library of the University of Istanbul, with an introduction, notes, in-icides, and a vocabulary of selected words, Uppsala-Wiesbaden 1953; idem, The Book of Plants. Part of the monograph section, Wiesbaden 1974; and Muhammad Hamidullah, Le dictionnaire botanique d’Abū Hanīfa ad-Dīnawārī (Kūbit ab-nabat, de sin à yd) reconstitué d’après les citations des ouvrages postérieurs, Cairo 1973. The contents and sources of ad-Dīnawārī’s book are discussed in T. Bauer, Das Pflanzenbuch des Abū Hanīfa ad-Dīnawārī, Wiesbaden 1988. The author observes that Abū Hanīfa had in mind a scope far beyond a mere botanical dictionary: he intended to describe all the aspects of Bedouin life which had a botanical component. The book also includes a survey of the complicated textual history of the K. al-Nabāt. Ibn Sidād (d. 458/1066) dealt with plants extensively in his K. al-Muḥṣas, Cairo 1316-21, 17 vols. The botanical section starts at the end of the 10th volume and goes on till the beginning of the 12th volume. To eliminate doubt about the correct meaning of a botanical term, the philologists describe the plant, in-
cluding the names of its different parts as well as the synonyms which refer to it, among these the name which the plant carries during its different stages of growth. Literary sources, especially Bedouin poets, are quoted extensively.

As for systematics, there is no attempt in our modern sense; such classifications as are made serve to arrange the material in a more or less accessible way. Here, all kinds of different systems may be encountered, ranging from the simple alphabetical order to divisions according to practical use; divisions in trees, flowers, and garden vegetables; in trees (chador, including shrubs) and plants, with a further subdivision of the latter group; trees may also be subdivided according to the edible qualities of the skins and kernels of their fruit, as by al-Nuwayri (Nabāt, Cairo ed., ii, Contents). Given this approach, no systematic description which took into account a set number of unambiguous characteristics was developed. Greek influence can be discerned in occasional attempts at binary nomenclature, such as for instance the adding of bari to wild varieties.

Extensive references to plants and flowers are not only found in the Bedouin poetry, as earlier mentioned, but also in later poetry, especially in the genres called rauḍiyāt, rabī‘iyāt and zahrīyyāt, i.e. garden, spring, and flower poems. See e.g. Ibn al-‘Arabī, al-Dīwān al-Sīrāfī, ed. J. F. Glick, Paris 1953, 161-201; G. Scholer, Arabische Naturlprichtung. Die zahrīyyāt, rabī‘iyāt und rauḍiyāt von ihren Anfängen bis az-Sanaubari. Eine gattungs-, motive- und stilgeschichtliche Untersuchung, Beirut 1974.

(b) Practical. This category includes:

1. Agriculture (filāḥa [q.v.]). There are a number of works on this subject in Arabic (see Ullmann, Nat. 427-51, Sezgin, GRS, iv, 303-46), one of them being the much-discussed, so-called Nabataean agriculture of Ibn Wabighiya [q.v.]. The discussion, which has gone on for more than a century, is summarised in Sezgin, op. cit., 318-29. Muslim Spain was especially proficient in this field. Latin sources in some form may have been accessible in this region (Sezgin, op. cit., 198-9). A description of the agricultural situation in Islamic Spain is given by Th. F. Glick, Islamic and Christian Spain in the early Middle Ages, comparative perspectives on social and cultural formation, Princeton 1979, 51-109. The material provided by the authors in this field is to a large extent included in later compilations such as Ibn al-A‘wām’s [see filāḥa]. II K. al-filāḥa, which offers descriptions of all the economically-exploited plants (including roses and other garden plants), as well as instructions about their culture, such as preparing the soil, planting, watering; different techniques of grafting, including a method of cutting a plant off at the root, leaving intact the root system, and then embedding the seed of a plant of a different species in the remaining stump; avoiding certain combinations of plants which tended to have a damaging effect on each other, such as palms and junipers, and combining others that furthered each other’s growth.

A certain overlap between the literary and the practical genres is found in texts such as a makāma on palm-protection (shrubāḥa), written ca. 1800 in Hadramawt, edited by R. B. Serjeant, in JNES, xl (1981), 307-22, and Ibn Luyūn’s (s. 750/1349) urduza on agriculture. K. Helād, al-makāma wa-ndaqal al-najafī fi wūl sinā‘at al-filāḥa, ed. and tr. J. Eguaras, Granada 1954.

2. Pharmacology. Islamic pharmacology [see adwī‘a], of which knowledge of plants was an important part, largely worked along the lines set out by Dioscorides (1st century B.C. [see druṣkūrād])s, whose Materia medica was translated into Arabic (via Syriac) in the 3rd/9th century. Several illustrated copies of this translation are known to have existed; on the (mainly botanical) illustrations of the copy in the Leiden University Library see M.M. Sadek, The Leiden Dioscorides. A study of an Arab illuminated manuscript of Dioscorides’ De Materia Medica with special reference to the Vienna and Pierpont Morgan Codices, dss. New York 1969, unpubl.; idem, The Arabic Materia Medica of Dioscorides, Quebec City 1983. See also A. Dietrich (ed.), Dioscuresi triumphans; an anonymer arabischer Kommentar (Ende 12. Jahrh. n. Chr.) zur Materia medica: arabischer Text nebst kommentierter deutscher Übersetzung, 2 vols., Göttingen 1988. The Persian tradition was also of some importance in pharmacology, as can be inferred from the Persian names of a number of plants and drugs (see Ullmann, Nat., 89-9).

For a survey of the field, see Ullmann, Med., 257-320, and Sezgin, GRS, iv; also M. Levey, Early Arabic pharmacology, an introduction based on ancient and medieval sources, Leiden 1973 (the subject is treated rather superficially, but the work contains illustrative translations from source material). A recent study of a pharmacological text, the Aḥrāb al-Ṭabī‘iyyiyyūn of al-Kalānisī (ca. 1200), was made by J. Feldmann (1986, Beitr. Texte und Studien 35). The authors, special mention should be made of al-Ḡalīkū (q.v. in Supplement) (flor. probably in the first half of the 6/12th century). K. al-Adwīya al-mufrada, and of Ibn al-Baytār (d. 646/1248 [q.v.]), al-Dīmīsī al-kabīr li-khuṣūd al-adwīya wa l-aghīya, who are considered as the great authorities in this field; their plant descriptions quote intensively from older sources. For botanical descriptions of Birim’s [q.v.]. K. al-Ṣayyāma deserves attention. It contains elaborate plant descriptions in which the author often refers to Dioscorides, but also gives many details of his own. The latter include, for instance, botanical details such as the question whether flowering is axillary or otherwise; shape, colour and structure of flowers, leaves, tubers and roots; smell and taste; manner of growing; habitat; comparative description of other plants which may easily be confused with them; etc.

Modern pharmacological tradition still remains to a large extent continuous with the past. Modern herbalists consult the handbooks of the mediaeval authorities, even though using the results of modern chemistry to give a scientific basis to the traditional practices. A number of studies on herbalists’ practices in modern Middle Eastern and North African countries have recently appeared, which include inventories of plants used by these herbalists. These studies have appeared in Studia Islamica (Tokyo University), no. 2 (1976), Miki, Index of the Arab herbalists’ materials; no. 8 (1979), Miki, Honda, Ahmed, Herb drugs and herbalists in the Arab Middle East; no. 19 (1982), Miki, Honda, Bellakhdar, Herb drugs and herbalists in the Maghreb; no. 27 (1986), Bauer, Honda, Miki, Herb drugs and herbalists in Turkey, and no. 28 (1986) Ushmanghani, Honda, Miki, Herb drugs and herbalists in Pakistan. See further H. Venzlaff, Der marokkanische Drogenhandler und seine Ware. Beitrag zur Terminologie und volksmäßigen Gebrauch traditioneller arabischer Materia medica, Wiesbaden 1977 (31-145 about plants). Pharmacological literature, too, gives many interesting details about plants, but no fixed set of characteristics is described. The authors generally add the quality of the plant according to humoral principles (dry, cold) and mention its medical use. In this genre of works illuminated MSS. such as the above-mentioned
Dioscorides mss. are found. Some information about the actual practice of botanical illustration is given by ed. and tr. M. Meyerhof and J. Autodidactus, c (7th/13th century, a pupil of Ibn Abi Usaybi, ed. Wiistenfeld, ii, 219, as opposed to zoological ones (unlawful) is noted. The attitude which some Islamic scholars took towards botanical illustrations (lawful) as opposed to zoological ones (unlawful) is noteworthy; about a remark of this kind in al-Umarī's (d. 749/1349) Mamlāt al-ahār, which has only botanical, not zoological, illustrations, see B. Farès, "Un herbar arabe illustre du XIV siècle," in Archaeologica orientalia in memoria E. Hershfeld, New York 1952, 86.

(c) Philosophical-theoretical. A very interesting part of mediaeval Islamic botany is found in the work of scholars who discuss botanical problems of a more general nature. Such discussions may also be found in a theological context, where they serve as proof of God's wisdom, for instance in al-Ghazālī's (d. 505/1111) al-Iḥkāma fi 'l-makhlūkāt, ed. Weisser, Aleppo 1979; tr. idem, Das Geheimnis der Schopfung (ed. Drossaart Lulofs, 172) admits here only earthy, watery and fiery powers. Balīnūs also discusses the intermediate forms: corals are of mineral substance, but have a vegetable spirit. A parallel is drawn between the five main divisions of the vegetable kingdom (grasses; aromatic plants; corn; large, non-fruiting trees; fruiting trees) and a similar division in the animal kingdom. The dependence of Diābīr b. Hayyān's [q.v.] natural philosophy on Balīnūs has been analysed by Paul Kraus (Jābir ibn Hayyān, ii, Cairo 1943, 270-303).

The theory of these philosophers concerning the generation and the diversity of plants is largely based on some form of elemental theory, sometimes mixed with astrological influences; from here to the artificial production of plants (not to be confused with artificial pollination, as was practised in date-palm culture), as described in the Diābīr b. Hayyān corpus (in the K. al-Tadhīmī, see Kraus, Jābir ibn Hayyān, i, Textes choisis, Paris-Cairo 1935, 386 ff.) is but a step. In this context, Ibn Wadhshīya's strange recipes (see Ullmann, Nat., 76) are not as outlandish as they may seem at first sight, and do in fact fit in with generally accepted ideas about the possible artificial generation of, for instance, banana trees ('Abd al-Latīf al-Baghdādī, Ibfāda, Ibn al-'Awāwm, Ifāba). Related to this is the question of the variability of species (denied by the Ifkān al-Safā, Ullmann, Nat., 77) but considered possible by Ibn Sinā and Ibn Bāḍdjīa (Ullmann, Nat., 80 n. 5); Ibn Sinā points out that the variation of species depends partly on geographical location: cabbages, transported into different regions, change their appearance (Hayawān, ed. Cairo 1970, 404); it also depends on geographical location whether a palm shoot develops into a date- or a coconut-palm.

(d) General. This category includes the botanical information offered by geographers, who describe the flora, especially the commercially relevant plants, of the countries they are dealing with (material exhaustively collected by A. Miquel, La géographie humaine du monde musulman jusqu'au milieu du 11e siècle. III. Le milieu naturel, Paris 1980, 391-483). Their information has occasionally found its way even into fictional travel literature: the fifth voyage of Sindbad the Sailor contains a description of the pepper plant, which has a large leaf protecting the flower against sunshine and rain, and bends aside when protection is no longer needed. The information found in the botanical sections of the encyclopaedic works, abundant in the period after 1200, is also of a general nature. These sections compile literary-philological as well as practical information from older sources and thus sometimes preserve material that is otherwise lost. An interesting botanical section is found, for instance, in Ibn al-Athīr's (7th/13th century; this is an otherwise unknown Ibn al-Athīr) Taḥfīt al-ṣagāī'h (for mss., see Ullmann, Nat., 37; two more mss. in Cairo, Dār al-Kutub). Identification. It is often extremely difficult to discover the botanical identity of plants mentioned in
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Special attention should be paid to the concepts of natural philosophy found in the works of the pseudo-Apollonios of Tyana (1st century A.D.; see Balīnūs). Book IV of his K. Sirr al-khālika or K. al-Ifāda (ed. Weisser, Aleppo 1979; tr. idem, Das Buch über die Geheimnisse der Schöpfung von Pseudo-Apollonios von Tyana, Berlin-New York 1980) deals with plants. It gives a theory for the development of the vegetable kingdom, based on the author's theory of the four elements. Noteworthy is the insistence on the importance of the airy element in the generation of plants, whereas Aristotle, according to Nicolaus (ed. Drossaart Lulofs, 172) admits here only earthy, watery and fiery powers. Balīnūs also discusses the intermediate forms: corals are of mineral substance, but have a vegetable spirit. A parallel is drawn between the five main divisions of the vegetable kingdom (grasses; aromatic plants; corn; large, non-fruiting trees; fruiting trees) and a similar division in the animal kingdom. The dependence of Diābīr b. Hayyān's [q.v.] natural philosophy on Balīnūs has been analysed by Paul Kraus (Jābir ibn Hayyān, ii, Cairo 1943, 270-303).

The theory of these philosophers concerning the generation and the diversity of plants is largely based on some form of elemental theory, sometimes mixed with astrological influences; from here to the artificial production of plants (not to be confused with artificial pollination, as was practised in date-palm culture), as described in the Diābīr b. Hayyān corpus (in the K. al-Tadhīmī, see Kraus, Jābir ibn Hayyān, i, Textes choisis, Paris-Cairo 1935, 386 ff.) is but a step. In this context, Ibn Wadhshīya's strange recipes (see Ullmann, Nat., 76) are not as outlandish as they may seem at first sight, and do in fact fit in with generally accepted ideas about the possible artificial generation of, for instance, banana trees ('Abd al-Latīf al-Baghdādī, Ibfāda, Ibn al-'Awāwm, Ifāba). Related to this is the question of the variability of species (denied by the Ifkān al-Safā, Ullmann, Nat., 77) but considered possible by Ibn Sinā and Ibn Bāḍdjīa (Ullmann, Nat., 80 n. 5); Ibn Sinā points out that the variation of species depends partly on geographical location: cabbages, transported into different regions, change their appearance (Hayawān, ed. Cairo 1970, 404); it also depends on geographical location whether a palm shoot develops into a date- or a coconut-palm.

(d) General. This category includes the botanical information offered by geographers, who describe the flora, especially the commercially relevant plants, of the countries they are dealing with (material exhaustively collected by A. Miquel, La géographie humaine du monde musulman jusqu'au milieu du 11e siècle. III. Le milieu naturel, Paris 1980, 391-483). Their information has occasionally found its way even into fictional travel literature: the fifth voyage of Sindbad the Sailor contains a description of the pepper plant, which has a large leaf protecting the flower against sunshine and rain, and bends aside when protection is no longer needed. The information found in the botanical sections of the encyclopaedic works, abundant in the period after 1200, is also of a general nature. These sections compile literary-philological as well as practical information from older sources and thus sometimes preserve material that is otherwise lost. An interesting botanical section is found, for instance, in Ibn al-Athīr's (7th/13th century; this is an otherwise unknown Ibn al-Athīr) Taḥfīt al-ṣagāī'h (for mss., see Ullmann, Nat., 37; two more mss. in Cairo, Dār al-Kutub).

Identification. It is often extremely difficult to discover the botanical identity of plants mentioned in

Bibliography: Given in the article. An ex-haustive bibliography of literature before 1970 is found in the surveys of M. Ullmann, Die Medizin im Islam, Leiden 1970 (257-321 on pharmacology); idem, Die Natur- und Geheimwissenschaften im Islam, Leiden 1972 (62-95, 427-51). For the period of the first four centuries of Islam, see the relevant volumes of F. Sezgin's GAS, esp. iii, Medizin, Pharmakologie, Agrarwissenschaft, and iv, Botanik. With the advent of modern botany, a large number of studies on North Africa and the Middle East have appeared. Floras of the different regions are published both by Western and local botanical institutions, e.g. V. and G. Tackholm and M. Drar, Flora of Egypt, Cairo 1941-69; V. Tackholm, Students' Flora of Egypt, 2nd ed. Cairo 1974; A. Parsa, Flora of the Iran, Tehran 1951-60 (includes an index of local names); R. Maire, Flora of the Afrique du Nord, Paris 1952-67; K.-H. Rechinger, Flora Iranica, Graz 1963- [in Latin]; P. Davis et alii, Flora of Turkey and the East Aegean Islands, Edinburgh 1965-88, 10 vols.; E. Nasir and S.I. Ali, Flora of West Pakistan, Rawalpin-di 1970-; D. Heller and C. Heyn, Conspectus florae orientalis, Leiden 1980-; S.I. Ali and S.M.H. Jabeel, Flora of the Punjab, Lahore 1966 (145 families published so far); M. Zohary, Flora Palaestina, Jerusalem 1966-86 (very good illustrations); J. Léonard, Contribution à l'étude de la flore et de la végéta-tion des déserts d'Iran, Jardin Botanique National de Belgique, 1981- . For lexicological aspects, see I. Hauenschild, Türkischsprachige Volksernen für Kräuter und Stauden mit den deutschen, englischen und russischen Bezeichnungen, Wiesbaden 1989. Valuable information on the vegetation of Middle Eastern countries can also be found in the Bethhef of the Tübingen Atlas des Vorderen Orients. Of Reihe A (Natur-wissenschaften), Wiesbaden 1977-, vols. i-viii, and v-xvi, x-xi, x-xi, xxii, x-xv-xxv, xxx deal with vegeta-tion aspects. (Remke Krui) NABATAEANS [see NABAT] NABAT or Nabit (coll.), Nabati (sing.), Anbât (pl.), the name given by the Arabs to the Nabataeans, amongst whom they distinguished the Nabat al-Sham (i.e. of Syria), installed at Petra towards the end of the Hellenistic imperial era and at the beginning of the Roman one, and the Nabat al-'Irâq (i.e. of 'Irâk).

[The Editors of the EI have decided to retain unchanged the following two articles, despite the inevitable overlappings in their present forms.]

1. The Nabat al-Shâm. The Arabic term, occurring in Aramaic inscriptions, nab, nabt, appears very often in the royal titulature of the Nabataeans of Petra in the expression "king of Nabataea" (mîk nbtw). In other contexts, it is clear that nbt represents an ethnic designation, rather than a geographical region. At Petra, it appears also as an anthroponym, indicating that it probably represents an eponym, which Greek transcriptions suggest was vocalised as Nabîtâ. The root *nbt is well known from ancient Semitic languages, attested in both Akkadian nabîtu ("light up, shine, radiate") and in Amorite ("to shine, appear, look") for the illumination of planetary bodies, metallic objects or the human face. In Biblical and post-Biblical Hebrew, nbt appears almost exclusively in Hîphîl with the meaning "to look at, gaze". Nebat is also the name of the father of Jeroboam I, the first king of Israel (I Kings xi, 26). In pre-Islamic Arabic, nbt is attested as a personal name in Safaitic, Minaic and Sabaic. In the South Arabian onomasticon, it appears also with theophoric elements and in other associations: nbtî, nbtîly, nbtâbî, nbtâm and nbtîf are attested in Minaic, Qatabanian or Sabaic. The verb nbt also occurs in Sabaic texts with the meaning "to dig [a well] down to water"; cf. Arabic nabat "to gush out".

The relation of nbt to nbyt. It remains disputed whether the "Nabataeans" (nbtw) are to be equated with the Aramaean tribe of Nabayat/Nabaiatu known from Neo-Assyrian cuneiform texts from the reign of Assurbanipal (883-859 B.C.) and the later periods. In the Hebrew Bible, who appear in the biblical genealogies as the eldest son of Ishmael and brother of Qedar (Gen. xxv, 13). The correspondence of the terms is indi-cated by the Jewish Targums (for Gen. xxv, 13; I Chron. i, 29; Isa. lx, 7; Ezek. xxvii, 21), and was widely accepted among scholars until J. Starcky argued that the transformation of a taw to a teth and the loss of the yodh made any relationship of the terms highly unlikely. Discovery of several pre-Islamic Thamudic texts on 7abâl Ghunaym near Taymâ' [g. v.] that mention a "war against Nabâyat (dr nbyt) was considered the coup-de-grâce to the theory that the same people were involved, since the Arabic spelling contained neither a yodh nor a teth. As a result, it was assumed that the -ti/-ti- ending of NBYT represented an inflectional suffix. This linguistic argu-ment is not as convincing as it may appear, since the Semitic root *NBY is poorly attested in pre-Islamic Arabic, whereas *NBT is fairly common. It then remains possible that the yodh is not part of the root and has another linguistic explanation. As for the transfor-mation of a final taw to a teth, this shift is attested elsewhere in Semitic languages and provides no real obstacle in equating the terms. Nor is Starcky's argument per-suasive that the Nabayat/N'byat were Aaraeamaeas, not Arabs. The names of Natnu and his son Nuhuru, the kings of the Nebayat in the Assyrian chronicles, are both well represented in the Pre-Islamic Arabic onomasticon.

Of some importance for deciding this issue is the vexed question of the homeland of the Nabataeans. Starcky assumed an origin in South Arabia, but neither the Nabataean pantheon nor their material culture contains any vestiges of South Arabia as their native land. In contrast, Knauf argues the Nabatua originally constituted one of the Arab clans of the Qedarite tribal confederation that dominated North Arabia in the 8th-5th centuries B.C. During this time, it is argued, they formed part of the indigenous popula-tion of Edom, whereas the Nabataeans were placed in the region of Ḥâ'il [g. v.]. But other possibilities seem more likely. Of importance in this regard is Diem's observation that the Arabic orthography contained in the Nabataean onomasticon
employs that used in Aramaic of the Neo-Assyrian and Achaemenid Persian period, such as the -w suffix in nbtw, which represents the -u of the nominative case. These elements embedded in the Arabic dialect of the Nabataeans suggest they arose in the Syrian-Mesopotamian sphere, providing credence for Milik's view that the Nabataeans migrated from the area of the al-Hulif [q.f.] district of north-east Arabia. If this is the case, the equation of the Nahbatat with the Nabatae or Nabataeans remains feasible, in spite of the linguistic difficulties.

Although no author of a Nabataean Aramaic inscription uses the political or ethnic term nbt as a self-designation, such references are contained in other Aramaic and Arabic dialects, as well as in Greek. At Palmyra in A.D. 132, a cavalryman probably serving in the Palmyrene cavalry stationed at Ana on the Euphrates, designates himself as "the Nahbatan, the Rawah-ahen" (nbtz rubhy[2] ), Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum, ii, 3973 - Répertoire d'epigraphie sémitique, no. 285). The tribe of Rawah is known from Saffatic (GIS, v, 5162) and Nabataean (RES, no. 2065) texts from the vicinity of Umm al-Qiţan in the southern Hawrān. At Nemārā, a cavalryman named Mūshin in the III Cyrenaica legion identifies himself as a descendant from the gen(s) Naħbat, i.e. a Nahbatan (A.D. 106). The tribe of Rawah is known from Safaitic texts, no. 285). The tribe of Rawah is known from Safaitic (GIS, v, 5162) and Nabataean (RES, no. 2065) texts from the vicinity of Umm al-Qiţan in the southern Hawrān. At Nemārā, a cavalryman named Mūshin in the III Cyrenaica legion identifies himself as a descendant from the gen(s) Naḥbat, i.e. a Nahbatan (A.D. 106). Finally, a Saffatic text from the baraz in Jordan indicates he is "Dārīb b. Qayn the Nahbatan" (V. Clark, A study of new Saffatic inscriptions from Jordan, Ph.D. diss., Melbourne, unpubl., no.661, nbtj). All of these texts are from the northern frontier of the Nabataean realm and date to the period after the annexation of the Nabataean kingdom by Rome in A.D. 106. (historical references to the Nabataeans from the vicinity of Umm al-Qiţan in the southern Hawrān. At Nemārā, a cavalryman named Mūshin in the III Cyrenaica legion identifies himself as a descendant from the gen(s) Naḥbat, i.e. a Nahbatan (A.D. 106).)

As an ethnic term, Nabatû denotes two groups of different origin: in an Aramaic text of Hegra (GIS, ii, 199; other references, see G. Cantinceau, Le Nabatèen, ii, 123), Nabatu is named alongside Šamalum, the Salamians, whom Stephen of Byzantium associates with the Nabataeans (cf. J. Starcky, Pétra et les Nabatéens, in Compare et alii, L'Arabie préislamique et son danger, vii [1981], 123-42; A. Negev, Personal names in the Nabataean realm (= Qedem, Monographs of the Institute of Archaeology, 32), Jerusalem 1991. (D.F. Graf)

2. The Nabat al-‘Irāk.

In Arabic, the root n-b-t supplies various meanings, including the following: to gush forth (in reference to water), to dig to obtain water (form IV), to extract (products from the land); to explain, draw a conclusion from a text, from a law, etc. (form X), while in connection with the god Nabu). Cf. LA, ed. Dar. 2. The Nabat al-‘Irāk.

NABAT

und Sprache, in ZDMG, xxv [1871], 122-3; an interpretation shared by J. Starcky, loc. cit., but contra E. M. von der Müllert, „Mémoire sur les Nabataens, in JA, xv (1835), 5-55, 97-137, 209-271, who claimed that these people were Aramaeans; this view was repeated by Glaser, Skizze, ii; Hommel, Die altislamitische Überlieferung, (202). These Arabs spoke a western Aramaic dialect very close to what was to become the Arabic of the earliest inscriptions. Imperial Aramaic, which had become the language of Persia, was still, at the end of the Greco-Roman period, the official language of the Near and Middle East.

The second group is of Aramaean origin, and spoke an eastern Aramaic dialect, close to Mandaean, from which Syriac was derived, the language in which the K. al-Filāha al-nabatiyya was composed, i.e., al-surāniyya al-kadima, as is stated by the translator Ibn Wabshiyya [q.v.].

The Arabs distinguish between these two groups: they called the first Nabat al-Shām and the second Nabat al-īrāk. On the first, we find in Yākūt, Maṣʿūm, s.v. Saʿl and Wādī Muṣā, the two names designating Petra and its valley (cf. T. Fahd, Le panthéon de l'Arabie centrale à la veille de l'hégire, Paris 1968, 218, n. 5), without any reference to the Nabataeans. Dusares (Dhū l-Šārā), a god venerated by the Nabataeans, was also a god of the Mandaean pantheon (on this divinity, see Fahd, Le panthéon, 71-5); Yākūt mentions him (s.v. Šārā) without any reference to the Nabataeans.

The only information which seems to refer to Nabataea, then under Byzantine domination, is the assertion of the ascendants of Kuṣayy [q.v.], the reformer of the cult at Mecca and the ruler of the Kurayshites, were Nabataeans (kum miṣālābād; cf. T. Fahd, La division arabe, Paris 1987, 121 ff.). In the long article which the author of the LA devoted to the root n-b-t, there is a single reference to the Nabat al-Shām, of whom Ibn Abī Awaṣa says: "We used to pay the Nabataeans (nabīl) of Shām in advance for their merchandise".

On the second, al-Maṣʿūdī, Muṣāf (ii, 93 = § 520), speaking of the Assyrian kings (aṭṭhiriyān) says that "the inhabitants of Nineveh (were) of those whom we have called Nabataeans (Nabat) and Syriac-speaking people (Surāniyyān); they are", he emphasises, "of the same race and they speak the same language". Speaking of the kings of Babylon (ii, 95 ff. = §§ 522 ff.), he says: "These are the Nabataeans (Nabat) and others, known by the name of Chaldeans (Kalāṃṣiyān)… It is they," he adds, "who erected the buildings, founded the cities, established the administrative divisions, dug the canals, planted the trees, sank the wells, worked the land" (ii, 100 = § 527). Further on, speaking of the Seleucids (Muṣāf al-Taʿawṣuʿī), he informs us that "the Ardashīr (the Artabanids, last kings of the Parthian dynasty) were kings of the Nabataeans (muṣāf al-Nabat); they reigned in Šām, from the vicinity of Kafr Ibn Hubayra, Ṣakīr l-Furāt, al-Djamiʿayn, Šūrā, Ahmad Abīṣād and Nars, as far as Ḥimmaḥab and Ṣall Fākhr and the whole of this region" (ii, 134 = § 558). It was Ardashīr I (226-41) who killed the last Parthian, Artaban IV (in 224), in a duel on the bank of the Tigris and seized his crown (ii, 135, 161 = §§ 539, 585). Al-Tabarī (i, 737-8), speaking of the Ardashīryānīyy, Seleucid kings, says that "they reigned between Najfar [q.v.] (the ancient Nippur), in the Saʿd, al-ʿIrāk, and al-Ubbula and the fringes of the desert. They were at war with the inhabitants of the plains, and as far as the region of Maswīl. These Aramaeans," he says, "are the Nabataeans of Saʿd al-ʿIrāk".

For Ibn Khaldūn, in his Muṣākīdīma, the Nabataeans were the native inhabitants of Mesopotamia before the Islamic conquest of ʿIrāq (1), (7). Assyrians, Babylonians and the Nabataeans are called Nabataeans (iii, 128); they were renowned for their magical practices (iii, 125) and for their expertise in agricultural matters, an expertise recorded in the K. al-Filāha al-nabatiyya (iii, 120). Speaking of their language, he says that it is the writing system of the Nabataeans and the Chaldeans (iii, 244 and 283).

This, then, is a summary of what was known by Arab historians concerning the Nabataeans. Besides the confusion between Nabataeans of ʿIrāq and Nabataeans of Šām, there was the confusion between Assyrians, Aramaeans, Ardashīrīs, Ğārānīs and Ninevites (Aṭṭhirīs), who are, according to al-Maṣʿūdī (K. al-Tanbih, tr. Carra de Vaux, Paris 1897, 131 ff.) Chaldean tribes. He speaks of Nabataean Chaldeans (127), of Aramaean Nabataeans (114) and of Nabataeans or Syrians (265), while acknowledging the antiquity of the Nabataeans who dominated Babylon (152).

Of this nation, certain reminiscences survive in folkloristic Arabic accounts. The author of the LA, mentioned above, collected several of them. For the ʿArabs, the Nabīt, Naḥaṭ or Aḥnāṭ constitute a nation (qift) inhabiting the Saʿd, the Saʿd al-ʿIrāk, i.e., the cultivated plains of Lower Mesopotamia, and the Marshes between the two (i.e., the two cities of Baṣra and Kuft). The denomination of Nabat does not necessarily indicate an ethnic origin; this may be deduced from the following saying of Ayyūb b. al-Ḥirīrīyya, "The inhabitants of ʿUmān are "Nabājīs" (iṣṭanābūta) Arabs and those of al-Baḥrān are "Arābis" (iṣṭanābūta) Nabataeans (Naḥīt). To become "Nabataean" was to practice agriculture and everything associated with it, in particular the quest for subterranean water, as opposed to the pastoral or military life. The caliph ʿUmar b. al-Ḥaṭṭāb is alleged to have said, "Become "Maʿaddites" (tamaʿadda) and not "Nabataeans" (lā tastaḥtanūba), in other words, "Imitate Maʿadd [q.v.] and not the Nabataeans", the meaning of this being "become nomads Bedouins, and not farmers". He is furthermore supposed to have said "Do not become city-dwellers (lā tanabbatū bi l-maṣād iyn)", in other words, "Imitate the Nabataeans neither in abode, nor in sedentary living, nor in possession [of land]".

Caravan trading also seems to have been one of the occupations of the Nabataeans; in fact, the remark is attributed to ʿAli: "Whosoever enquires into our genealogy [will find that] we are Nabataeans, originally from Kūthā (Yaḵūt, iv, 688; T. Fahd, Le panthéon, 215; on Kūthā (the homelands of Abraham), see ibid. and art. s.v.). The same origin is asserted by Ibn ʿAbbas, who says: "We, the Kurayshites, we are Nabataeans originally from Kūthā-Rabbā", the town where Abraham was born and where the Nabataeans lived (LA. loc. cit.).

Regarding the expertise of the Nabataeans in matters of commerce and the exploitation of the earth, an assessment made by ʿAmr b. Maʿṣūd Karbī, concerning Saʿd b. Aḥbāk ʿAbbās, in reply to a question posed by the caliph ʿUmar, gives an impression of this: "Arab in his talents (kihaṭwaṭīk), Nabataean in the levying of taxes (ḍiṭbaṭwaṭīk); meaning that he was as
skilful and as ingenious as the Nabataeans in such matters as the levying of taxes and exploitation of the land. The were, adds the author of the L.A. "the inhabitants of 'Irâk and its masters (arhabbâhâ)."

A forgotten nation, the Nabataeans of 'Irâk have returned to the attention of scholarship through the efforts of orientalists who, from E.M. Quatremère, in 1835, to M. Plessner in 1929, have applied themselves to study of the al-Fîlûbâ al-nabâtîya, an agricultural treatise of controversial origin (for the history of this dispute, see Ibn 'Awâlîyâh). The title of this compilation is not original; it was given to it by the translator, Ibn Wahshîyya, the former title having been 'Irfâ al-asr wa-islâh al-zar' wa 'l-šâ'dar wa 'l-ti'mâr wa-đîf al-âfût anhâh ("Book of cultivation of the land, the care of cereals, vegetables and crops, and their protection") in the body of the text, the name Nabât is used in the translator’s glosses: the themes in question are called, according to the manuscripts, Kaldâniyyûn, Kasdâniyyûn or Kardâniyyûn. The first of these names was applied to nomads related to the Aramaeans, the Kaldû, who dominated Lower Mesopotamia in the mid-9th century B.C. (cf. Dupont-Sommer, Les Araméens, Paris 1949, 24, 73). Thus on the ethnic level, Chaldaeans and Aramaeans are nearly distinguished. There are references in the manuscripts to "land of the Kaldû" and to "land of Aramû" (ibid., 76 and passim.). As for Kardaeans and Kasdaeans, these are probably dialectical modifications. Ancient nomenclature, compared with what has survived, shows many examples of this kind (cf. Melid for Maštîya, Gurgum for Qurmu'd; the inhabitants of the latter, the Qârâmîyû, are frequently mentioned in the K. al-Fîlûbâ). On this point, a useful reference is Le Témoignage, in Trois textes de la Jeanne de Rochefort sur le Proche-Orient et la Grèce antique, iv, Leiden 1977).

The book is written in "the ancient Syriac language" (al-surûyûnîya al-kadîma). Eastern Aramaic, which is the language in question here, was current "throughout Mesopotamia, from the mountains of Armenia to the Persian Gulf." It was established, at the outset of the Christian era, in literary texts and inscriptions, in three dialects: Judaco-Babylonian, Mandæan and Syriac (Dupont-Sommer, op. cit., 101; F. Rosenthal, An Aramaic handbook, Breslau 1967, i, 1–2 and ii, 1–2). The basic text of the book, developed and embellished by the three compilers (Sağrî, Yanbûghî and Kuthâmâ) must have been written in Syriac; originally it would have consisted of long extracts, intermingled in some cases and arranged consecutively in others, from quoted auctores. It may be added that Syriac, the language of Edessa, an intellectual metropolis situated within the great loop of the Euphrates not far from the ancient Kharan (Harrân), in a region Aramaised since the end of the second millennium B.C., had been promoted from the status of a dialect to that of a classical language in the Church of Edessa, and later in the Christian communities of Mesopotamia and Syria. It served as the vehicle for an immense corpus of literature, most of it as yet unpublished. The origin of Syriac was in one of those "eastern" Aramaic dialects spoken by the Aramaeans of Mesopotamia.

Finally, let us glance at the religious concepts and magical data revealed in this work in the course of long digressions. These data represent only a minute proportion of the whole, but their impact was so great throughout the Middle Ages that the K. al-Fîlûbâ was considered a treatise on magic and classified as such. An Andalusian author, Ibn al-Rûkîkî, purged it of all religious and magical references and another, the P.-Madjîritî, used the same data in his well-known work entitled Châyû al-khadîm (ed. H. Ritter, Leipzig 1933), translated into Latin under the title Picatrix (ed. M. Plessner, London 1962).

As for the particular character of this material, it may be deduced that the central principle is a variety of solar "theology", where the Moon appears sometimes as subordinate to the Sun, sometimes as an independent divinity. "In fact, sometimes the Sun appears as a unique source of knowledge and revelation, and the other planets, in particular the Moon (as 'god' of fertility) and Saturn (as 'god' of agriculture) serve as intermediaries between him and mankind, sometimes each of the seven planets reveals directly to mankind the knowledge that relates to its own domain" (cf. T. Fahd, Donnees religieuses de l'Agriculture nabatéenne, in ZDMG, Suppl., iii, i (1977), 362–6). We therefore see that in the Picatrix the name of the plant displays a pivotal role, a theology with three levels: rational level (logos), civic level (nomos) and mythic level (mythos), a division of theological knowledge which characterises the end of paganism (cf. P. Hadot, La fin du paganism, in Histoire des Religions, ii, Paris 1972, 81 ff.). Three major socio-religious groups, clearly defined and differentiated by doctrinal and social disagreements, are opposed on the topic of these "messages" granted astral revelatory disagreements concern the origin, the nature and the modalities of the inspiration (wushû) of Adam (see details in our article mentioned above). For the Messians, disciples of Mâsa al-Sûrânî, a "sophist", a native of Sûrâ and a landowner, like Kûthânâmâ, whose writings are quoted extensively in the K. al-Fîlûbâ, it was Jupiter who made revelations to Adam. If it could be established that the context in which this compilation was composed was that of Babylonian gnosis, the sectarian group involved would be that of the "followers of Messos to whom, with Seth (the Allalonge), Nico- theus, Zostrian and Zoroaster, certain sectarians, such as Adelphius and Aquilinus, opposed by Porphyry and Amelius, attributed revelations" (cf. J. Doresse, "Eschatologie Gnostique de Michel Lapidaire", Bruxelles 1903). For the Kukaeans, known from the Syriac authors, whose leader was Kûthânâmâ, author of the third edition of the K. al-Fîlûbâ, a Kasdaean born at Sûrâ and a major landowner, and for the Sethians, disciples of Seth, son of Adam, well-known to historians of gnosticism, it is the revelations made to Adam by the Moon and conveyed in the "Books of Adam" which form the basis of their anti-revelatory disagreements concern the origin, the nature and the modalities of the inspiration of Adam (see details in our article mentioned above). For the Messians, disciples of Mâsa al-Sûrânî, a "sophist", a native of Sûrâ and a landowner, like Kûthânâmâ, whose writings are quoted extensively in the K. al-Fîlûbâ, it was Jupiter who made revelations to Adam. If it could be established that the context in which this compilation was composed was that of Babylonian gnosis, the sectarian group involved would be that of the "followers of Messos to whom, with Seth (the Allalonge), Nico- theus, Zostrian and Zoroaster, certain sectarians, such as Adelphius and Aquilinus, opposed by Porphyry and Amelius, attributed revelations" (cf. J. Doresse, "Eschatologie Gnostique de Michel Lapidaire", Bruxelles 1903). Historically, Sethians, Kukaeans and Messians flourished in Mesopotamia during the 2nd century A.D., a period shortly preceding the transfer of power from the hands of the Arsacids to those of the Sânâsîd. It is not impossible that this is the political change to which reference is made in the K. al-Fîlûbâ, disguised by the fictitious allusions to Kasdaeans and Cannaïtes. It may be concluded from this that the work was compiled in an environment where Hellenistic and Egyptian theology had a tendency to survive. There is, furthermore, no involvement here of either Judaism or Christianity. The last great upsurge of paganism in 'Irâk was that inspired by Julian the Apostate (d. in Mesopotamia in 363 A.D.). From Apollonius of Tyana (d. 97 A.D.) to Julian the
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Apostate, by way of Philostratus (d. 247), author of the legendary Life of Apollonius, paganism enjoyed numerous revivals, especially with the Harranians.

Bibliography: Besides the sources and studies mentioned in the text, see, in particular, for the latter section: T. Fahd, Matériaux pour l'histoire de l'Agriculture en Irak: al-Fi'ilāḥ-nabatiyya, in Handbuch der Orientalistik, 1, 6, 6/1: Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Vorderen Orient in islamischer Zeit, Leiden-Cologne 1977, 176-377 (cf. 376, for a list of our studies devoted to this work); idem, Données religieuses de l'Agriculture nabatéenne, in ZDMG, Suppl. iii, 1 (1977), 362-6. See also J.M. Fiey, Les Nabati de Kaskar-Wäsit dans les premier siècles de l'Islam, in MUSÜ, ii (1990), 51-87. (T. FAHD)

NABATI (a.), the name given to the popular vernacular poetry of Arabia. Opinions differ regarding its origin and nomenclature. One view is that it is the direct descendant of Classical Arabic but termed Nabati to indicate that it does not conform strictly to the rules of literary Arabic. Another view, one hardly to be taken seriously, holds that Nabati poetry is older than Classical Arabic, was colloquial in origin, and flourished under the dynasty of al-Anbät, i.e., the Nabataeans, who ruled in Petra until 105 A.D. and who were said to be originally nomads from the Mecca area. Although the term is very much in use, al-shīr al-nabati constituted until recently an unbroken link with a poetic tradition created by the particular socio-economic and linguistic conditions of tribal central Arabia, in which poetry had a political as well as a social function. The poet incited his listeners to war by the power of his verse and shaped their conduct by it. Nabati poetry: the oral poetry of Arabia, especially with the Harranians. A number of revivals, especially with the Harranians, has witnessed some disapprovingly, he recorded that Abu Muhammad al-Anbati, whose poetry was well-suited to mobilise public opinion, since it was the most popular medium of expression and the most effective channel of communication. The increasing isolation of Arabia after the early period of Islam led to the development and—in the eyes of most mediaeval Arab scholars—the "corruption" of this vernacular poetic variety away from literary Arabic. However, in spite of linguistic differences, Nabati poetry and Classical Arabic poetry share many prosodic, thematic, and functional similarities. In the 19th century, early (although unreliable) compilations of Nabati poetry appeared, edited by Western orientalists; but it was not until the mid-20th century that definitive collections were published by al-Farajî (1952) and al-Hātam (1968), the former being based on the notebooks of devotees of this type of poetry at the court of King 'Abd al-'Azīz Ibn Sa'ūd.

Nabati poetry varies in length from a few lines to 100 or more verses which are divided into two hemistichs, metrically identical but each having a different rhyme. Transmission was not entirely oral, since by no means all Nabati poets were illiterate and some drew deliberately from the Classical tradition in order to enrich their own vernacular compositions.

Since the 1970s, Nabati poetry has witnessed something of a revival, being the subject of a Saudi Arabian television series Min al-Bīda and many poems have been saved from extinction by the tape-recorder. There has also been renewed interest in Nabati poetry in Arab Gulf states, where it may coexist with other indigenous forms of popular poetry.


NABHAN, the name of a tribe in 'Umān, whose tribes are divided into independent fakhdh (sing. fakhdt), with leaders generally denominated shaykh, each one considering himself independent of the others, and acknowledging no superior.

S.B. Miles reported in 1881 that 400 "Beni Nebhān", a Nabhāni (Ghaffīri) tribe, dwelt at Semālī (sic for Samālī), on the coast in 23° 18' N., 50° 30' E. They appear to have been of minor importance.

J.R.L. Carter gives a genealogy of Nabāhāni shaykhīn from the Banū Rīyan, exclusively from traditional oral sources, which he calls malik. Of these, Sulaymān b. Sulaymān was elected Imām, reigning as overlord for a short while. A shaykh and others were living in 1982.

Sirhan ibn Muhammad b. Sirhan (1728) describes a Nabhāni dynasty of rulers of 'Umān with the title of malik. They had an inland capital south of the Djabāl Akhdār, and reigned, says he, over an undefined territory from ca. 1100 until 1624, when they were extinguished by the Yaʿrubī dynasty [q.v.]. In 731/1330 (Miles) or 732/1331 (Hrbek), Ibn Battuta visited the then ruler, called Abū Muḥammad 'Ībād ibn Nebhān. He gives him the title sulān, and says that he was nearly 80 years old. Sirhan says he was called by this name, and was a Shaykh of all the tribes. The latter, however, he records that Abū Muḥammad was of the Ibādī madhab; and that from his capital at Nizwa [q.v.] he ruled over a number of coastal villages, including the port of Suḥār [q.v.], but that most of 'Umān was under the government of Humrūz. The Nabhāni court was very simple, and there was no chamberlain or vizier.

The Nabhāni dynasty of Pate [q.v.] in the Lamu archipelago of East Africa is stated in the traditional Barabi za Pate (History of Pate) to be an offshoot of the Nabhāni dynasty of 'Umān that fled when the Yaʿrubī dynasty extinguished that dynasty. This event took place in 1624, whereas the very full details that we possess of the dynasty of Pate claim that it was founded ca. 1200. A living senior representative of this Pate family regards the descent from the 'Umānī dynasty as unfounded in fact, and it would seem to be a separate fakhdt.

On Songo Mnara Island adjacent to Kilwa [q.v.], Sir Richard Burton reported a Nabhāni mosque decorated with Persian tiles. He states that his island was conquered by the Nabhānī, and that it is possible that this tradition is an echo of the claim in the traditional History of Pate that Sultan 'Umar the Great (ca. 1331-48) conquered the coast as far as Kilwa. The account reads, however, more like one of a raid than as a conquest, and for certain it was not consolidated. The name Nabhānī is still found in the Kilwa area, and the family may constitute a distinct fakhdt.

NABHAN — NABI
Miles, The countries and tribes of the Persian Gulf, 2
vols., London 1919; Sirhan b. Sacid b. Sirhan,
Annals of Oman, ed. and tr. E.G. Ross, repr. London 1984; and information kindly communicated in
Mombasa by Shaykh Ahmed Sheikh Mohamed
Nabhany.
(G.S.P. FREEMAN-GREENVILLE)
NABI, YUSUF, an important, highly renowned
O t t o m a n poet of the second half of the llth/17th
and beginning of the 12th/18th centuries.
He came from Urfa (Ruha, hence Ruha D i); on the
members of his family cf. M. Dirioz, Ndbi'nin dilesine
ddiryeni bilgiler, in Turk Kulturu, xiv, 167 (1976), 66873. From mentions in his writings, we know that he
was born in 1052/1642-3 and that he moved to Istanbul in his early twenties, i.e., during the reign of
sultan Mehemmed IV (1058-99/1648-87). In Istanbul
he enjoyed the patronage of Musahib Mustafa Pasha
(cf. SidjiU-i ^Othmdni, iv, 403-4), who appointed him
diwdn secretary. In 1089/1678-9 he made the
pigrimage, and upon his return Musahib Mustafa
Pasha made him his steward (ketkhuda). Following the
Pasha's death in 1097/1686, Nabi settled in Aleppo,
where he remained for about 25 years. In 1122/1710
Aleppo's governor Baltadji Mehmed Pasha [ q . v . ] , in
whose entourage he had been, was appointed grand
vizier for the second time, and he returned to Istanbul
with the Pasha. Here Nabi was first appointed head
of the mint office (darb-khdne emini), then of the
accounting office for Anatolia (Anadolu muhasebedjisi),
and lastly of the registration office for the particulars
and salaries of the Kaplkulu cavalry other than the
sipdhts and the sildhddrs (suwdri mukdbeledjisi). He died
on 3 Rablc I 1124/10 April 1712 and was buried at
Uskiidar in the Karadja Ahmed cemetery.
NabI shows great versatility as to subject matter
and style in his writings. He wrote both poetry and
prose. While some of his work is in more or less
straightforward Turkish, some of it is written in a
heavily Persianised manner. It can be said that Nabi's
prose is generally ornate, whilst his poetry is at least
in part composed in relatively plain language. It is his
philosophising, moralising tone and his didactic vein
that have secured a special position for him in the
Ottoman world of poetry. This disposition of his is
suitably reinforced by his mastery in the incorporation
of proverbs (irsdl-i methel). Nabi was immensely
popular for a long time, and the title of "king of
poets" was bestowed on him. Among his disciples we
find Sam! (d. 1146/1733-4), Rashid (d. 1147/1734-5),
Seyyid Wehbl (d. 1149/1736-7), and Kodja Raghib
Pasha (d. 1176/1763).
Nabi's poetical works comprise: (1) His extensive
Turkish Diwdn, renowned especially for its ghazeh
which dominate in number and in importance.
Lyricism, however, is not their strong point; they are
characterised by a relatively unadorned language and
a sententious style. The ghazels are in alphabetical
order, with a rubd^T heading each new letter. Nabi's
Diwdn has been printed twice: in Bulak in 1257 and
in Istanbul in 1292. (2) His Persians diwdnce containing about 50 poems (ghazel and takhmis). (3) Khayriyye
is Nabi's most famous work. He composed this
methnewim Aleppo in 1113/1701-2 for his son Abu '1Khayr. It is a book of advice (nasihat-ndme) from father
to son meant as a guide to life. It is composed in a
terse style and contains Nabi's reflections of an educational nature on all aspects of life. This is the work in
which his predilection for moralising and philosophising remarks is most in evidence. Khayriyye had great
popularity and impact; for example, Ibrahim Hakk!
of Erzurum (d. 1194/1780) quoted a number of its
beyts, albeit without mentioning their provenience, in
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his Ma^rifet-ndme (cf. 1. Pala, Erzurumlu Ibrahim
Hakki 'da Nabi tesiri, in Osmanh Arastirmalanl The Journal
of Ottoman Studies, x [1990], 195-209). Khayriyye was
printed both together with the Diwdn and separately
(e.g. Khayriyye-i Ndbi, Istanbul 1307). Cf. also Conseils
de Nabi Efendi d son fUs Abou 'l-Khair, publics en turc avec
la traduction franc,aise et des notes par M. Pavet de Courteille,
Paris 1857, as well as §air Nabi, Hayriye (hzl. L Pala),
shehzddegdn-l hadret-i sultan Mehemmed Ghdzi): This
methnewT of almost 600 verses is a description of the
festivities on the occasion of the circumcision of sultan
Mehemmed IV's sons in Edirne in 1086/1675. Its diction is clear and simple, and it is of some historic and
social interest. It was printed in Roman characters, cf.
A.S. Levend, Ndbi'nin Surndmesi, Istanbul 1944. (Its
only known ms. is in the Istanbul Universitesi
Kiituphanesi, Ty, no. 1774, Mecmua, margins of 40658a.) (5) Khayr-dbdd is Nabi's last methnewi (composed
in 1117/1705-6) and is not considered one of his more
successful works. It is a story of adventure and love in
a language laden with Arabic and Persian words. (6)
Terdjume-yi hadith-i erba^in: This is regarded as one of
the best translations into Turkish of Djami's [q.v.}
Hadith-i arba^in. It is in strophic form in relatively
plain Turkish, and the translation is not literal but
rather free. This work was printed for the first time in
Milli Tetebbu^ar Medjmu'asi, ii/4 (1331), 155 ff.
Nabi's prose works are: (7) Feth-ndme-yi Kamenice or
Tdrikh-i Wekdyi^-i Kamenice or simply Tdrikh-i
Kamenice. This is an account of the conquest in
1083/1672 of the fortress town Kamieniec in Podolia
(Kamenets Podolskiy; see KAMANICA). Nabi inserted
some verses into this feth-ndme, which he wrote upon
Musahib Mustafa Pasha's behest in his youth. It was
printed under the title Tdrikh-i Kamenice in Istanbul in
1281. (8) Tuhfet el-Haremeyn is an account of his
pilgrimage which he wrote a few years after
accomplishing it, that is in 1093/1682. He
interspersed the prose text, which is written in a rather
heavy style, with verses composed by himself and
others. This has been printed twice: Tuhfet elHaremeyn, n.p. [Istanbul] 1265 and Tuhfe, Istanbul
1288. (9) Dheyl-i Siyer-i Weysi: This is Nabi's continuation of WeysT's (d. 1037/1628) Siyer; it was printed at
Bulak in 1248. His style here is ornate. Nabi wrote a
second Dheyl after an interval of about twenty years:
Dheyl dheyl el-Ndbi. These two Dheyh are together in
some mss., separate in others. (10) Munshe^dt: This is
a collection of official and private letters and as such
not devoid of interest.
Bibliography (in addition to the titles cited
above): cAs°im, Dheyl-i Ziibdet el-esjfdr; Safayl,
Tedhkire; Salim, Tedhkire; Beligh, Nukhbet el-dthdr liDheyl-i Zubdet el-eshcdr; Sidjill-i C0thmdni, iv, 530-1;
^Qthmdnllmu^ellifleri, ii, 448-50; Hammer-Purgstall,
GOD, iv, 49-70; Gibb, HOP, iii, 325-48; F. Babinger, GOW, 237-9; A. Karahan, in L4, art. Nabi
(cf. for information on mss. of Nabi's works, as also
F. Babinger, GOW, 238-9, and idem, in El1 art.
Ndbi; on the printed copy of Tdrikh-i Kamenice cLJA,
i [1868], 471 ff); idem, NdbPnin el yazisi, imzasi,
muhril ve surndmesine ddir, in Istanbul Universitesi
Edebiyat Fakiiltesi Turk Dili ve Edebiyati Dergisi, ii
(1948), 133-40; idem, Nabi, hayati, sanati siirleri,
Istanbul 1953; idem, Islam turk edebiyatinda kirk hadis
toplama, tercume ve serhleri, Istanbul 1954, 230-2;
idem, Ndbi, Ankara 1987; M. Kaplan, Ndbi ve "orta
insan" tipi, in IUEFTDED, xi (1961), 25-44; M.
Mengi, Qagmin insani olarakNabi, in Omer Asim Aksoy
armagam, Ankara 1978, 177-84; idem, Divan siirinde
hikemi tarzm buyuk temsilcisi Ndbi, Ankara 1987; T.
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NABI DJIRIS [see djirjis].

NÂBI YÎNUS [see nainaw].

NABÎDH (A.), a comprehensive designation for intoxicating drinks, several kinds of which were produced in early Arabia, such as miyir (from barley), bit (from honey: al-Bukhârî, al-Dhohrî, bob; al-Hasânî, bob), maklûd, bob (from dates: al-Tanukhî, tr. M. âl-Dawâd, bob; al-Hasânî, bob). Later on, in some countries of the Islamic world, there has been a change of meaning. In today's Syria, for example, nabîd is used for any kind of intoxicating drinks, while in Egypt khâmîr and nábîd are used with the same meaning.

Side-by-side with milk and honey, nabîd was also a beverage that was offered to the pilgrims in Mecca. The institution of al-sikâya (also the name of the building, close to Zamzam, where the distribution took place), was an office held by the 'Abbâsî family (Abâd b. Hanbal, Musnad, 2, 372; Muslim, hadîj, trad. 437; Abû Dâwûd, Manâzik, bâb 90). The descriptions by Ibn Sa'd (d. 230/843) and al-Azraqi (d. 244/859) give the impression of referring to the present state of things; in the time of al-Mu'âdh (d. ca. 1000 A.D.) the institution had already passed into desuetude. For details, cf. Gaudenfrey-Demobymes, Plénerage.

There was a lively discussion among the fâkârâh as to whether the consuming of this kind of beverage is allowed or forbidden. One argument in favour of nabîd was put forward, for example, by the Mu'tazzî al-Djubâhî [q. v.], who argued that God has created things which resemble those things which were allowed in Paradise but are forbidden on earth. Among them is nabîd, which is allowed for the believers so that they can guess what khâmîr will be like in the hereafter (al-Tanukhî, tr. Margoliouth, Table talk, 1931, 575; for details on the legal discussion, see khâmîr and masjûrubât).

Nabîd, like khâmîr, was used to discredit certain individuals or groups. Thus the calligrapher Ibn al-Wahbî (647-711/1249-50 to 1312) was suspected of putting wine or nabîd in the ink which he used for copying the Kur'ân (Rosenthal, The herb, 154), or else there was a rumour about the Qarmatis, that among them nabîd was forbidden and wine allowed in order to underscore the antinomian character of this movement (Ibn al-Athîr, vii, 488).


E.G. AMBROS

NABIGHA AL-DHUBYANI

AL-NÂBI GHA AL-DHUBYANI, Ziyâd b. Mu'tâwîya (var. 'Amr) b. Dabâb b. Djaîbî (var. Djânbî) b. Yarîb' b. Salâmâ of the Banû Murra (Ghastafln), one of the most renowned poets of the Djaibîyya. With Imru'î al-Kays and Zuhayr [q. v.], he eclipsed the earlier poets (Ibn âl-Salâm, Tabakât, ed. Şâkir, i, 50, 56-9; Abu 'l-Bâkî' Hibát Allâh al-Hillî, al-Manâkit al-mazyâdîyya, Amman 1984, i, 172). The traditions relating to al-Nâbigha are concerned with a brief period of his life, confined to the years 570-600, and show the poet being received by the Ghassânî tribal chieftains at Djaibîa and subsequently by al-Nu'mân III at Hira. The rest is enveloped in total silence.

From the time of his arrival on the scene, at an unknown date but certainly prior to 580, he pleaded the cause of keeping the defeated 'Abâs within the fold of the Banû Ghâtafln and preventing at any price their migration and installation among the Banû 'Amîr, the consequences of which would be inauspicious (Dîwan, ed. Abu 'l-Fadîl Ibrâhim, Cairo 1985, xii, xvii, xxi; Castro, al-Murâdî, ii, 657); E. Landau-Tasseron, Ridda, 140-1 and n. 41-5, 149-50; U. al-Dusûkî, al-Nâbigha al-Dhubyani, Cairo 1956, 121-3). At a later date, he is seen calling upon his fellow-tribesmen, on numerous occasions, to renew their hîf (alliance) with the Asad (Banû Murra [q. v.]; see Dîwan, IV, V, XI, XXIII, XXXIX). In a very finely wrought kawûd, he states that the Asad have fought courageously to defend their Dhubyân allies (Dhubyân and Murra being interchangeable in ancient times) and to assure their glory (Dîwan, V; al-Baghdâdî, Khâtîrat al-adâb, ii, 132-8, v, 169; Dener- bourg, Nâbîga, in JA [Sept. 1868], 214-17). Furthermore, history has justified the poet in adopting these alliances, declared in the mid-6th century on Mount Khadîl, seems to have well served both economic interests, in guaranteeing the protection of zones of pasture and the palm-groves of Wâdî 'l-Kurû, and military interests since it enabled them to resist the expansionist aspirations of the Ghassânîs. The area of contention seems to have been Dhu Uqair, a fertile oasis full of water and salisbury grass (âmûdî), ideal for camels. This territory had belonged since time immemorial to the Banû Murra, but it was forcibly appropriated by the Ghassânîs who declared it a forbidden zone (Dîwan, title of IX; al-Hasan b. 'Abd Allâh al-Isâfâhî, Bilad al-'Arab, Riyâd 1388/1968, 73-81, 153-4, 400; Yâkût, Bukdân, s.v. Uqar; Denerbourg, op. cit., 211; Nödelke, The Princes of Ghasânî from the House of Djaibî, Beirut 1933, 42-3; cf. al- Mura, Banû, the last two references relating to the conquest of fertile lands formerly the property of the Banû al-Dhubân). This alliance, which proved its worth at Yâwâm al-Nisâr, seems to have entered into customary thought; the two tribes are habitually named the hîfûn or the ahîfî (al-Djaîbîhî, Hayawân, i, 362; E. Landau-Tasseron, Ridda, 100-33). However, certain reservations seem to have been evident among the Banû Murra in relation to this activity on the part of the poet, to such an extent that he found himself obligated to seek aid and protection from the 'Udgrî, his neighbours to the north (Dîwan, XIV, and title of XVI).

In the same period, he made his first visit to the
house of Djafla. Six poems dedicated to al-Nu'mân, the son of al-Harîth al-Nasîbî, survive (Dîwân, IV, IX, XIV, XIX, XXII, XXXII; Nôldeke, op. cit., 41-2). The first three represent a fine example of tribal poetry at its highest level: intercession for his fellow-tribesmen and reproofs are intermingled; moreover, the poet went so far as to warn al Nu'mân that his army would be defeated if he dared to attack the abîlîf (Dîwân, XIV). Among the three poems, which relate to specific circumstances, special mention should be made of the lament which he composed on the death of al-Nu'mân, considered a very fine specimen of the genre.

The death of the latter marks a turning-point in the life of al-Nâbigha, who seems to have understood that the dispute between Bantî Djafla and Dhubyân proceeded from a long-lasting geopolitical situation, and that it was thus impossible to bring about peace and harmony between the two parties. On the other hand, al Nu'mân III (who reigned at Hira from 580 to 602, see Lâkhmî) had inaugurated a new policy, abandoning the major confrontations of his predecessors with the Ghassânîs and supporting the tribes established to the north of the Nadjd with the object of embroiling his Syrian enemies in a guerilla war with the Bedouin [see LAKHMIDS]; al-Nâbigha was received as a distinguished poet. According to the sources, he became the intimate companion and poet laureate of the sovereign, at the expense of other poets who arrived in large numbers hoping to benefit from his patronage.

For a reason which remains obscure, the king decided to execute the poet. Various fanciful theories, which have hardly any foundation on either side, have been put forward, and almost all of them concern a scurrilous portrait of the queen al-Mutâdjarirra; Murra b. Kuraycî al-Tammî or al-Munâkkhal al-Yâkîrî [q. e.] are cited in turn as protagonists. Others mention a hîdâ against al Nu'mân, which is just as problematical since the identity of the author is not definitely known. He owed the saving of his life to the chamberlain 'Ibâm b. 'Abânî al-Dhârî, who adopted al-Nâbigha as his own and gave him a style and a manner as a distinguished poet. According to the sources, he became the intimate companion and poet laureate of the sovereign, at the expense of other poets who arrived in large numbers hoping to benefit from his patronage.

The Seven Odes; in RSO, iii, 27-36. Later, it might have been added by Ibn al-Nâhîâs on account of its superior quality (Khizanât al-Adab, iii, 186-7, iv, 5, viii, 450). The nuhâriyya, hybrid pieces containing a combination of excesses and panegyric, were particularly appreciated by ancient criticism (whence the judgment that attained the status of an aphorism: al-Nâbigha is the best of poets when he is gripped by panic, al-Abîhîni, vii, 77, xv, 97; Ibn Sa'id, Naqdât al-Tarîbî, ii, 567; Khizanât al-Adab, i, 175).

However, the essential genius is to be sought elsewhere: by virtue of his verbal imagination, the poet has raised the poems appropriate to circumstances, almost all of them concerning a scurrilous portrait of the queen al-Mutâdjarirra; Murra b. Kuraycî al-Tammî or al-Munâkkhal al-Yâkîrî [q. e.] are cited in turn as protagonists. Others mention a hîdâ against al Nu'mân, which is just as problematical since the identity of the author is not definitely known. He owed the saving of his life to the chamberlain 'Ibâm b. 'Abânî al-Dhârî, who adopted al-Nâbigha as his own and gave him a style and a manner as a distinguished poet. According to the sources, he became the intimate companion and poet laureate of the sovereign, at the expense of other poets who arrived in large numbers hoping to benefit from his patronage.

For a reason which remains obscure, the king decided to execute the poet. Various fanciful theories, which have hardly any foundation on either side, have been put forward, and almost all of them concern a scurrilous portrait of the queen al-Mutâdjarirra; Murra b. Kuraycî al-Tammî or al-Munâkkhal al-Yâkîrî [q. e.] are cited in turn as protagonists. Others mention a hîdâ against al Nu'mân, which is just as problematical since the identity of the author is not definitely known. He owed the saving of his life to the chamberlain 'Ibâm b. 'Abânî al-Dhârî, who adopted al-Nâbigha as his own and gave him a style and a manner as a distinguished poet. According to the sources, he became the intimate companion and poet laureate of the sovereign, at the expense of other poets who arrived in large numbers hoping to benefit from his patronage.
The generosity of al-Nu’man IV, the sovereign is compared with the Euphrates. A description, which stands in a purely hypothetical relationship to reality, transports the hearer towards an impressive rolling river with enormous waves; like a skilled painter, the poet then introduces a human element, the mariners and their embarkation and a series of dialectical contrasts between the power of the river/king and the weakness of the men/mariners, the grandiose opposed to the limited and the imperturbable opposed to the fearful. This passage (three verses, 44-6) establishes the symbol and gives it a problematical poetic genre, which is not in itself certain. This method is one to which al-Nabigha frequently returns; in his address to the Banū Ḥunn, the clan of Udāra, the description of the date-palms, symbolising the power of the tribe, is drawn on the same register (Diwdn, XIV, 5-7). The same applies to his impasioned appeal for the preservation of the Asad-Dhubyan alliance (Diwdn, V); here he presents two very expressive imaginary tableaux, the Banū Ghādir (Asad) embroiled in warfare, their women abandoned as if they had been impure (verses 14-20), and the bucolic tableau of the horses of al-Rumayḥa (verses 24-6). Finally, in more than one instance, in addresses to his fellow-tribesmen, he readily sketches hypothetical scenes in which their women-folk, taken captive, would be subjected to the beat of his own drum: the arrangements required for the slaughter of the wild bull at bay and the dramatic tension inherent in descriptions of the wild bull at bay and the grandiose opposed to the limited is transformed into mafṣīl (Diwdn, LIV, 1), a procedure condemned by scholars.

Moreover, this should all be kept in proportion, and these are merely the minor sorelisms of a poet confident in his talent. This faḥl poet set his seal on classical poetry for many centuries. The greatest poets were influenced by his art (al-ʿAskari, Sināʿat al-ḥiyal, 203-4, 242, 252-3; Bagdādi, Abū Nuwās and Ibn al-Rūmī took inspiration from his poetry; al-Baghādī, Khīzānāt al-adab, iv, 289-92); in this context, a special place belongs to al-Mutanabbi, who mentions him by name in his poems and imitates him in several instances (Ps.-al-ʿUkbārī, al-Tibydn, Cairo 1355/1956, iv, 55-6; see also, i, 25, 22, 110, 287, 299, ii, 255).


(A. ARAZI)
of repartee and his youth having probably pleased the Prophet, the latter blessed him... xv. 
[18x296]for combatting the Muctazila, and the different points in their doctrine, sc. the created KurDan, a refusal to which listed the fdiiha of repartee and his youth having probably pleased the xv [1934], 383-4). They (Diwdn, Khurasan, have been presented in his Diwdn, of the journey). Certain episodes of this stay there, bear witness to the influence of the desert and the place the contests in on the famous Mirbad [q.v.] of Basra. Al-Nabigha is Makdl [q.v.] of Basra. Al-Nabigha is
(Diwdn, Hidjdja 36-Safar 37/656-7) the Banu Dja da (on al-Nabigha's invective, see c
(Arriy; Layla intervened, and the quarrel got even worse, Ibn al-Nadim a section in Ibn al-Nadim a section in Fihrist, ed. Cairo, c
Khalil Abu Dhiyab, c 
This author be-
ndbitat al-hashwiyya, [see DJABRIYYA] and to the


Between 63 and 65/683 and 684-5, he gave his allegiance, not without reluctance, to 'Abd Allâh b. al-Zubâyr. After Mar'dj Râhi [q.v.], the poet made himself the defender of the Kays supplanted by the Kalb or Yemenites. The policy of reconciling and appeasing tribal conflicts followed by 'Abd al-Malik caused a change of tone in al-Nabigha, and he now preached harmony between the two groups (Diwdan, no. I, 20-7, with reference to the Di'idziyiâd b. al-Asbåh, who had vainly tried to make peace between 'Ali and Mu'awiyah). His last years were spent in Khurâsân in relative tranquillity, and he died there in 79/698-9.

Al-Nabigha al-Dja'dî's poetry does not seem to have been the subject of an independent recension; the various râwiyât of the 2nd-3rd/8th-9th centuries seem to have been collected together in the work of Abû 'Amr al-Shaybânî (d. 203/820), the K. Bani Da'dî. The present edition of Maria Nallino is an excellent reconstitution from all points of view (the edition of 'Abd al-'Azîz Rabâh, Damascus 1964, brings nothing new, and simply reproduces Nallino's edition). It is very hard to estimate the quality of his poetry and his conception of the ka'sîha. However, in regard to his themes, one can discern a profound influence from Labîd [q.v.], notably in the confronta-

This last author be-

The vocabulary of recollection frequently recurs in his poems; he recalls his carefree youth, the baccachi gatherings, his lives and the encampments of his tribe, the dates, the raids where he has suffered danger.

Between 63 and 65/683 and 684-5, he gave his allegiance, not without reluctance, to 'Abd Allâh b. al-Zubâyr. After Mar'dj Râhi [q.v.], the poet made himself the defender of the Kays supplanted by the Kalb or Yemenites. The policy of reconciling and appeasing tribal conflicts followed by 'Abd al-Malik caused a change of tone in al-Nabigha, and he now preached harmony between the two groups (Diwdan, no. I, 20-7, with reference to the Di'idziyiâd b. al-Asbåh, who had vainly tried to make peace between 'Ali and Mu'awiyah). His last years were spent in Khurâsân in relative tranquillity, and he died there in 79/698-9.
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anathematise tyrants, taaj_wir (the attribution to God of evil actions as well as good ones), and sometimes djabriyya) (Mukhtalif al-hadith, § 108-9). Because of their predilection for the Umayyads, there is a tendency to link the Nabata with the Uthmaniyya, but these last, like the Nabata, rejected the dynasty founded by Mu'awiyah and, through that, those of his two predecessors (cf. Lecomte, Ibn Qutayha, Paris 1965, p. XXIII, 336-41, who appears to follow F. Goldziher in Mabartha (Mamortha) in Pliny and Holscher, i.e. "crossing", to the low saddle ma). Uthmaniyya, but these last, like the djabriyya" (Mukhtalif al-hadith, § 96, tr. G. Lecomte, §§ 3). According to Eusebius, the place where the old town stood was pointed out in a suburb of Neapolis. The correctness of this identification of the site of Shechem has now been completely proved by Sellin's works where it figures, from the time of al-Djahiz onwards; see his Firdabi's funny flora: al-nawdbit as 'opposition', in Arabic, xxxvi (1990), 56-90. (CH. PELLAT)

NABOB [see NAWBAH].

NABLUSU, a town in central Palestine, the name of which is derived from that of Flavia Neapolis built in honour of Vespasian. Its Old Testament predecessor was Shechem, which however lay more to the east on the site of the present village of Balāṭa (the name is explained by S. Klein, in ZDPV, xxxvi, 38-9; cf. R. Hartmann, in ibid., xxxiii, 175-6, as "platanus", from the evidence of the pilgrim of Bordeaux and the Mundabk gen. rb., c. 81, § 3). According to Eusebius, the place where the old town stood was pointed out in a suburb of Neapolis. The correctness of this identification of the site of Shechem has now been completely proved by Sellin's excavations; and this also explains how the old name did not as usual drive out the late Greek one. In the time of the Arab writers, the name Shechem was long forgotten and what they tell us refers to Neapolis-Nabulus.

Nabulus is in a long valley (running form east to west) formed by two chains of hills, on the south side Garizim, Arabic Djabal al-Tur or al-Kibli (2,900 feet high), on the north side Ebal, Arabic Djabal Isalamiyya or al-Shamali (3,140 feet high). G. Höschler (ZDPV, xxxiii, 98) refers the older name of Neapolis, Mabarthu (Mamortha) in Pliny and Josephus, i.e. "crossing", ma'bartha, to the low saddle running right across the valley. The town with its 22 springs is unusually rich in water, which can be heard running everywhere and produces a very luxuriant vegetation. Where the road from the south turns westwards into the valley there is a well with the ruins of a church. Unanimous tradition since the 4th century A.D. locates here Jacob's well, and it is undoubtedly the same as is mentioned in John, iv, 5. About a thousand yards to the north is a building where tradition locates Joseph's grave. In the post-Christian period, Shechem belonged to the territory of the mixed people of the Samaritans, whose capital it became after they had built on the hill of Garizim (the Samaritan text of Deut., xxvii, 5, has this name instead of Ebal) a temple as a rival to that of Jerusalem. They were continually at strife with the Jews, and in the end John Hyrcanus in 129 B.C. destroyed Shechem and its temple. At a later date, this always turbulent people were equally hostile to the Romans, which caused Vespasian to attack them on Garizim, when a large number were slain. Christianitv gradually spread in the country and Neapolis now lay more to the east on the site of the present church there. They wrought still greater havoc in the time of Justinian, who punished them with great severity and destroyed their synagogues while he rebuilt the churches. This finally broke their spirit; many of them fled to Persia while others became Christians. Their part had been played out by the time that Nabulus, with many other towns, fell into the hands of the Muslims. The notices of the Arab authors about the town are very scanty. They know that it was inhabited by Samaritans [see SAMIRIYYA] and some add that, according to the Jews, they are found nowhere else; but it should be noted that al-Baladhuri, Firdabi, 158, speaks of Samaritans in Filastin and Urdunn. Al-Ya'kubi mentions the well of Jacob where the Samaritans to Garizim where they sacrificed lambs. The Muslims had a fine mosque in the town, where the Kurgan was recited day and night. Accord-
ing to Khalil al-Zahiri (d. 872/1467), the area included 300 villages. During the Ottoman period, and till the time of the appearance of the Egyptian commander Ibrahim b. Muhammad from Tulkarm eastwards into the hills via Mas'udiyya to Nablus.

Nablus has always been a strongly Muslim town, with many Jews and Christians and a very small community of Samaritans (161 in the 1931 census), and from the 1930s onwards became a centre of resistance to Jewish immigration into Palestine; it was there in 1936 that the first “Arab National Committee” was founded in the wake of the communal violence at that time. Until 1931, Nablus had been a flourishing centre of olive-oil pressing and the manufacture of olive-oil soap, but the export of this soap was hit by Egyptian protective tariffs and the rise of an indigenous Egyptian soap-making industry.


(N. Buhl—C. E. Bosworth)

NADHIR (‘A., pl. nudjîr, Kur‘ân, LIII, 57, from form IV of n-dh-r, with the meaning of warner; sometimes also as a verbal noun, e.g. LXVII, 17. The plural nudjûr is also found in the sense of an infinitive, e.g. LXXVII, 6. The term occurs frequently in the Sacred Book, where it is even said to be synonymous with ra‘îl; its opposite is baqîr, mubâqîr. Nadîr as well as baqîr are applied to the prophets, the former when they are represented as warriors, the latter as announcers of good tidings (cf. XVII, 106; XXV, 58; XXXIII, 44; XLVIII, 8; mubâqîr wa-‘aw-nadîr). As an epithet it is used especially in connection with Noah, the great warner before the Deluge, and with Muhammad himself who thereby receives the stamp of a second Noah (cf. XXVI, 115; L, 51; LXXI, 2, with XXIX, 49; XXXV, 21; XXXVIII, 70; LXVII, 26). Sometimes the Kur‘ân insists on the fact of Muhammad being only a warner (sûra XLVI, 8), or his being the first warner who was sent to his people (XXVIII, 46; XXXIV, 43).

The term is found in kardh from the apart common use, known from the Kur‘ân, in the curious expression al-nadîr al-‘arîm (Bukhârî, Rîdîk, kâb 26; Fâsunam, bâb 2; Muslim, Fadîl, trad. 16) with which Muham- mad denounces himself when he says: “Myself and my mission are like a man who went to some people saying: I have seen the army (of the enemy) with my own eyes, and the enemy has thrown his sword...”. Several anecdotal stories are told by the commentators in explanation of this expression. It is also said, by some of them, that in early Arabia, a man who saw an approaching danger stripped himself of his clothes and wound them around his head in order to warn his tribespeople. The meaning “Nazirite”, which in several dic- tionaries is given to the term nadîr, in the first place does not occur in the Kur‘ân, nor in kadhdh, nor in Lisan al-‘Arab nor in Tâd al-‘arâ‘û, it is however, used in translations of the Bible.

Bibliography: Lisan al-‘Arab, vii, 54 ff.; Tâd al-‘arâ‘û, iii, 561-2; Ibn al-Athîr, Nihâyâ, iv, 136; Kastallâni, ix, 305; Nawawî’s commentary on Muslim’s Sahîh, Cairo 1283, v, 71.

(N. A. Wensink)

NADHIR AHMAD DIHLAWI (Mawlûl/Deputy) (1856-1912), Urdu prose writer, is often described as “the first real novelist” in the language. But this description presupposes that by “novels” we mean fiction dealing with contemporary social themes, more or less following Western models (for fiction prior to Nadhir Ahmad, and that on other themes, see kiis 2. In Urdu. The same article provides information on five of Nadhir Ahmad’s novels).

He was born in a village of Bidjawar district, not far from Dhilli, of an impoverished and improvident farmer, who also tried to prevent him from studying English. The family moved to Dhilli where, at the age of nine, he was admitted to a madrasa attached to a mosque. He had to support himself by begging and working as a servant. In 1847, an injury that he sustained in a brawl outside Dhilli College brought him to the attention of the Principal, who was so impressed by him that he gave him a scholarship to study there. Nadhir Ahmad left in 1854, and began his working life as a teacher in the Panjâb. It would appear that his early success in his career stemmed, in part, from the gratitude of the British authorities for his “support”. During the Mutiny (1858) he saved the life of an English lady, and he was appointed Deputy Inspector of Schools at Allâhâbâd. He had already begun teaching himself English, and made such progress that he was appointed to translate into Urdu first the Income Tax Regulations (1861), and then the Indian Penal Code. His career thus changed from education to finance, and in 1867 he was appointed Deputy Collector of Settlements. In 1877 he was invited to Hyderabad, and earned a high salary as a member of the State Revenue Board. He retired on pension in 1883, and returned to Dhilli, where he remained till his death.

Nadhir Ahmad’s work as a translator has enhanced his command of language, and his literary works indicate an extensive Urdu vocabulary, including many Persian, and more especially Arabic, words. At the same time, the efforts he had made in mastering English must have commended him to British government officials. This in its turn encouraged his work as a novelist, though it was only a part-time occupation; seven novels spread over more than twenty years hardly constitute a large output.

His first novel, Mîrû‘at al-‘arsû (1869), was written for his daughters, as he was struck by the lack of Urdu educational material suitable for Muslim girls. Its theme is the aptitude of girls for marriage, two sisters being contrasted. The manuscript was seen by the British Director of Public Instruction for the North
eastern Provinces, with the result that it was published with the support of the Indian Government, and became not only a text book but also a best-seller. Equally successful was his third novel, Tawbat al-
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The term nadhr is associated with the root which is also
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obtain good fortune in a particular respect. The promise to dedicate an animal when the herd had reached the number of a hundred (op. cit.) had an effect on the prosperity of the animals because the word anticipated the fact. According to the story, 'Abd al-Muttalib similarly dedicated a son to be slain beside the Ka'ba if he should have ten sons and they grew up (Ibn Higham, 97-8) but for his nadhr 100 camels were substituted.—A childless woman could also vow if she had a son to dedicate him to the sanctuary (ibid., 76; perhaps this story is a literary borrowing). According to the hadith of Maymuna bint Kardam, her father promised to sacrifice 50 sheep if he had a son (Yahjah, 1, 754; 'Abd al-Dawud, Aydm, b8 19; Ibn Madja, Kaf-

Ordinary sacred duties such as participation in the ordinary ceremonies and alms were recovered (al-Azraki, 123, 8 ff.). Escape from every difficulty was sought by a nadhr. During a battle, a camel used to be dedicated as a sacrifice (al-Wakidi-Wellhausen, 39). The traveller in the desert used to make a vow on account of the danger (see the verse in Lane and Sdnn al-Abn, s.v.). In distress at sea one promised offerings to God or a saint or vowed to do something oneself, such as fasting (sura X, 23, XXIX, 65; 'Abd al-Dawud, Aydm, b8 20; see also Goldzihler, Malay Stud., ii, 511). During a drought 'Umar vowed to taste neither samm (i.e. ghee), nor milk nor meat till the rain fell (al-Tabari, i, 2573, 12 l.).

Even if a sacrifice were promised, the vow also affected the person concerned, as we see from the fact that he had his hair shorn not only on the head, so that the ajandba is not removed (Aghdni, vii, 149, 2141, xiii, 69, 266; Ibn Hisham, 543, 980; al-Bukhari, 54; al-Bukhari, b8 125); for the cutting of the hair ended, as in the case of the Israeliite Nazirite, the state of consecration. The vow therefore had always more or less the character of a self-

dedication. This aspect was often quite prominent. Ordinary sacred duties such as participation in the hadith were assumed as a consecration by nadhr (sura XXII, 30) at which special obligations were assumed, e.g. to go to the sanctuary on foot, or barefooted (al-

The isolation had the definite object of spiritual concentration and strengthening the soul and thereby influencing the deity. Abstinence was therefore practised in preparation for great deeds, especially in war. The Arabs 'touched no perfume, married no woman, drank no wine and avoided all pleasures when they were seeking vengeance, until they attained it' (Hammusa, 447, v. 5 schol.); avoidance of wine (Hammusa, 237, v. 4 ff.) and women (Kitab al-Aghdni, xv, 161, 154) is specially mentioned. These abstentions like the hadii rites and the istikaf are also the objects of a nadhr. The form of this vow is for example "wine and women are haram to me until I have slain 100 Asadis" (Aghdni, viii, 68, 625). A definite term may be fixed, such as drinking no wine for 30 days in order to obtain vengeance (Kays b. al-Kaftim, ed. Kowalski, iv, 28). Forms of abstaining are not to eat the meat, not to wash the head, so that the ginsah is not recovered (Aghdni, ix, 149, 2141, xiii, 69, 626; Ibn Higham, 543, 980;
Hudhailitenlieder, ed. Wellhausen, no. 189), not to anoint oneself (al-Wakidi-Wellhausen, 201). Refraining from meat, wine, ointment, washing and sexual intercourse are mentioned by ‘Umar (Ager, 21, 84; Ibn Kayy al-Rukayyat, 52, 5). After a wish has been fulfilled a vow of gratitude may also be taken (al-Wakidi, 290).

The consecration placed the person making the vow in connection with the divine powers, the nadhr was an 'ahd (sura IX, 76, XXXIII, 27 XLVIII, 10), whereby he pledged himself. A neglect of the nadhr was a sin against the deity (Imru’ al-Kays, 51, 10). The sacred obligation of living made this a nadhr or (synonymous) nahr, which one should fulfil (kada), instead of wandering aimlessly (sura XXXIII, 23; al-Wakidi, 120; Labid, 41, 1; Kumayt, Hájímníyyát, ed. Horovitz, 4, 48). The importance of the binding pledge gradually becomes more prominent (cf. LÍsan al-Árab, where nadhara is explained by acqáda, incorrectly Amá’yyát, 7, 2); the emphasis on the material dedication gradually became less. The abstinent motivations receive their importance on the one hand from works meritorious to the deity, on the other from the unpleas- ant deprivations, by which the person taking the vow disciplines himself. Both points of view are seen in the examples quoted. The releasing of slaves or divorcing of wives often form the subject of a kind of vow by which a man pledges himself under certain condi- tions. A man may also vow to sacrifice all his camels or (synonymous) s. v.) nadhara (nadhr al-ladjaaj, wa... As the title of Kádi denotes, his ancestors were judges in the Muslim administration. His father, a lover of Persian and Bengali poetry, died while Nadhr al-Islám was only eight years old. He had a miserable childhood, which explains why he was nicknamed Míshá Míshá ("this unhap- py life"). He had his primary education in the village maktab, reading Kur’Án, Arabic and Persian, and taught there for a year. He then joined the village Leí (fokm drama) group for about three or four years, composing songs and plays. Thereafter, he moved to the nearby town of Asansól and worked there at a bread shop. His talents attracted the attention of a Muslim police of- ficer, who got him admitted to the high school in his village in the district of Mymensingh, now in Bangladesh; a year later, he moved to study in Burd- wán. Before he could appear for the matriculation ex- aminations, he joined the army in 1917 at the age of 18, influenced by one of his teachers who was a member of the revolutionary Dúngarant Party. The idea was that the military training thus acquired could be used later in the anti-British struggle. He was posted at Karachi as part of the 49th Bengali Regi- ment with a rank of havildar (sergeant) quarter- master.

Nadhr al-Islám, Kádi, Kazi Nazrul Islam, (1899-1976), revolutionary Bengali poet, and the greatest Muslim contributor to modern Bengali literature. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún of Curúhlí, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún of Curúhlí, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1899 to Kádi Pa’kr Ahmad and Záhida Káhiún, a village in the district of Burdwan in present-day India. He was born on 24 May 1919 issue of the Calcutta journal Bangiya Sahitya Parishad (Bengali Literary Academy). His first short story in print,
Bhanduler Atamkatha ("Autobiography of a vagabond"), believed to be his own story, was also published the same year by a Calcutta Muslim journal, Shariat's Rubāʾiyāt into Bengali. These were published in various magazines and later completed and collected as Rubāʾiyāt-i Ḥafṣa (Calcutta 1930). He continued this interest into the 1930s and translated the Rubāʾiyāt of ʿUmar Khayyām, published in book form in 1960.

With the end of the First World War, Nadhr al-Islām's regiment was disbanded in March 1920. He returned to live in Calcutta and became closely associated with the BMSS, where his friends persuaded him not to seek government employment but to promote his literary potentialities. It was a time of great turmoil with the Non-Cooperation and Khalifat movements raging in India against the British colonial rule. The BMSS's Muẓaffar Ahmad, later founder of the first Communist Party in India, proved a vital factor with which Nadhr al-Islām strongly associated. The first poet of awowedly Communist inspiration in Bengal, if not in India. He soon took to political journalism and joined in July 1920 a daily evening paper, Nawa Djug published in various magazines and later completed and collected as Rubāʾiyāt-i Ḥafṣa (Calcutta 1930). He continued this interest into the 1930s and translated the Rubāʾiyāt of ʿUmar Khayyām, published in book form in 1960.
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with it ended his apparent atheism. Henceforth, his work was marked by a new seriousness and sadness. He became increasingly preoccupied with dubious Tântâvic (Nasrî orthodoxy) practices, learning to establish communion with Bulbul. In the later phase of his life, a return to Islam is visible, with repentence and a confession of sinfulness. He also started to write a biography of the Prophet in verse. This incomplete work was later published as Marû Bhâskar ("Moon of the desert") (Calcutta 1957).

Nadhr al-Islam returned to political journalism in 1940 when Nawa Djug was re-published, again with him as its editor. In the same year, his wife was paralysed and remained so until her death in 1964. Soon he too was totally crippled on 9 July 1942 by an incurable brain disease. Despite local and foreign medical attention, he never recovered from his semi-conscious condition. He received great recognition and tributes during his lifetime. In 1945 he was granted by the Calcutta University the Djugatari Medal, until then the greatest Bengali literary award. The governments of West Bengal and Pakistan (Bangladesh since 1971) granted him special pensions. In 1976 he was moved to Dhâkâ, where he died on 29 August of the same year and was buried with full state honours in the Dhâkâ University campus.

Nadhr al-Islam is generally placed next only to Rabindranath Tagore in modern Bengali literature. He was fond of using Urdu and Persian words in his poems and writings, and introduced ghazal into Bengali in 1926. He also started the translation of the Kur'ân into Bengali verse, but the work was never completed. His translation of the last (30th) part of the Kur'ân was published as Kasuya 'amm pârhâ (Calcutta 1935). For all his multi-faceted contributions, Nadhr al-Islam is generally placed next only to Rabindranath Tagore in modern Bengali literature. He had great command over rhyme and metre, using Arabic and Persian ones as well as inventing new ones. The basic theme of his poetry was to arouse people to struggle for the freedom of their country and recover their rights, but he had no coherent philosophy to offer. As he said in his "explanation" (Amâr kafsaat, 1926) he was "a poet of the present, not the prophet of the future".

His translated Nadhr al-Islam works were poetry, prose, short stories, novels, songs, plays, books for children as well as the translations mentioned above. The national bibliography of Indian literature, 1901-53 (ed. Kesavan and Kulkarni, New Delhi 1962, i, 94, 120, 193, 220) lists 35 works by him, but the National Library of India at Calcutta has on its shelves 77 of his works without taking reprints into account. Several attempts have been made to collect Nadhr al-Islam's works; the biggest collection, apparently incomplete, is Nadhrul rananâdashi (Dhâkâ 1984).


(Encyclopedia of Islam, VII)
Arazi, contains more than 90 references to *nadim* and mediaeval Arabic literature (which includes, among other literary forms, a special branch of anthologies devoted to drinking, feasting and pleasure; see Bib.) supply an etymological explanation according to which the term *nadim* (pl. *nadam*, *nudam*, *nudan*; sing. *nadman* and pl. *nadmans* are also encountered) would be derived from the verb *nadima* "to regret". Writers (e.g., Kushâdîm, *Adab al-nadim*, ed. Cairo, 3; al-Kayrawânî, *Muhâjir min kath al-sawîr*, 136; and the bibliographical sources noted above) disagree as to the reason for this "regret"; does the friend of the *nadim*, or his master, regret the fact that the convivial experience, enjoyed in the company of the *nadim*, must come to an end, or, on the contrary, does the *nadim* regret indiscretions, of deed or of word, which he has committed while in a state of intoxication? This disagreement reveals the artificial nature of the false etymology proposed by mediaeval authors. The *nadim* already appears in accounts relating to the pre-Islamic period, such as the account concerning al-Farkhâdîn, the two *nadmans* (nudmans) of the Arab prince Dshadhima al-Abraš [q.v.]. His court, situated at Hira, was dominated and influenced by that of the Sassanids. However, the style and the vocabulary of these Arabic accounts are the handiwork of writers of the Islamic period. These texts may be of assistance in clarifying the meaning of the word (see Bib.), but do not supply an etymological explanation according to etymology proposed by mediaeval authors. The *naddm*, *nudalm*, *nudmdn*; which the term *dakara*, *muqdara*, *musdmara* refer to the activities (which also resemble *kadr*, having the same or almost the same sense), meaning "the bottom of a glass or a cup"; the activity in question would thus consist of draining the cup to the dregs. *Muqdara*, in the sense of a meal taken with friends, is explained, however, as deriving from the ancient Arab custom of competing in generosity with rivals, all members being of the same tribe. Each, in turn, attempts to outdo the others in slaughtering camels (by cutting the veins of the lower limbs) and distributing the meat to the people of the tribe. *Muqdara* thus possesses two senses at once: eating and drinking, in other words, a meal and wine. But the question then arises as to why there should be two different etymologies for the two senses. It is evident that the explanation linking *muqdara* with a competition of some sort is very revealing as to the initial sense which is likewise concealed in the custom of *munaddama*; this sense will be elucidated below.

The concept of *munaddama*, for its part, also in fact retains the mutual aspect and the competitive spirit of the activity. Certain rules concerning the etiquette of the *nadim* bear indirect witness to the primal importance of the competitive spirit in this occupation. The rules forbid a *nadim* to leave indirect witness to the primal importance of the competitive spirit in this occupation. The rules forbid a *nadim* to leave after an uneven number. It cannot be doubted that the authors dealing with this subject (see, e.g., Ibn al-Mu'tazz, *Fusâl al-tamâghi*, Cairo 1925, 71) have not succeeded in perceiving the significance of this evidence which they copy or reformulate in terms of the code of etiquette. The explanation which they propose is insufficient: "so that he (i.e., the *nadim*) should leave a remainder..." as if the uneven number is incomplete and thus encourages the *nadim* to return to his "superior" and resume the feast. What we have in fact is an important leap in the evolution of etiquette which presents, at the same time, an anthropological aspect. It is permissible to compete in generosity with "equal" (nadir) friend, of the same social class, in a drinking session. But this is not allowed with the sovereign who is the "superior" of the drinking companion. Even in the court, an archaic notion of competition has been preserved: in the past (long before the Islamic period, apparently), the first glass was reckoned to be the gift of the "superior", the second to be provided by his companion, the third to be a gift of the "superior", etc. But, according to an unstated rule, it is always appropriate to let the king win in this supposed competition (to all appearances, the totality of drinks served comes from the king's cellars). It is for this reason that all those who wish to leave must do so after the "uneven number"..

A similar code of etiquette is found in the Bible, in the Book of Judges (4, 6), which seems to it to the Persian court of the Achæmenids. Here there are three types of behaviour appropriate to a feast: (a) drinking in free fashion (the text does not specify what this means; it emerges from the presence of the two following possibilities), probably in reference to feasts held on other occasions, or by other groups, outside the royal court; (b) drinking under obligation, because the king imposes it (Hebrew: onîs = "one who forces"), with the aim of preventing those invited from drinking each to his own taste; and (c) drinking according to the code, according to some custom (= *kad-daft*, an expression which has given rise to various interpretations, in ancient and mediaeval translations and commentaries). This possibility finds expression in certain limits which occupy an intermediate position between total liberty and constraint. Obviously, there are no exact parallels to be established between the ancient Persian court, described in the Bible, and that of the Abbâsid caliphs (influenced, besides, by the Sassanid Persian kings, as will be seen in the course of this article), in the Islamic Middle Ages. However, there is a certain similarity to be noted between the two royal courts.

The rules of conduct observed by the *nadim* symbolise, at least in part, the evolution of ceremonial in the courts of Muslim sovereigns. The commensal is in effect a special case of the more general concept of "companion of the sovereign" (gâshib al-sulâm, i.e., one who belongs to the entourage and plays a role in the service of the sovereign). The diverse activities, political intrigues and secrets associated with this occupation have been minutely described by Ibn al-Mu'âkifâ, at the dawn of the development of Arabic literature (cf. M. Inostraznov, *Iranian influence*, F. Gabrieli, in RSO, xi, 292-305; Ch. Pellat (tr.), *Couronne*, Introd., 8-10). Mediaeval readers were enabled to discover some traits characteristic of Sasanid ceremonial in certain sources such as the *Tagâ* ("Book of the Crown") attributed to al-Djâhâbîz and the "Meadows of Gold" (Munîq) of al-Mas'ûdi, which reflect the ambience in Muslim courts, as well as the Persian precedent (cf. Ch. Pellat, *Empire Sassanides*, idem, L'Iran sous les Sassanides, Sadan, in *Studies in memory of Gaston Wiet*, 138-9). Certain advice
given in the text of the above-mentioned book of pseudo-Djahiz, and especially in Kushadjim's book (for example 27-8, giving detailed instructions as to how and in the company of whom one may wash one's hands), is formulated in a fashion which suggests that the rules of the Persian court were not followed, in the 'Abbāsid period, with absolute rigour. However, in courts situated to the east of the 'Abbāsid empire, there is evidence of a more pedantic tendency in this respect (see Sadan, in REI, liv, 295, 299: an episode at the Sāmānid court).

The fact that the Sāmānid code served as a model for the etiquette of the commensal is clearly attested by a series of instructions addressed to the royal nadīm. While stressing the danger which attends the occupation of the nadīm, these teachings instruct him to combine opposing qualities and patterns of behaviour: serenity and gaiety, or 'the respectable behaviour of old men with the joy (manah, which alternates in the texts with mizd = humour) or urchins'. A drinking companion who is unable to decide, on the basis of the gestures and reactions of his master during the munādana, which quality would be appropriate to a given situation, risks his life (al-Mas'ūdī, Murūdī, ii, 155-6 = § 380; Kushādīm, op. cit., 7-8 (cf. addenda, supplied by I. 'Abbas, in ʿAbd Ardāshīr, 94-5); al-Kayrawānī, Kāb al-surūr, (incomplete Damascus edition), 209; ibid., 'Abd al-Muḥīt min Kāb al-surūr, 136; anon., 'Abd al-muḥīt ʿalā ṣawwēs, m. L. Or. 5314, fol. 2b; anon., Nasāḥ al-ṣābīk, ms. Cairo, Taymuʻriyya, Adab-152, fol. 95b). The Arab authors, with the exception of al-Mas'ūdī, do not mention the source of these instructions, which is the ʿAbd Ardāshīr, bequeathed to Arab culture by Persian literature. It is impossible to know how many other fragments of the Persian code are cited by Arab authors in such a way that their origin cannot be identified. Furthermore, even when the sources reflect the courtly life of the Muslim era, they describe customs influenced by the Persian heritage (see D. Sourdel, in REI, xxvii, 121-48; only M. Canard, in his magisterial study of comparative ceramic in Byzantron, xxi, 355-420, further stresses the Byzantine influence on the Fāṭimid court; but when he wrote this, Canard lacked additional detailed sources concerning the ʿAbbāsid ceremonial which influenced the Fātimids. Certainly, their court riddled that of their adversaries, the ʿAbbāsids, in its sumptuous conditions; nevertheless, in an earlier period, among the Umayyads, the Byzantine influence is discernible (see O. Grabar, in Studies in memory of Gaston Wiet, 51-60).

Ibn al-Muʿtazz (loc. cit.) indicates that the role of the nadīm is exceedingly complicated, and he declares his intention of tackling the subject elsewhere (in another work, unknown to bibliographers, which must have been composed specifically for this purpose). Al-Ǧuzūlī, Maṭātī, i, 182, and al-Nawādī, Ḥalba, 25-6, cite a variant version of these remarks of Ibn al-Muʿtazz and continue to describe in detail the rules of conduct of the nadīm, as if they were conversant with this lost work. However, it is quite reasonable to see here a later blending of instructions belonging to the code of conduct of commensals, which these two authors have found elsewhere and which they quote (without indicating the title of their common source), immediately after the remarks of Ibn al-Muʿtazz.

The rules of conduct which the nadīm must observe envisage all situations which are liable to arise in the court and in the homes of wealthy people. The Arabic sources advise him to show good taste and perfect cleanliness. He should perfume himself, clean his teeth, purify his breath by chewing aromatic herbs, take good care of his clothing (including undergarments), conform to the rules of politeness and observe the rules of good manners as determining the etiquette of the table. The rules of this code are shown by al-Ǧuzūlī, op. cit., 180: according to his rank = murātba; knowledge of the arrangement of seats in hierarchical terms was a firm requirement; cf. Sadan, in REI, xl, 51-70), as well as the manner of sitting, posture, drinking (always in moderation; see al-Nawādī, loc. cit.; al-Ǧuzūlī, loc. cit.; Sadan, in Studies in memory of Gaston Wiet, 258-66, 271) and conversation. He must observe the table manners during the meal (al-Ǧuzūlī, Buhkalā, ed. Ḥājdī, 67-8, 76-7, speaks of table manners known in a certain class of the Persian aristocracy, the dāhkān, but not observed by the purely Arab aristocracy, aḥi al-hayūṭāt (cf. H. Kindermann, Sitten, 1964, passim; see also Al-Ǧaḥfī, ʿAbd al-akl, Beirut 1986; Al-Ǧaḥzī, ʿAbd al-maṣʿūdak, Rabat 1984; Ibn Tūlūn, K. al-Walīʾīm, Damascus 1987). It is thus appropriate that the nadīm should be one of the zarīfis (the 'refined ones' described by al-Waṣāḥā in al-Muʿwaṣṣilā; cf. M. Ghazi, in Sl, xi, 40-41; M. Berge, ʿAbi Ḥayyān al-Tuwāḥīdī, Damascus 1979, 55-6), but it cannot be deduced from this that every zarīf is necessarily a nadīm; munādana often consists of muʿṭāna (— maintaining the friendship of somebody, participating in a reunion of friends), muḥālās (— being seated in the company of some person, or in the company of friends) muṣāmāra (— keeping company, at night, with one or more friends, telling them stories), muḥābā (— playing with somebody at chess, etc.) and muṣāmāla (— accompanying, on horseback, some person setting out for the hunt, or on a journey; see al-Mas'ūdī, Murūdī, vii, 108 ff. = §§ 2791 ff., for a summary of the rules). In mediaeval courts, it was most often the case that poets, ʿadīm (men of letters), singers (Ibrāhīm al-Mawṣūli and his son Ithāk) and even grammarians (al-ʿAṣmaʿī) belonged to the entourage and played the role of nadīm, ḏgāt, etc. This latter had to have a repertoire of captivating stories and amusing anecdotes, for the purpose of entertaining his master. Furthermore, it is preferable that he be a man of letters, or a scholar, and that he possess poetic and artistic talents. All in all, the activities of the nadīm reflect the ambience prevailing in the courts and literary circles of the Islamic Middle Ages and colour in, at least in part, the image of the muḥādārāt (gatherings in the course of which the participants converse and exchange information, quotations and stories) of oral adāb [b. v.].

NADIM — NADIR

Sadan, in Studies in memory of Gaston Wiet, Jerusalem 1977, 129-60; idem, in REI, xl, 51-70; idem, ... fortnight, help from the Mundfikun was not forthcoming, and when the Muslims began to cut down their palms the Banu 'l-

Mahrusa, and Mukhtdrdt li-^Abd Allah went to Palestine, but in 1892 was pardoned by the he spent years in hiding. In 1891 he was arrested and writing entire articles in colloquial Arabic. After the own satirical paper, and then l-Tabkit, al-Tankirt wa-tal-iyyat al-Arabiyya al-Islamiyya in 1881. As a result of poetry. With his brother death. Many of his works have been lost, including his Alexandria, and he studied at the mosque of Shykh Ibrâhim Paşa. Running away from there, he worked as a telegraph officer in Banâh, and then later at the residence of the mother of the Khedive Ismâîl in Cairo. While in the capital he followed courses at al-Azhar, and met the leading literati. On his dismissal, he pursued various occupations in the Delta, spending years as an itinerant versifier (udabdti), entertaining village notables, earning the epithet of nadim, "boon companion." On returning to Alexandria in 1879, he participated in the secret political society Djam'iyyat Misr al-Fatat/Union de la Jeunesse Egyptienne, a group of young intellectuals challenging Riyâd Paşa's authoritarian government; but not long afterwards he left it to found a more open charitable society, al-Djam'iyya al-Khayriyya al-Islamiyya in 1879. As head of its school he wrote two plays: al-'Arab or al-Nu'mân, and al-Watan wa-tal-iyyat al-ta'asîfi in colloquial. He was forced to leave the school in 1881, allegedly at the instigation of Riyâd. He contributed, in the main anonymously, to several newspapers, Hikmat al-Akbâr, Misr, al-Madrasa, and al-'Asr al-Quddus, the last three belonging to Salîm al-Nâkîkh, and founded in 1881 his own satirical paper, al-Tankîr wa 'l-Tabkit, and then al-Tâbî'î, that became before and during the revolt the organ of the 'Urâbîists [see urâbi paşa], for whom he had been an early and popular campaigner. He pioneered a new, less heavily ornamented style of prose in his newspapers, and ventured as far as writing entire articles in colloquial Arabic. After the collapse of the revolt, accused with others of responsibility through his speeches for inciting the massacre of 11 June in Alexandria, of calling for rebellion, and of participating in the burning of the city on 11 July, he spent years in hiding. In 1891 he was arrested and then released on condition that he leave Egypt. He went to Palestine, but in 1892 was pardoned by the Khedive 'Abbâs II. Returning to Egypt, he founded the satirical magazine al-Una'âd (1892-93), opposing the British occupation. Exiled again to Jaffa and then Istanbul, Sultan 'Abd al-Hamîd II [q. v.] thought to silence him with a sincere, appointing him to the Education Ministry, and then inspector of publications until his death. Various selections from his works have been published: Majma'at muhdwardt fukdhiyya, Alexandria n.d.; Kâna wa-yâkunâ, Cairo 1892, 1926; Alexandria 1883; Sulâfât al-nadim fi munkhabdât al-Sayyid 'Abd al-Nâdîm al-Nadîm, Cairo 1896, n.d. (1897)-1901, 1914 (with a biography by Ahmad Samir, 3-23); Makâliât 'Abd al-Nâdîm al-Nadîm, Cairo 1909 and Mukhâfârât li-'Abd al-Nâdîm al-Nadîm, Alexandria 1911. al-Musâmîr, n. p. (Cairo) n.d., a violent satire lampooning the Sultan's advisor Abu 'l-Hudâ al-Sayyîd, was published after his death. Many of his works have been lost, including his three diwâns of poetry. With his brother 'Abd al-

Fatâh al-Nadîm he published Tahât'a sanîya bi 'l- qâfrî al-riyâdîyya, Cairo 1910. His zagâl [q. v.], unsurpassed by his contemporaries, was innovative, inspired as it was by his political fervour.


NADIM, AHMAD [see nadin, ahmed].

NADIR [see nazir al-samt].

NADIR, BANU 'L- one of the two main Jewish tribes of Medina, settled in Yathrib from Palestine at an unknown date, as a consequence of Roman pressure after the Jewish wars. Al-Yâkûbî (ii, 49) says they were a section of the Djudhâm Arabs, converted to Judaism and first settled on Mount al-Nadîr, whence their name; according to the Sûra Halâshîyya (Cairo, iii, 2) they were a truly Jewish tribe, connected with the Jews of Khaybar [q. v.]. This seems the more probable, but a certain admixture of Arab blood is possible; like the other Jews of Medina, they bore Arabic names, but kept aloof from the Arabs, spoke a peculiar dialect, and had enriched themselves with agriculture, money-lending, trade in armour and jewels.

They were clients of the Aws, siding with them in their conflicts with the Khazrajî, and entering with them into the compact with Muhammad known as the Constitution of Medina in 1 A.H. Their most important chief at this time was Huwayy b. Aqîth, whose daughter Safiyya became Muhammad's wife in 7 A.H. For a list of Muhammad's worst enemies among the Banu 'l-Nadîr, see Ibn Hisâm, Sûra, 351-2.

Their fortresses were half a day's march from Medina, and the only large Arab savages, Banu Hânîf and Buwayyât, whose dwelling places were south of the city. The Banû 'l-Nadîr seem to have been in (commercial?) relations with Abû Sufîyân before the battle of Uhud. In 4 Rabi' I, owing to difficulties about the Banû 'l-Nadîr's contribution to a certain payment of blood-money which was being collected from the whole Muslim community in Medina, Muhammad, who had personally negotiated the matter with their chiefs, became convinced of their enmity towards himself and suspected them of intending to kill him. He decided to get rid of such dangerous neighbours, and ordered them through Muhammad b. Maslama al-Awsî to leave the city within ten days, under penalty of death, allowing them to take with them all their movable goods, and to return each year to gather the produce of their palm-groves.

The tribe, having no hope of help from the Aws, agreed to leave, but 'Abd al-Mâlik b. Ubayy al-Khazrajî, chief of the Munafîkîn [q. v.], persuaded them to resist in their fortresses, promising to send 2,000 men to their aid. Huwayy b. Aqîth, hoping the Banû Kurayza [q. v.] would also help them, prepared to resist, in the face of opposition from moderate elements in the tribe.

The siege lasted about a fortnight, help from the Munafîkîn was not forthcoming, and when the Muslims began to cut down their palms the Banû 'l-

Nadir surrendered. Muhammad's conditions were much harder than formerly; their immovable property was forfeited, and nothing left to them but what they could take away on camels, arms also captured. After two days' bargaining, the tribe departed with a caravan of 600 camels; some went to Syria, others to Khaybar.

The Banu 'l-Nadir's booty Muhammad did not divide in the usual manner; the land was distributed among the Muhammadin, so as to relieve the Ansar of their maintenance; part of it the Prophet kept for himself.

Sarat al-Hašr (LIX) was revealed upon the expulsion of the Banu 'l-Nadir.

From Khaybar, the exiles planned with the Kuryaš the siege of Medina in Dhū l-Ka‘da 5/April 627. The treasure of the Banu 'l-Nadir was captured by Muhammad in Khaybar in 7 A.H.

Bibliography: Caetani, Annali dell'Islam, 1.A.M., §38, 39, 58; 4 A.M., §10-14; Ibn Hisham, Sīra, 652-61; Noldeke, Geschichte des Qorans, i, 153; Yākūt, Baldun, i, 662-3, 756; Wensinck, Mohammed en de Joden te Medina, 22, 33 ff., 156 ff.; R. Leszynski, Die Juden in Abythien, Berlin 1910; see also the general biographies of Muhammad.

(N. VACCA)

NADIR SHAH AFŠAR, ruler of Persia (1735-1747).

Nadir (or Nadir-kułi) Beg was born in Mumarram 1100/November 688 into an undistinguished family of the Kirklu (Kirkhlu) clan of the Afšar Turkoman tribe, at Dastgird in northern Khurasan, during the seasonal migration to winter pastures in Darra Gaz district. As a youth, Nadir joined the retinue of Bābā ʿAlī Beg Kusā-Ahmadlū, governor of Abīward, who gave him successively two daughters in marriage (one bore his eldest son Rida-kul-T, and the other Nasr Khan); he was peremptorily dismissed many of Tahmasb's governors, and in the anarchy that followed the invasion of Persia by the Ghulay Afghān, Nadir entered the service of Malik Mahmūd of Sīstān, who had occupied Mashhad. After various intrigues with chief- tains of the Afšar and Dājūlary Turkomans, Nadir formed his own band of raiders and, in alliance with the latter, occupied Herat; on 1 Ramadan 1144/27 February 1729 Nadir subdued the Abdalis, taking some chiefs prisoner, at Dastgird in northern Khurasan, during the occupation of Persia by the Ghulay Afghān, Nadir entered the service of Malik Mahmūd of Sīstān, who had occupied Mashhad. After various intrigues with chief- tains of the Afšar and Dājūlary Turkomans, Nadir formed his own band of raiders and, in alliance with the latter, occupied Herat; on 1 Ramadan 1144/27 February 1729 Nadir subdued the Abdalis, taking some chiefs prisoner, at Dastgird in northern Khurasan, during the occupation of Persia by the Ghulay Afghān, Nadir entered the service of Malik Mahmūd of Sīstān, who had occupied Mashhad. After various intrigues with chief- tains of the Afšar and Dājūlary Turkomans, Nadir formed his own band of raiders and, in alliance with the latter, occupied Herat; on 1 Ramadan 1144/27 February 1729 Nadir subdued the Abdalis, taking some chiefs prisoner, at Dastgird in northern Khurasan, during the occupation of Persia by the Ghulay Afghān, Nadir entered the service of Malik Mahmūd of Sīstān, who had occupied Mashhad. After various intrigues with chief- tains of the Afšar and Dājūlary Turkomans, Nadir formed his own band of raiders and, in alliance with the latter, occupied Herat; on 1 Ramadan 1144/27 February 1729 Nadir subdued the Abdalis, taking some chiefs prisoner, at Dastgird in northern Khurasan, during the occupation of Persia by the Ghulay Afghān, Nadir entered the service of Malik Mahmūd of Sīstān, who had occupied Mashhad. After various intrigues with chief- tains of the Afšar and Dājūlary Turkomans, Nadir formed his own band of raiders and, in alliance with the latter, occupied Herat; on 1 Ramadan 1144/27 February 1729 Nadir subdued the Abdalis, taking some chiefs prisoner, at Dastgird in northern Khurasan, during the occupation of Persia by the Ghulay Afghān, Nadir entered the service of Malik Mahmūd of Sīstān, who had occupied Mashhad. After various intrigues with chief- tains of the Afšar and Dājūlary Turkomans, Nadir formed his own band of raiders and, in alliance with the latter, occupied Herat; on 1 Ramadan 1144/27 February 1729 Nadir subdued the Abdalis, taking some chiefs prisoner, at Dastgird in northern Khurasan, during the occupation of Persia by the Ghulay Afghān, Nadir entered the service of Malik Mahmūd of Sīstān, who had occupied Mashhad. After various intrigues with chief- tains of the Afšar and Dājūlary Turkomans, Nadir formed his own band of raiders and, in alliance with the latter, occupied Herat; on 1 Ramadan 1144/27 February 1729 Nadir subdued the Abdalis, taking some chiefs prisoner, at Dastgird in northern Khurasan, during the occupation of Persia by the Ghulay Afghān, Nadir entered the service of Malik Mahmūd of Sīstān, who had occupied Mashhad. After various intrigues with chief- tains of the Afšar and Dājūlary Turkomans, Nadir formed his own band of raiders and, in alliance with the latter, occupied Herat; on 1 Ramadan 1144/27 February 1729 Nadir subdued the Abdalis, taking some chiefs prisoner, at Dastgird in northern Khurasan, during the occupation of Persia by the Ghulay Afghān, Nadir entered the service of Malik Mahmūd of Sīstān, who had occupied Mashhad. After various intrigues with chief- tains of the Afšar and Dājūlary Turkomans, Nadir formed his own band of raiders and, in alliance with the latter, occupied Herat; on 1 Ramadan 1144/27 February 1729 Nadir subdued the Abdalis, taking some chiefs prisoner, at Dastgird in northern Khurasan, during the occupation of Persia by the Ghulay Afghān, Nadir entered the service of Malik Mahmūd of Sīstān, who had occupied Mashhad. After various intrigues with chief- tains of the Afšar and Dājūlary Turkomans, Nadir formed his own band of raiders and, in alliance with the latter, occupied Herat; on 1 Ramadan 1144/27 February 1729 Nadir subdued the Abdalis, taking some chiefs prisoner, at Dastgird in northern Khurasan, during the occupation of Persia by the Ghulay Afghān, Nadir entered the service of Malik Mahmūd of Sīstān, who had occupied Mashhad. After various intrigues with chief- tains of the Afšar and Dājūlary Turkomans, Nadir formed his own band of raiders and, in alliance with the latter, occupied Herat; on 1 Ramadan 1144/27 February 1729 Nadir subdued the Abdalis, taking some chiefs prisoner, at Dastgird in northern Khurasan, during the occupation of Persia by the Ghulay Afghān, Nadir entered the service of Malik Mahmūd of Sīstān, who had occupied Mashhad. After various intrigues with chief- tains of the Afšar and Dājūlary Turkomans, Nadir formed his own band of raiders and, in alliance with the latter, occupied Herat; on 1 Ramadan 1144/27 February 1729 Nadir subdued the Abdalis, taking some chiefs prisoner, at Dastgird in northern Khurasan, during the occupation of Persia by the Ghulay Afghān, Nadir entered the service of Malik Mahmūd of Sīstān, who had occupied Mashhad. After various intrigues with chief- tains of the Afšar and Dājūlary Turkomans, Nadir formed his own band of raiders and, in alliance with the latter, occupied Herat; on 1 Ramadan 1144/27 February 1729 Nadir subdued the Abdalis, taking some chiefs prisoner, at Dastgird in northern Khurasan, during the occupation of Persia by the Ghulay Afghān, Nadir entered the service of Malik Mahmūd of Sīstān, who had occupied Mashhad. After various intrigues with chief- tains of the Afšar and Dājūlary Turkomans, Nadir formed his own band of raiders and, in alliance with the latter, occupied Herat; on 1 Ramadan 1144/27 February 1729 Nadir subdued the Abdalis, taking some chiefs prisoner, at Dastgird in northern Khurasan, during the occupation of Persia by the Ghulay Afghān, Nadir entered the service of Malik Mahmūd of Sīstān, who had occupied Mashhad. After various intrigues with chief- tain
Istanbul and St. Petersburg in quick succession. Each power was determined not to relinquish its foothold in northwestern Persia until the others had first withdrawn. The Ottoman envoy was informed that no peace was possible until Armenia, Georgia and Adharbáiyán were retroceded; the Russian delegate, Prince S.D. Golitsyn, was promised a mutual alliance against Turkey, and accompanied Nadir on his next campaign. Nadir began with an attack on an Ottoman vassal, Surkháy, the Gházi-Kumúk governor of Shirwán. After occupying Shamsháhil, Nadir pursed Surkháy into his mountain fastnesses and destroyed Kumúk; he received the submission of Kháṣṣ Fúdál Kháñ, the former Khámhál of Tarikhán, and restored him in that office. In November 1734 Nadir laid siege to Gandjá, assisted by Russian engineers and artillery. The fortress held out for over eight months, until after Nadir’s defeat of a relief force under ‘Abd Alláh Págá Kópúrlážáde on 27 Muḥarrám 1148/19 June 1735 at Bagháhárd, near Erivan. Tiflis also surrendered on 12 August, and Erivan on 3 October, after Ahmed Pásha (appointed as successor to ‘Abd Alláh) sued for peace. Nadir accordingly raised his siege of the Ottoman frontier fortress of Kýrás and proceeded personally to settle affairs at Tiflis, the capital of the Christian Georgian kingdom of Kátheti-Kártli, which had been the Safawí state’s most important vassal and buffer in the region. There he departed radically from Safawí precedent in appointing as governor the Muslim ʿAlí Mirzá, nephew of King Taymuráz II, with Saʿfí Kháñ Bugháyír and a Persian garrison as watchdogs. Taymuráz fled to Circassia; later he was reinstated, and his son Irákli accompanied Nadir on his Indian expedition.

Already on 10 March (21 N.S.) 1735 Nadir had signed the Treaty of Gandjá with Russia, whereby he agreed to a defensive alliance and the Empress Anna undertook to return Darband and Bákú to Persia. Though Nadir refused to sign a treaty with Turkey unless Russia was also included, it was now evident that his recent campaigns had secured Russia from the threat of a Turkish advance to the Caspian and had freed Persia from both these menaces. Káplan Gíráy, the kásh of the Crimea, who on orders from Isfáhan had followed Nadir to the site of his camp, this success marks the completion of Nadir’s irredentist and essentially conservative campaigns to restore the territorial extent of the Safawí empire. His army reinforced with Abdáll and Qhálázay recruits, he now embarked on an invasion of India. Kábúl, Djalálábáb and Pesháwar fell before the end of the year, and Lahore on 23 January 1740. Nadir’s seventeen-year-old son Riḍá-kúl Mirzá was sent back to Mággháb as viceroy of Persia. The Mughál emperor Muhammad Sháh [q.v.] had by now gathered an army reportedly of 300,000 men with 2,000 elephants and artillery at Karnál, seventy-five miles from Delhi. On 15 Dhu al-‘Hijjádat 1152/15 February 1739, the Persians decisively defeated this force. Muhammad Sháh, after a ceremonial luncheon with the victor (which followed the traditional etiquette of the Safawí and Mughál courts, the conversation being conducted in Turkish), was escorted to Díhlí. Here the shába was read and coins were struck in Nadir’s name. On 15 Dhu al-‘Hijjádat 1152/26 March a rumour spread that Nadir had been assassinated and in a popular uprising thousands of Persian soldiers were massacred. The next day Nadir ordered a general massacre and sack of all quarters where his men had been attacked, in which perhaps 20,000 Díhlí citizens perished.

Twelve days later, Nasr Alláh Mirzá was married to a Mughál princess. At a grand darbár on 3 Safár 1152/12 May, Nadir and his rival and apparent vassal at the courts, the king of Hindústán, in return for which all lands west of the Indus were ceded to Persia. Nadir exacted an enormous sum as reparations (at least 700,000,000 rupees in cash and kind, including the Peacock Throne [see tárkh-i táwús] and the Kháh nú diamón [q.v.]), and declared a three-year tax amnesty in Persia. A week later Nadir’s army with its huge baggage-train left Díhlí for Kábúl. After a detour south into the desert to chastise the rebellious Kusdávár Kháñ, ruler of Sind, they reached Nádirábád on 7 Safár 1153/4 May 1740, having lost several thousand men and a quarter of the booty in crossing the swollen Ċenáb and Kurrum rivers.

During Nadir’s campaigns south of the Hindu Kush, Riḍá-kúl Mirzá had extended his father’s realms in Bálkh and the steppes south of the Oxus. This had provoked threats from Ilbárs Kháñ of Khár̄arám, whom Nadir resolved to punish on his way back. Arriving at Herat on 10 June, he crossed the Oxus at Cárdgyú late in August, by means of boats specially constructed by Indian shipwrights. Abu ‘l-Fáydí Kháñ of BHárárás rested in vain; Nadir reinstated him as ruler, while annexing all lands south of the Oxus. With reinforcements of Osbégés and Turkomans, Nadir set off in October 1740 for Kháwá, the army and fleet proceeding parallel along the Oxus. The city and several other fortresses were bombardèd into submission, and Ilbár Kháñ was put to death. At
least 12,000 Persians (and ten Russians) were liberated from slavery. On 10 December Nadir left Khwarazm and reached Mashhad at the end of January 1741. Refusing to retreat to the western fronts. During Nadir’s Indian expedition, his brother Ibrahim had been killed on campaign in Dāghistān. In spring of 1741 Nadir marched to exact vengeance on the Lāzgīs, who had moreover renewed their raids on Georgia. On his arrival at Shirvān, the rulers of the Caspian littoral (including Surkhāy Khān) hastened to make obeisance, but Nadir’s attempts to subdue the moutainers of Avarīa were frustrated. The Russians, suspecting that he had designs on the northern Caucasus, in May 1742 reinforced their base at Kizylar (Kīlār). For eighteen months the Persian army suffered Lāzgī ambushes, lack of provisions, an epidemic, and severe winter weather, but Nadir refused to quit; only a message from the Ottoman ambassador rejecting his proposals concerning the Dja’farī rite provided him with the excuse, on 15 Dhū ’1-Hijdja 1155/10 February 1743, to march south in preparation for a new campaign against Turkey.

During the šah’s passage through Māzandarān in May 1741, an unknown sniper had wounded him. Later the marksmen was found, and denounced Rida-kuli Mīrzā as the author of the attempt. The prince was brought to Dāghistān and, despite his protestation of innocence (which most accounts endorse), was blinded. Nadir was grief-striken. Soon afterwards he learned that his vassal in Khārak had been ousted and killed by rebels.

Nevertheless, the suspended hostilities with the Ottoman empire were now resumed. Marching via Kirmāngāh, where he began construction of a large fortress and arsenal and reviewed an army of a nominal 375,000 men from all over his empire, Nadir bombarded Kirkūk into submission in Djiqmādā II 1156/August 1743. Mawṣīl resisted stoutly; Nadir negotiated a truce and, under the aegis of his old adversary Ahmad Pasha of Baghdād, visited both Shīfī and Sunni shrines in ‘Irāk. On 24 Shawkal/12 December, at Naḍaf, he convened a council of ‘ulamā’ from ‘Irāk, Persia, Afghanistan and Turkistan to discuss the religious question. In the resulting communiqué, all deplored the extremist šīfi policies of the Safawīds, and approved the device of the Dja’farī rite (Suwaydī, 1906 and 1973); whether this reflected more the disinterested magnanimity of theologians, or Nadir’s prompting and his wife’s presents to the shrine, it was doomed in the face of popular and political realities. Meanwhile, a Persian force that had been besieging Rāsā was withdrawn in December. In order to fund these campaigns in the west, Nadir had rescinded the tax amnesty declared in India and redoubled his exactions from the Persian populace. The consequent insurrections in his rear were now too serious to ignore.

Rebellion and disintegration. Pretenders to the Safawī throne provided the focus in several disaffected areas. In Aḏharbāyjān and Dāghistān, revolts led by one Šām Mīrzā were defeated in turn by Nadir’s nephew Ibrāhīm Khān and his younger son Naṣr Allāh in 1743, and in October of that year one Safl Mīrzā, his cause sponsored by the Ottomans, was reported to be advancing via Kārš. In January 1744 the Beglerbeg of Fārs, Taki Khān Shirāzī, a favourite of Nadir’s, led a widely-supported revolt; Nadir’s forces stormed and sacked Shirāz in June, and Taki Khān was blinded in one eye and castrated. In Khārak, the Yomud and Salur Turkomans rebelled against Nadir’s appointees in Khvā, and order was restored only in 1745 by the shah’s other nephew, ‘Ali-kuli. Despite these dangers, Nadir himself had not withdrawn farther east than Hamadān, and when in February 1744 he was informed of Turkey’s refusal to ratify the treaty, he marched northwest and besieged Kārš from May until early October. Nadir wintered north of the Kura, surprising the Lāzgīs and forcing their submission. Next summer the Ottoman sērer Yegen Paša crossed the frontier, and in Radjab 1158/August 1745, at Baghāward, Nadir repeated his victory of 1735, aided by a mutiny in the Turkish camp and the death of Yegen Paša. Nadir again opened peace talks, this time without insisting on recognition of the Dja’farī rite.

Returning to Isfahān in December, Nadir extorted funds and punished officials with renewed ferocity, as he did at each stage of his return journey to Khurāsān during February and March 1746. From Mashhad he went to inspect the construction of the new treasury at his fortress of Kālāt [see KILĀT-I NĀDIR]. Soon after, he set out westward again with an imposing entourage to meet the Ottoman ambassador at Kurdān, near Sāwēd Būlāgh (Mahābād); here on 17 Shab‘ān 1159/4 September 1746 was signed the treaty with Turkey, which essentially restored the frontiers of 1639. At Isfahān once more, Nadir again behaved with arbitrary cruelty; reports of contemporary Europeans confirm that he was widely judged to be deranged (Lockhart, Nadir Shāh, 258–9). A levy of 300,000 tumans imposed on Sīstān provoked an insurrection, to subdue which the šah dispatched ‘Ali-kuli Khān; and on arrival, however, his nephew—learning that he, too, had been assessed 100,000 tumans—made common cause with the rebels. Nadir left Isfahān for Kirmān and Khurāsān, erecting towers of heads wherever he halted. From Mashhad he moved first against the Kurds of Khābāthān, who had declared for ‘Ali-kuli. While encamped near their fortress on 11 Djiqmādā II 1160/20 June 1747, a group of his Persian, Afshār and Kādjar officers, fearing that he had already ordered his Afghan troops to arrest them, cut him down in his tent. Nadir’s army disintegrated, his treasure was plundered and his progeny killed (with the exception of a grandson, Shāhrūgh Mīrzā). On 27 Djiqmādā II/6 July, ‘Ali-kuli was raised to the throne as ‘Ādī Shāh.

Policies and achievements. Nadir Shāh excelled as a strategist, and is to be credited with rescuing Persia from partition and foreign domination. His campaigns against Turkey indirectly benefited Russia, and his humiliation of the Mughal empire hastened its eventual demise under British suzerainty. His career of conquest parallels that of Timūr (Tamerlane), and even argues conscious emulation: e.g., his grandson was named Shāhrukh, after Timūr’s third son, and Nadir removed Timūr’s tombstone from ‘Aṣarbāyjān to Mashhad (Lockhart, Nadir Shāh, 186, 188). He employed freely the traditional policy of deporting tribal populations (notably Kurds and Afghans, to Khurāsān), but this was disruptive rather than constructive (Perry, Forced migration). He appreciated the advantages of seaborne commerce and power, and purchased or built ships for both the Caspian Sea and the Persian Gulf. His background was Shīfī, and his periodic gifts to Shīfī shrines indicate that his declared aim of restoring a form of Sunnī Islam to Persia was more a matter of pragmatism than of conscience (i.e., to facilitate a treaty with Turkey, and perhaps as a preparation for a greater Islamic empire). His imperious personality and ruthlessness ensured obedience even after his con-
quests turned sour; but the cumulative effect of his reversal of Safawid policies—his confiscation of waqf properties and threatened abolition of state Shi'a properties and threatened abolition of state Shi'aism. With the arrival of the Abbasids, demand increased; instruction in the art of composing and delivering anecdotes was given at a very early stage,

thing in the art of the anecdote was transferred to the cities of Irak, prospering in Basra and most of all in Bagdad, where the caliphs, the aristocrats and the wealthy merchants maintained entertainers charged with the task of distracting them from the cares of the world, and felt no qualms about listening to and rewarding individuals otherwise known for the gravity of their activities, such as al-Aqma [d (213/828 [q.v.])], to whom the following admission is attributed: “through knowledge, I have received gifts, and through pleasantries (mulud) I have attained riches” (al-Djahiz, Baytîn, i. 198; al-Hafawi al-Nadira, i. 160).

Literature has preserved the names of a score of raconteurs from the earliest centuries of Islam; a list of them is to be found in F. Rosenthal, Humor, 7 ff., and mention here will be limited to those who seem to be the best known: Aghubb [q.v.], Muzabbid al-Madani, Abu 1-HarshLimamayn, al-Djammas, for example. It is probable that the répertoire of the entertainers mentioned in later works was in part their own invention, but they also had the opportunity of drawing from the dozens of anonymous collections which existed in the time of Ibn al-Nadîm (end of 4th/10th century [q.v.]); among these works, some bear more or less expressive titles which cannot be identified, but a more interesting series presents real or fictitious characters around whom a lasting legend is built. The 1st of this genre is a collection attributed to al-Djahiz (ed. S. al-Ashtar, Al-Kafî, related in Mawsil, 1913, 270-98, Farag bâd as-Sidda Literatur, 463/1071 [q.v.]), another in this line who was to be distinguished much later is Naṣr al-Din Khodja [q.v.]. A third category of sources is constituted by anthologies owed to compilers who, although capable of devising their own anecdotes, seem rather to have collected here and there material which they reckoned worthy of handing on to posterity, to be placed at the disposal of future entertainers; among this group are distinguished names such as those of al-Madînî, Ishak al-Mawsili [q.v.], Abu 1-Andbas and Abu 1- constraint and quite simply in the narration of amusing stories is to be found in the fact that several authors enunciate the rules which should be followed, if the narrator is to win the readers of his work and to be assured, in the case of professionals, of a reasonable income. The first, naturally, was al-Djahiz who, in the introduction to his Ba'dh, the characters and can be traced back to their sources by establishing a kind of contact with their protagonists. If they are separated from their elements and their context, then a half of their piquancy and originality is suppressed.” On the other hand, specifying the identity of the heroes presented two dangers: first, there was the risk of offending them if they were still living and, second, the risk of supplying historians with invented facts, especially when it was a matter of stories concerning eminent persons allegedly recounted by equally distinguished narrators, as in the case of A'ya and of Ibn Abi A'tug, related in the Riskh (ed. Pellat, §§ 12-13) to al-Djahiz, who declares elsewhere that his work on misers would be irrevocably damaged by the suppression of anecdotes the heroes of which could be recognised and which would nevertheless constitute “the most important and most interesting chapter”.

Al-Husri, for his part, gives a series of useful tips in his Baytîn (7 ff.). First, he observes that a “tedious” anecdote is fatal to the narrator since, being neither entertaining nor serious, neither hot nor cold, it becomes boring, as is demonstrated by the proverbial saying “more boring than a mediocre enter-
tainer". The person telling stories should be sparing of gestures, should express himself with elegance and eloquence, and display neither violence nor cruelty. He should adapt himself to all situations, it is possible of utilising all his abilities adeptly, and be ready to discontinue when he senses that his presentation is not appreciated by the audience. As regards the form of anecdotes, it is appropriate to conform to the normal endings of words. On the other hand, it is possible to make comedy out of the faults committed by the semi-educated, who say, for example, rajul adja wa-taraka abi wu-akbih. As for the substance, no rule is enumerated. No advice is given to the composers of anecdotes. It should be said that in principle the materials constituting the collections intended for the instruction and edification of readers are carefully chosen and contain nothing at all inedent, while those required only to entertain are very often characteristic specimens of obscenity and scatology, such that the texts which have preserved them are difficult to translate; this applies, for example, to the anonymous Nuzhat al-adab wu-sulwat al-gharab (ms. B.N. of Paris 6006 and 6710). To show that there were all the same some decent anecdotes, the following are two examples: in the Nahj al-Balagha, it is in the work written by Abu Talut in the 4th/10th century to illustrate the legendary ugliness of al-Dżahiz. The first is constructed on a formula of which the western equivalent is as follows. A well-known woman says to an eminent man: "You should marry me; I would give you a son who would have your intelligence and my beauty". "Yes, but supposing he has your intelligence and my beauty?" In the Arabic text, it is a slave who asks al-Dżahiz to buy her and not to marry her. One only lends to the rich, and yet it is curious that the latter here occupies the same place as Mark Twain in an American version and as Sacha Guitry in a French one. In the second anecdote, the same al-Dżahiz is accorded one day, in the street, by a woman who invites him to follow her; being of a curious nature, he agrees willingly, even eagerly, to her proposal. So he al-Dżahiz himself to be led by the unknown woman to the workshop of a jeweller, to whom she says only "like him", before leaving hurriedly. Intrigued, al-Dżahiz asks the meaning of this laconic phrase and the artisan replies: "A few days ago, she asked me to engrave an image on the jewel in a ring, and because I couldn’t imagine what it looked like, she brought you here". "And what was this image?" "That of Satan!"

The titles of the collections cited in the Fihrist of Ibn al-Naḍīm are presented under the form Kitāb Nawadir fulān; later, as has been seen with Ibn al-Dżawizi and Ibn Kaysim al-Dżawizya, it is akhbor which is employed in place of nawadir, perhaps to confer a sort of respectability on the documents collected and to prepare them to be treated as accounts of historical facts, although most often these are clearly anecdotes produced by the imagination of entertainers or of writers. In this regard, attention should be drawn to the biographical notices of famous men which in many cases contain doubtful akhbor. Elsewhere (s.v. MUKADDI) there has been mention of a person, Khālid b. Yazid, to whom Yākūt devoted a biography drawn from a chapter of the Bukhāra?

The substitution of the word akhbor for nawadir was perhaps dictated by the possibility of confusion arising at the time when very diverse authors started adopting the latter term and entitling their works Kitāb al-Nawadir, often without any other specification. In such cases, nawadir generally has the sense of "curiosities, originalities, rarities" and is applied to studies of religion, philology, mathematics, astrology, botany, medicine, etc. Sezgin cites a total of 144 titles in which nawadir never has the meaning of anecdotes (GAS, ii, 900:16; ii, 789:54; iii, 561:2; iv, 384:2; v, 495:3; vi, 463:8; viii, 366-7:31; ix, 376-7:16), but since of these only two apply to medicine and three to mathematics, more than a hundred are to be located in the linguistic sciences, grammarians and lexicographers being particularly interested in discovering and defining "rarities of the genre.

**Bibliography:**


(Ch. Pellat)

**Naḍjadiät, Khāridjiät sub-sect which was especially widespread in Bahrayn and Yamāma.**

The name derives from that of its founder Naḍjadi b. ‘Amīr al-Hanāfi al-Harūrī. It is known of him that he rebelled in Yamāma at the time of al-Husayn’s death in battle (61/680) and that in 64/683 he gave military help to ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr when he was besieged in Mecc by the Syrian army. Once the siege was raised, Naḍjadi, in company with other Khāridjiēts, including Naḏi b. al-Azraq and ‘Abd Allāh b. Yūsuf b. Mārzūk b. Bāṣr, who was his son, and who in 65/684, under the leadership of Naḏi, took part in the khurādī against Muslim b. Yūsob who, at the head of the Meccan troops sent by ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr, was posed to attack the city. He was subsequently in al-Ahwáz, which was to become the head-quarters of the Azārīqa [q.e.]. But Naḍjadi did not remain there for long; his differences with Naḏi, all concerning the fate of the quietists (kuwād), led him, during this same year, to separate from him and to return to Yamāma. We have a great deal of information about his activities in this region from Baladhūrī, Ansāb, xi, 125-47.

The Yamāma Khāridjiēts had chosen Abū Tālūt Sālim b. Mātar as chief, as a temporary stop-gap until they could find a better candidate. In 65/684, Abū Tālūt seized control of Dhūn al-Khaḍārīn, a large expanse of Yamāma occupied by Mušiwiya, established himself there and divided up as plunder, amongst his partisans, the agricultural lands and the 4,000 slaves who worked them. In the next year, Naḍjadi, captured at Diabala a caravan coming from Bāṣra and destined for Ibn al-Zubayr in Mecc. He led it to Abū Tālūt in Khādirārn, divided up the booty amongst his partisans, allowed the slaves to cultivate once again the temporarily-held lands, as had been the previous practice and proposed himself as chief in place of Abū Tālūt. The Khāridjiēts present there, including Abū Tālūt, unanimously recognised his merits and gave him formally their bay’a, assuring
him that they would have deposed him only if he had been guilty of a clear injustice. Some short time afterward, Nadjda, at the head of the Yamama Khāridjites, attacked the Banū Ka'b b. Rabī‘a b. ʿĀlib. This was not, as Abu ʿUmar b. ʿUbayd thought, to manage to deposed him, but to manage to take him to death. This marked the end of the Nadjadat principality in Yamama and Bahrayn, but not of their school; ʿAbd al-Kāhir al-Baghdādī, who lived at a period straddling the 4th/10th and 5th/11th centuries, tells that there were still Nadjadat in Siǧīṣṭān during his time.

Doctrines. The main religious ideas attributed to the Nadjadat were, according to al-Āḍabī ʿalī, the following: (1) the admisibility of ṣiǧiḥūd and ṣaʿīy; (2) justification for an error committed in ignorance of the law, with the exception of the obligatory precepts (waǧiḥ); (3) those who lagged behind in making the ḫiṭrā to their own group were branded as ʿudnafūkān [q.v.]; (4) those who declared it illicit to shed the blood of the abī al-mukām (= ḥimmīt) fi dār al-takṣīya and to confiscate their goods, were to be branded with takfīr; (5) the assertion that it is not known whether God will punish the believers for their sins, but if He does, it will not be with ḥeṣr; (6) the one who commits lesser sins and persists in his error is a muṣāhir, whereas the one who commits graver sins without persisting in them is a muṣāhir. Other details are provided by al-Sahrārastānī and al-Baghdādī: (7) permission for takṣīya, whether in words or in actions; (8) the world does not need an imām, but it is sufficient that it should be well governed; (9) ʿaṭiṣ is permissible, but ḡiḥūd, where possible, is better; (10) those who declare ʿaṭiṣ illicit are to be branded with takfīr; and by Ibn Ḥazm, curiously. Finally, according to al-Mubarrad, Kāmil, 615, there was no difference between the Ibāḍīyya [q.v.] and the Nadjadat.
town of al-Nadjar later arose (Yakut, Mu'jam, iv, 760), also called Nadjar al-Kufa (al-Zamakhshari, Long, iv, 354 ed. Salvator, Grave, 135). Under Umayyad rule, the site of the grave near al-
Kufa had to be concealed. As a result, it was later sought in different places, by many in al-Kufa itself in a corner above the kibla of the mosque, by others again 2 farsaks from al-Kufa (al-Istakhri, 82-3; Ibn Hawkali, 163). According to a third story, 'Ali was buried in Medina near Fatima's grave (al-Mas'udi, MonUQ, iv, 89 = § 1619) according to a fourth, al-
Kha'ir or the Imam (Caetani, Annali dell' Islam, x, 1926, 967-8, A. H. 40, § 99). Perhaps, then, the sanctuary of al-Nadjar is not the real burial-place but a tomb held in reverence in the pre-Islamic period, especially as the graves of Adam and Noah were also shown there (Ibn Batuta, Ritha, i, 416; G. Jacob, in A.
Noldeke, Das Heiligtum al-Husains zu Kerbela, Berlin 1909, 38, n. 1). It was not till the time of the Ham-
danid of al-Mawsil Abu 'l-Haydja that a large bubba was built by him over 'Ali's grave, adorned with precious carpets and curtains and a citadel built there (Ibn Hawkali, 163). The Sh'i Buiyid 'Adud al-Dawla (q.v.) in 369/979-80 built a mausoleum, which was still in existence in the time of Hamd Allah Mustawfi, and was buried there, as were his sons Sharaf al-
Dawla and Bahih al-Dawla. Al-Nadjar was already a small town with a circumference of 2,500 paces (Ibn
Khawarnak. Ibn Battuta entered Mashhad 1323, ii, 116, v, 88, 121, vii, 161, ix, 117, xi, 24, xxii, 123-7; Mukaddadi, 130; Ibn al-Fakih, 163, 177, 187; Ibn Rusta, 108, tr. Wiet, 121; Abu 'l-Fida, ed. Reinaud, 300, tr. Guyard, ii, 73; Idrisi, Nuzha, iii, 6; Ibn Dubayb, ed. Wright and de Goeje, 201; Bakri, Mu'jam, ed. Wustenfeld, 164, 302, 354, 564, 573; Ibn Battuta, i, 414-16; Mustawfi, Nuzhat al-kalib, ed. Le Strange, 32: in the year 366/976-7). Hasan b. al-Fadl, who died about 414/1023-4, built the defensive walls of Mashhad 3 'Ali (Ibn al-Adhur, ix, 154). The Maghadd was burned in 433/1041-2 by the fanatical Sunni populace of Bagdad, but must have been soon rebuilt. The Khaliji sultan Malikshah had already a vizier Nizam al-Mulk, which were in Bagdad in 473/1080-7, visited the sanctuaries of 'Ali and Husayn (Ibn al-
Adhur, x, 103). The Ikkhân Ghâzân (694-703/1295-
1297) describes the town and sanctuary very fully. According to the Mongol governor of Bagdad in 661/1263 led a canal from the Euphrates to al-Nadjar but it soon became silted up and was only cleared out again 4/1508 by order of Shah Ismâ'il. This canal was originally called Nahor al-Shâh (now al-Kah)m (Lughat al-'Arab, ii, Bagdad 1930-1, 458). This Sh'i Sufiwallid himself managed to a marshpadin of Karbalâ and al-
Nadjar. Suleymân the Magnificent visited the holy places in 941/1534-5. A new canal made in 1793 also soon became silted up, as did the Sheri al-Shaykh and the al-Haydariya canals, the latter of which was made by order of 4Abd al-Hamid II. In 1912 iron pipes were laid to bring water from the Euphrates to al-
Nadjar (Lughat al-'Arab, ii, 458-9, 491).

A considerable part of 'Irâk, with Bagdad, al-
Nadjar and Karbalâ, was temporarily conquered by the Persians in 1032/1623, but restored to Ottoman control in the winter of 1048/1638-9. Over the next two centuries or so, al-Nadjar was at times harried by Bedouins from the direction of the Syrian Desert and by Wahhâbi raids [see WAHHABIYYA], culminating in those of 1806 and 1810; and a recurrent factor within al-Nadjar during this period was also factional strife between the two groups of the Zugurt and Shumurd. Nevertheless, the town, with its Sh'i religious leadership of mudjahids and of the khid-dâr or guardian of the shrine, managed to retain a virtual autonomy under Ottoman rule, at times rebelling against what was regarded as the Porte's heavy hand, so that Ottoman troops had severely to repress revolts there in, e.g., 1842, 1852 and 1854; and attempts to introduce conscription there in 1915-
16 caused a further outbreak.

During all these centuries, al-Nadjar maintained its function as a centre for Sh'i pilgrimage and burial, and in the 19th century its mudjahids benefitted from the Oudh Bequest, that of the Sh'i king of Oudh [see AWADJ], distributed till the First World War by the British Resident. In the post-war years, it remained a centre of disaffection, a focus for anti-British opposition during the Arab revolt in 'Irâk of 1920 and sub-
sequently of opposition to King Fay salt; and the population has of course tended to become swollen seasonally by the pilgrimage traffic. According to the Arab geographers, al-Hira [q.v.] lay on the eminence of al-Nadjar (al-Ya'kubî, Buldân, tr. Wiet, 140, 309, Massignon (MIFAO, xxviii, 28, n. 1) thinks that al-Hira lay on the site of the present al-
Nadjar, while Musil, (op. cit., 35, n. 26) places the centre of the ruins of al-Hira south-east of the tell of al-Khurâ emerges, as a number of small shrines or cities as centres of clerical opposition immune from Persian official control.

In present-day 'Irâk, al-Nadjar falls within the mubâba'at of Karbalâ, and in 1970 had an estimated population of 180,000, of whom some quarter (at least before the expulsions of Persians from 'Irâk in the recent 'Irâk-Iran War) have always been Persians; its population had of course tended to become swollen seasonally by the pilgrimage traffic.

According to the Arabic geographers, al-Hira [q.v.] lay on the eminence of al-Nadjar (al-Ya'kubî, Buldân, tr. Wiet, 140, 309, Massignon (MIFAO, xxviii, 28, n. 1) thinks that al-Hira lay on the site of the present al-
Nadjar, while Musil, (op. cit., 35, n. 26) places the centre of the ruins of al-Hira south-east of the tell of al-Khurâ emerges, as a number of small shrines or cities as centres of clerical opposition immune from Persian official control.

In present-day 'Irâk, al-Nadjar falls within the mubâba'at of Karbalâ, and in 1970 had an estimated population of 180,000, of whom some quarter (at least before the expulsions of Persians from 'Irâk in the recent 'Irâk-Iran War) have always been Persians; its population had of course tended to become swollen seasonally by the pilgrimage traffic.
The best historical source for an understanding of the dynasty is 'Umāra (see Kay, in Ibn Bihd.), but it should be stressed that 'Umāra's account is sometimes confused, frequently anecdotal with interruptions of little or no relevance and lacking in dates. Other published sources which can be used as a control on 'Umāra's text are listed below, though many depend ultimately on him, being transmitted in the main through other writers.

When the last Ziyādíd [q. v.] had been put to death during the rule of the Abyssinian ważīr, Mardjan, by one of his slave governors, Naфīs, the other, Naфīḥ, came forward to avenge him. After fighting, Naфīs was killed and Naфīḥ in Dhu 'l-Ka‘da 412/February 1022 entered Zabīd, where he had the vizier built alive into a wall in exact revenge for the Ziyādíd. As his rival, Naфīs, had already done, Naфīḥ assumed the insignia of royalty, struck his own coins and inserted his own name in the khutba after that of the 'Abbāsīd caliph. The latter recognised him under the title of al-Mu‘ayyad Nasir al-Dīn. His territories extended northwards from Zabīd as far as Harad in northern Tiḥāma [q. v.], while the highlands remained divided among petty rulers. When among the latter the Sūlayhīds [q. v.] came to considerable power, their relations with the Naфīḥīds decisively affected the history of the latter. The first Sūlayhīd, 'Alī, is said to have had Naфīḥ poisoned about 452/1060 through a slave girl bought in India, as a gift. In the confusion that followed, 'Alī occupied Zabīd and Naфīḥ's sons fled to the Red Sea island of Dhaḥal [q. v.]. While the eldest, Mu‘ārikī, committed suicide, the other two resolved to regain power in their lands: Sa‘īd al-Alwāl and Abu 'l-Tâmī Djiyyāsh, whose lost work, al-Ma‘ṣīfi fī akhṭār Zabīd, is much quoted by 'Umāra. Sa‘īd made his preparations in a hiding place in Zabīd and arranged for Djiyyāsh to arrive later. The two then came out openly, fell upon and killed 'Alī al-Sūlayhī, who was heading for Mecca, in 473/1081. Zabīd at once recognised Sa‘īd as lord, he appealing in particular to the large number of Abyssinian slave troops. But Asmā‘, the widow of 'Alī al-Sūlayhī who was kept prisoner in Zabīd, persuaded her son, al-Mukarram, to rescue her in 475/1083. The Naфīḥīds again escaped to Dhaḥal. In 479/1086 Sa‘īd returned as ruler, but in 481/1088 he was put to death at the instigation of the Sīlayhīd queen, al-Sayyīda, al-Mukarram's wife. Djiyyāsh escaped to India with his vizier Khalaf b. Tāhir, returned to Zabīd disguised as an Indian, plotted with his compatriots and easily regained power in 482/1089. With his death in 498/1105 or 500/1107, confusion reigned. He himself had domestic difficulties and his former helper, Khalaf, had to flee and there were fierce family feuds among his descendants. His son, Fāṭik I, the son of a slave girl bought in India, had to defend himself against his half-brothers, Ibrāhīm and 'Abd al-Wāhīd. He died young in 503/1109. The latter's infant son, al-Manṣūr, was set aside by his uncles, who were quarrelling with one another, and fled to al-Sayyīda, whose favourite, al-Mu‘azzabīr b. Abī 'l-Bakrāt brought him back in 504/1111 as a vassal of the Sūlayhīds.

Because he was still a minor, the dynasty's viziers began to take full control. Al-Manṣūr's vizier, Anīs, even assumed royal honours. When he attained his majority, al-Manṣūr murdered him with his own hand in 517/1123. Al-Manṣūr, however, in his turn was at once poisoned by the next vizier, Mann Allāh. The latter made the boy Fāṭik II ruler, the son of al-Manṣūr and a slave, 'Alām. This woman, who died 545/1150, endeavoured with great skill to preserve the rights of her house against the encroachments of the viziers. Mann Allāh was killed at her instigation in 524/1130. His successors were the slaves Rūzayq and later al-Mu‘ālib. Against the latter 'Alām put forward her favourite Sūrūr and Iṣbāl, who were however not themselves on good terms. During their quarrels the various parties brought other petty Arab rulers against Zabīd. Iṣbāl had Fāṭik II killed in 531/1137. He was followed by his cousin, Fāṭik III. Sūrūr, who had been in effective control since 529/1135, was murdered in a Zabīd mosque in 551/1156 by an envoy of the Mahdīs [q. v.]. When the Zaydī Mīmān al-Mutawakkil Ahmad b. Sulaymān was summoned to help by the Naфīḥīds, he made it a condition that Fāṭik should be deposed and he himself recognised as lord of Zabīd. This was agreed, but in 554/1159 the Mahdīs entered Zabīd.

The Ziyādíds before them and the Naфīḥīds continued to be feudatories of the Abyssinian kings who had already established and is still very marked in Tiḥāma today. }
Abyssinians brought over specifically for that purpose: "It is said that there was not a single house of Arabs, except one of them being of blackness."

The striking of Nadjahid coins is mentioned by most of our sources, although no great caches of such coins have been discovered. Bikhazi (Coins, 1970, 106) claims to have read the legend of a coin struck in Zaid in 534, although the ruler's name is illegible. The coin is otherwise unpublished and is in the British Museum. He lists three others minted in San'āʾ and suggests all are Nadjahid coins. He does not, however, explain how the Nadjahid kings were related to the Christianization of the Hijaz. Much more promising is the research carried out by Lowick (Coins of the Nadjahids, 1976) and, despite problems, he argues convincingly that the four coins listed in his publication, all minted in Zaid, are indeed Nadjahid.

acted as wall. This daughter of Abu Sufyan b. Harb [q. v.] had been among the first emigrants and it was she who, together with Umm Salama who had also begged, was delivered for the Prophet on his deathbed the wonders of the church of St. Mary in Aksum (W. Muir, *The Life of Mohammed*, 490).

According to Ibn Sa’d (Tabakût, 1/2, 15 ff.), the Prophet in 7/628 sent envoys to six rulers of the surrounding countries, among whom the Nadjashî, sum- moning them to embrace Islam. The letter for the king of Abyssinia, who is named as al-Ashjâm b. Abdujgâr, was delivered by ‘Amr b. Umayya al-Damrî (see the references in Van Donzel, *A Yemenite embassy*, 239 n. 8; on the historicity of these letters, see Montgomery Watt, *Muhammad at Medina*, 345-6; Hammadullah, *Documents*, 19; idem, *Le Prophète*, i, 205-7; Dunlop, *Another Prophetic letter*). According to Muslim tradition, the Nadjashî became a Muslim so that ‘when the Negus died, the Prophet prayed over him and begged that his sins might be forgotten’ (Ibn Isha’k, *Sirâ, Sira*, 155; cf. Raven, *Some early Islamic texts*, 209).

In 9/630-1 the Prophet sent ‘Alkama b. Mudjazzaz al-Mudljîqi to chase Abyssinian pirates from an unnamed island (Ibn Sa’d, *Tabakût*, i/1, 117-8), but this expedition was not directed against the Nadjashî himself. Neither was this the case with the naval expedition which Umar b. al-Khattab in 19/640 is reported to have sent against the Abyssinians under the command of the same ‘Alkama. The outcome was so disastrous for the Muslims that ‘Umar would have no more to do with the sea (Caetani, *Annali*, iv, 219, 366-7).


Abbyssinians), the Prophet said: ‘leave the Abyssinians as long as they leave you’ (‘atruku l-habasha m tarâkâmam) and elsewhere in Abû Dâwûd and in al-Nasâ’î (d. 309/921): ‘let the Abyssinians be as long as they let you be, and leave the Turks alone as long as they leave you alone’ (da’â l-habasha m waddâ’ukum wa-tru-kî l-turk m tarâkâmam). Apart from the pun between taraka and turk, the presence of the Turks in this tradition weakens its value as far as the Abyssinians are concerned. Whether traditions such as these have led to statements like ‘Abbyssinia is no more territory not subject to the djihad’ (Trimingham, *Islam in Ethiopia*, 52) cannot be ascertained. But it should be remarked that the reference in this connection to Ibn Hawâlî (ibid.) is wrong. In his *Khâbâr Sûrat al-ar’d (Opus geographicum, i, 56), Ibn Hawâlî speaks of the Budja [see BEJDA] and remarks wa-layasa dârshuh bi-dâr harb, which Kramers-Wiet (*Configuration*, i, 54) translate with ‘and their region is not a territory of war’, i.e. no war is going on there. This passage in Ibn Hawâlî’s text thus does not contain any reference to djihad at all. The reason why Abyssinia was not over- run by the Muslims in the 7th and 8th centuries is not to be found in the fact that tradition judged favourably on the Nadjashî and his land, but in the fact that Abyssinia could only be reached through naval expeditions, a technique not well developed in early Islam. Weaker reason is that the Byzantine and Sasanid empires (Hourani, *Arab seafar- ing*, 46). On the gradual penetration of Islam into the highlands of Ethiopia, see HABASH, HABASHIA.


NADJAT, Mīr 'Abd al-Ṣāliḥ, a Persian poet, born about 1046/1636-7, the son of a Husaynī Sayyid Mūḥammad Mūʿāmin of Isfāḥān. Little is known of his life. Only this much is certain, that he, like many other Persian poets of this time, worked in the offices of different Persian dignitaries. For example, he was a mustaʿāfī [q. v.] with the Sadr Mirzā Ḥāfnāʾ Allāh, later occupied the same office in Astarābād and ended his career in 1126/1714 after being for many years ṣanāʾī with the Ṣafawī princes Shāh Sūlaymān (1077-1105/1666-94) and Shāh Ṣūlṭān Ḥusayn (1105-35/1694-722). He owes his fame mainly to a long poem Guil-i kūhīti ("The rose as a challenge to fighting") which he finished in 1112/1700-1 and which deals with the theme of the zir-genre but is still very popular in Persia. As the Persian athletes still form a special closed corporation they use a special language (an argot) which is full of technical terms of their art and is not intelligible to the outsider. Nadjāt used these technical terms very skilfully in his poem, which makes it very difficult for laymen to understand. This produced several commentaries on his work, of which those of ʿArūt, Ṣaṭānīnī Šaghi (printed Lucknow 1258/1842) and Gobind-Rām (lith. Muradābād 1884) are the best known. Of Nadjāt's contemporaries, some did not approve of his peculiar style and thought his poem degraded the poet's art with its vulgar expressions and low humour. As a matter of fact, Nadjāt's tone suffers considerably from the traditional lofty style of Persian court poetry and approaches the language of the Persian middle classes; this makes his work of considerable importance for the history of the Persian language. Besides the poem, we only know of a collection of lyrics by Nadjāt of which there are manuscripts in several libraries (see below).


(N. E. BERTHELS)

NADJATI [see negavit]

NADJD (A., ‘‘uplands’’), conventionally defined as the plateau region of the Arabian peninsula lying to the east of the Red Sea lowlands (al-Thāmah or [q. v.]) and the mountain barrier running down through the western side of the peninsula (al-Iṣfahān [q. v.]).

1. Geography and habitat.

The exact application of this originally topographical conception is very differently understood, and sometimes it means more generally the elevated country above the coastal plain or the extensive country, the upper part of which is formed by the Thāmah and the Yamāma and the lower by Syria and ʿIrāk, or the part of Arabia which stretches from the frontiers of al-Yamāma to al-Madīna and thence across the desert from al-Baṣra to Bahrayn on the Persian Gulf (al-Iṣfahān, Ibn Hawkal) or the territory between ʿIrāk (al-Uṭaybah) and Dāhīt ʿIrāk (Ibn Khurraḍādhīb) or from ʿIrāk to al-Thāmah (Kudārān), which is described as the so-called Ditch of Chosroes (Kisra) as far as the Harra (al-Bāḥil), or lastly, the territory between the depression of the Wādī ʿRumma and the slopes of Dāhīt ʿIrāk (al-Aṣmāʾī). That originally the name was applied to the plateau only is evident not only from the fact that Nadjād appears in combination with various place-names; thus al-Aṣmāʾī (Yākūt, iv, 745) knows of Nadjād Barrī (in al-Yamāma), Nadjād Ufr, Nadjād Kākbāb (near ʿArāfāt), Nadjād Mārī (in the Yamāma), al-Bakrī (ii, 574) besides the last three named mentions Nadjād al-Yamāma, Yākūt (iv, 750-1) further mentions Nadjād al-Hidājāt, Nadjād al-Wadāḥ in the country of Ḥudhayl, Nadjād al-Ṣahrāʾ, and al-Ḥamānhī (55) Nadjād Ḥumyār and Nadjād Madhīhādī along with a number of places not otherwise known which are combined with Nadjād al-Mardūkān (127) further makes a distinction between upper Nadjād (Nadjād al-ʿUṭaybah) which is regarded as Nadjād proper (al-Nadjīd) and in which he includes the district (kīna) of Dūrāq and the town of Yabamba, and lower Nadjād (Nadjād al-Sulṭān) which is described as Arī Nadjād and with the Ḥidājāt and al-ʿArīd forms Central Arabia (135, 36, 137), the territory in which pure Arabic is spoken (136, 137). The original meaning is also seen in the dual Nadjān, which, it is interesting to note, is used for two mountains in the Adīb range, as well as in the place-name Nadjād Mārī and in the spring pasture ground Nadjān in the land of the Khāṭam mentioned by the poet Ḥumayd b. Ṭhwār (Yākūt, iv, 745).

That the wide interpretation of the name Nadjād above given is not unjustified is shown by the foundation in the second half of the 5th century A.D. by al-Hārith, chief of the Kinda, of a short-lived kingdom which extended from the Syrian times and Medina to al-Yamāma or from the hill of Tumīya in the N.E. on the Wādī ʿRumma to Dāhīt ʿIrāk. At a later date, the whole of al-Nadjād belonged to the administrative district of al-Yamāma (Yākūt, iv, 746).

The widest idea to which the name Nadjād has ever been applied is probably that of the present kingdom of Saudi (Suʿūdī) Arabia, which owes its origin to the Wahshābī chief ʿAbd al-ʿĀzīz b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamān Suʿūd, who, as Amīr of Nadjād conquered al-Riyyād [q. v.] in 1903, was chosen as ruler of Nadjād and the adjoining lands in the summer of 1921, on 10 January 1926 conquered the Ḥidājāt and on 19 January 1927 was proclaimed king of Nadjād and its dependencies at al-Riyyād. The northern frontier of his territories, which was delineated by treaties between the ruler of Nadjād with ʿIrāk and Great Britain on the one side (signed at ʿUkāy on 2 December 1922) and Nadjād, Great Britain and Transjordan on the other (signed on 2 November 1925 at Ḥadda in the Ḥidājāt) runs along the neutral zone between Nadjād and ʿIrāk (29°30′ N. lat. and 45°46′ E. long.) and is then continued in a line running N. and N.W. to the intersection of 39° E. long. and 32°N. lat. and leaves the Dībal ʿAnāzī on its north, then S.W. to the Wādī
Radjil and passing through the S.E. the point where 38°E. long, and 30°N. lat. intersect. The Wadi Sirhan is thus still in Nadjd. This line continues towards the south from 25° to 38°E. long, and crosses the former Hijaz railway towards 'Akaba. The ex-
tent of the territory is estimated at 900,000 square
miles. The capital is al-Riyad; the more important
towns are Burayda (Berede), 'Anayza ('Aneze), Ha'il (Hā'il),
Phalma, Shakra, Madgma, Huraymala (Har'ēmīle), al-Hufūf and al-Ka'ilīt. The population,
which with the exception of al-Hasa with a con-
siderable number of Shī'is, has almost entirely adopted
Wahhābism, belongs to the tribes of Muyayr
(Mejīr), Harb, 'Utyaya ('Atībe), Subay, Dawāsir,
al-'Uqaylam, al-'Awāzīm, al-Suhul, Bani Murra and
Kahtān [see further, Su'D, Al-].

The North Arabian Nadjd forms a part of the great
desert plateau, which is formed of primary rock with
overlying sandstone and volcanic outbursts and has
two great mountain ranges running through it; that in
the north is about 64 km/40 miles long and at its
northeastern end some 1,470 m/4,500 feet high,
known in ancient times as Djabal Tayyāy or Djabalā
Tayyy, i.e. Adja3 and Salmā (al-Handāni, 125,13) is
now called Djabal Shammar or Djabal Īdīj (Adja4).

Both ranges, which rise out of a table land levelled
by weathering, are of granite. The Djabal Adja5 stereo-
clus with the oasis of al-Khardj, about 56 km/35 miles
S.E. of it in approximately the same direction the
Djabal Salmā, in front of which in the S.W. lies the
Djabal Ramān, while S.E. of the Djabal Salmā lies the
Harra of Fayd, of volcanic origin.

S.E. of this rises the sandstone plateau, overlaid
with limestone, of Djabal Tuwayk (Tuēk) running
N.W. to S.E., which forms the western declivity of a
plateau of North Arabia, rising in the Harra of
Afladj, 64 km/40 miles long, with the oasis
part is the Afladj, 64 km/40 miles long, with the
oasis of Layla.

Nadjd is in the main steppe and desert. The Nafud
and Dahānah [q.v. to occupy the greater part of northern
Nadjd, while the Rub' al-Khali joins them on the S.E.
There are no perennial streams in Nadjd, so that
the country has to rely upon subterranean channels of
supply which are at various depths and have to be
reached by wells. In the oasis of al-Khardj the wells
are from 6m to 12m/20 to 40 feet deep, and in Afladj 15
to 18m/50-60 feet, in Hā'il and al-Riyad about
24m/80 feet. Sometimes these springs form ponds, for
example, in al-Khardj, the springs of which form
three ponds, the largest of which is 150 paces long
and 80 broad [cf. the picture in Philby, ii, 34] while the
springs of Afladj feed a lake nearly a mile long and a
quarter of a mile broad (Philby, ii, p. 86). These
supplies sometimes dry up suddenly, probably
because they have found a subterranean exit, as has
happened in the case of two waterholes in Afladj and
the probable number of S.E. of it, which lead the water that falls in the
rainfall on the rainfall from the summer and winter
rains. The former (wasmi or mātar al-sayf) fall in
August and September and particularly refresh the
pastures which the summer sun has dried up, while
the latter produce a springlike effect in the land on
winter (January) the temperature sometimes
sinks from a maximum of 53° F. by day to
below 23° and ice and snow have been occasionally
seen at the higher levels—while the summer drought
with a maximum temperature of 113° destroys the
crops. The two most important wasnis are the Wadi l-
Rumma about 650 miles long, which runs right across
the plateau of North Arabia, rising in the Harra of
Khaybar and entering the Euphrates plain at Bāṣa, and
the Wadi l-Dawāsir. These have formed since
ancient times the two main routes of traffic in Central
Arabia.

With the aim of sedentarising the Bedouin, King
'Abd al-As'ālobe Ibn Su'ūd established in Nadjd, in the
first quarter of the present century, settlements called
hidjar, pl. biḍjar; on these, see AL-HIDJAR and J.S.
Encyclopaedia of Islam, VII
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3. The period since the development of the oil industry.

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia was proclaimed on 22 September 1932, and the east of the country was allotted for oil exploration to Standard Oil of California (later operating within Aramco) in 1933, thus setting the political and economic stages for the development of the country as one of the world's most important oil economies during the following decades. Saudi Arabia's greatest oilfields are found mainly in the east of the country, but Nadjd, in the contemporary period, is the main arena of oil production and a major crude oil exporter. In the late 1970s, the five-month strike of the oil workers in the Nadjd region, led by the workers' union, drew international attention to the poor working conditions of the oil workers in Saudi Arabia. The strike, which lasted from January to May 1977, was the largest in Saudi Arabia's history and was met with a violent response from the government. The government eventually agreed to several of the workers' demands, including a 40% wage increase, improved working conditions, and better health care. The strike was a major victory for the workers and demonstrated their ability to organize and demand better working conditions. Since then, the country has made great strides in improving the working conditions of its oil workers.
produced metal weights. The sources are silent with regard to the dates of his birth and death; however, if we accept as true the report that he died of sorrow over his argument with al-Nazzām, the Mu'tazilī theologian, it is reasonable to assume that al-Nadjdjar died after the end of the third decade of the 3rd/9th century.

Al-Nadjdjar's doctrine became well-known towards the end of the reign of al-Ma'mūn (198-218/813-33) in the region of Rayy in the eastern provinces, in the shadow of the Tāhirid line of governors. Although he was still alive at the beginning of the midna [q. v.] or inquisition, we have no proof that he himself took part in it, as did his teacher and contemporary Bīgah al-Marāṣī [q. v.]. But there is no doubt that his opinions contributed to the spread of the inquisition, through his follower, the theologian Muhammad b. 'Isā, known as Burghūth [q. v.], who was invited to Baghdād from Basra by al-Mu'taṣīm (218-27/833-42), together with Mu'tazilī theologians, in order to participate in the controversy with the leader of the traditionalist party Ahmad b. Hanbal; his active role and tough stance was a considerable burden to the persecuted imām.

The very fact that al-Nadjdjar was a follower and pupil of the Murdijīte theologian Bīgah al-Marāṣī, did not prevent him from being influenced in certain issues by the opinions of Dirār b. 'Āmr [q. v. in Suppl.], who wrote a number of books attacking the Murdijīa, although al-Nadjdjar did not follow Dirār blindly. He rejected a number of his opinions, presenting totally contradictory opinions in their place. His circle of sources was not limited to these two figures; rather, it was broad enough to include as Ibāḍī and Hanafi sources, but his openness to a variety of viewpoints was not enough to remove him from the ideological framework characterised by the school headed by Dirār b. 'Āmr.

However, this was not the picture of al-Nadjdjar painted by Islamic heresiographic literature. Reports concerning his doctrinal identity are not unanimous: while al-Āsh'arī classifies him amongst the Murdijīa, al-Shahrastānī places him amongst the Djabriyya 'determinists', and stresses that most of the Murdijīa around the Rayy region were faithful to his opinions, presenting totally contradictory opinions in their place. On the other hand, several reports associate him decisively with the Mu'tazila, while others classify him and his followers as belonging to the ahī al-'ītbi 'the affirmationists', i.e. those who affirm God's kādar. (It is reasonable to assume that the ahī al-'ītbi were those who emphasized the createdness of the ātā'.)

The lack of unanimity regarding al-Nadjdjar's views undoubtedly stems from the fact that his opinions on the theological questions which interested the ahī al-kālard were not all like: on some issues his opinions suited those of the ahī al-sunna, while on others they suited the views of the Mu'tazila, as reflected in the heresiographic works that have reached us, which enumerate the points of discord and of accord between al-Nadjdjar on the one hand and the two opposing doctrines on the other. Disputes on various occasions between al-Nadjdjar and his follower Burghūth, on the one hand, and the two Mu'tazilī Ibāhīm al-Nazzām and Abu 'l-Hudayl al-Allāh [q. v.]; on the other, as well as the keen argument between Burghūth and Ahmad b. Hanbal, not only corroborate reports regarding the doctrinal dispute between him and them; they also point to the independent orientation which characterizes the man and his doctrine. The stormy dispute between al-Nadjdjar and upholders of the Sunnī doctrine lacked the power to distort the ideological proximity bonding some of the basic principles common to both doctrines; the scholars of the Sunna continued to consider al-Nadjdjar the closest to them amongst all the other doctrinal streams; on certain issues his views were even adopted by al-Āsh'arī, and it is reasonable to assume that because of this relationship, al-Nadjdjar's opinions were preserved and did not vanish. But his views, as reported by the heresiographers, were not well-formed enough and were even quoted in a disjointed and out-of-context fashion, whence the lack of clarity which characterizes his opinions with regard to certain issues. Nor is the long list of heresiographic attributed to him able to dispel this lack of clarity.

Nevertheless, the general account of his views as represented in the heresiographical works may help to identify the main concepts distinguishing him from the contemporary theologians. Faith (imān), according to him, consists in the knowledge of God, of His apostles and His commandments and in the profession of this knowledge by the mouth. It consists of several qualities (kāfiḍā), each of which is an act of obedience (aš'ā); complete faith is the sum of all the ātā'. Faith may increase but not diminish; it can be completely lost only through unbelief. Al-Nadjdjar's concept of faith is closer to the Sunnī one, but it is not the same as that of the Murdijīa. Concerning the attributes of God (šifāt), al-Nadjdjar has a special stand which differs from that of the proponents of the Sunna and the Mu'tazila, while some scholars have taken it as a basis for deriving the negative character of the divine attributes, claiming, for example, that God is ceaselessly generous (lām yazar dājawādū) in that avarice is denied of Him. (This theory of the negative character is not Islamic; its origins are related to Albinus of the 2nd century A.D., and it seems that this idea became known to Muslim theologians through Plotinus' works; see 'Abd al-Majīd 'Uthfān, Dirāsid al-rusūla al-nirā'ī al-fārwī, 1967, Baghdād 1967.) He also maintains Dirār's doctrine concerning God's quiddity (māhiyya) but rejects his innovation of the sixth sense as a means of seeing God on the Resurrection Day; instead, he maintains that the eye may be given the power of knowing. As for human power (isbīṣa'a), introduced as an atomistic conception in contrast to Dirār's view, he claims that it is never precedes an act but accompanies it; for each act there is a power originated when the act is originated, and the power does not endure. According to him, the body consists of assembled accidents (aš'ār madjīfātīn); those accidents which do not form part of the body do not endure. This view was probably developed by Dirār and then adopted by al-Nadjdjar and some Ibāḍī theologians.

In accordance with his deterministic orientation, al-Nadjdjar presumed that all that takes place in the world comes from the incessant and unrestricted activity of God; He who creates the actions of man, who himself can do nothing to avoid the will of God. But God is able to do favours (lutf) by which the unbeliever becomes believer. The activity of man is restricted to kābat. i.e. to his appropriation of divine will. Like the Mu'tazila, he presumed that he who commits a heinous sin is doomed to Hell, but (in contrast to the view of the latter) will emerge from there. Moreover, like Bīgah al-Marāṣī, his master, he claimed that infidels would not remain forever in Hell; similarly, believers not deserving an eternal stay in Paradise would not remain there forever. He also denied the punishment of the tomb (ṣudub al-kārāb [q. v.]), probably because of his deterministic tendency. As for the word of God (al-ilmāl), he maintains like Bīgah that it is created; it is accidental (aš'ā) when it is real; and it is body (dīsīm) when it is written. Clearly, al-
Nadjdjariyya was a prominent thinker whose views influenced the Mu'tazila in their formative period by his keen opposition to some of their views. In the meantime, his opinions paved the way for the Sunni scholars' defence of their doctrine on the basis of reasoned arguments which were unavailable before him.

**Bibliography:**


**AL-NADJĐJIYYA, also called AL-HUSAYNNIYYA, the followers of al-Husayn al-Nadjdjar [q.v.], an early, specifically Ḥanāfī sect of kalām (see W. Madelung, *Religious trends in early Islamic Iran*, Albany 1988, 29) which flourished during the reign of al-Muḥammad b. ʿAlī (198-218/813-928), and whose representatives took part in the controversies throughout the course of the muḥāna [q.v.] or inquisition. But this doctrine, unlike the Muṭzaṭila, was compelled to withdraw from Baghdād and from the borders of Iʿrāk and to move on to the eastern provinces in the wake of the abolition of the muḥāna by al-Mutawakkil (232-42/847-80) and the isolation reaction of adherents of the Sunna against opposing doctrines. There, and particularly in the provinces of Rāy, Tābirāstān and Djūrānd, the Nadjdjariyya took root and even attracted a large following; testimony from the 4th/10th century shows that it became one of the four main doctrines in those provinces, at a time when its followers had dwindled to a very small minority in Baghdād, although the doctrine had not completely disappeared there.

Heresiographers are not unanimous in their classification of the followers of this doctrine: in one case they classify them as Muʿtazila and in another as Murdjiya—a situation which probably arises from the fact that this doctrine presents opinions identical to those of other doctrines on specific theological subjects. Particularly prominent are reports which emphasise the connection between the Nadjdjariyya and the doctrine attributed to Djiham b. Saʿīdān [q.v.], a context which is undoubtedly intended to discredit the doctrine in the eyes of its opponents. Still, there are reasonable grounds to assume that the eminent proponents of this doctrine were part of the group of theologians known as ṣulṭan al-ʿāghā “those who affirm God's sovereignty over creation” and despite the diversity of the origins of the ideas of al-Nadjdjari, who founded this doctrine, it is possible to discern the independent orientation of this group, which cultivated its own unique theological principles and which had its own characteristic traits. The Nadjdjariyya, like other doctrines, gave rise to various sectarian sub-groups—in this case over ten of them—the most prominent of which was known as Burghūthiyya, named after Muhammad b. Iṣā Burghūthī [q.v.], who disagreed with al-Nadjdjari on the question of muṭtaṣalīlūdī “generated effects”, attributing them to the nature (fāḥ) concealed by God within objects themselves. He also disagreed with al-Nadjdjari on the question of iktiṣāb, “acquisition”, claiming that one who acquires an act cannot be called the doer (faṭiḥah) of it. A second major sub-group was the Nadjdjariyya, composed of the followers of a man known as Abū ʿAbd Allāḥ Ibn al-Zaʿfarānī. This group disagreed with the mainstream with regard to the matter of the createdness of the Kurān and developed paradoxical opinions in this context; they displayed extreme enmity toward the Muṭzaṭila in the region of Rāy. A third sub-group was known as Mustadrīka, “revisionists”, and these developed contradictory opinions on the same question and displayed considerable admiration toward the first generations of Islam.

Despite the controversy which evolved amongst the various streams, all of them remained loyal to certain fundamental principles which al-Nadjdjārī, in particular, had established: the rejection of divine attributes and the notions that seeing God is impossible and that the divine word is created.

**Bibliography:** See that for al-NADJDJAR.
by Ahmad ZakI Abu ShadI [q.v.] in 1932. An outstanding lyrical poet, much of his work concerns his personal relationships, in particular his second collection Layat al-Khura (Cairo n.d. and 1988). According to Jarrayi (Trends, 397) "he restored to Arabic love poetry, a tenderness, a sustained devotion and a direct, uncomplicated, even humble approach unknown since the days of the bedouin Umayyad poets.' His first diwan, Waraq al-Aghtam (Cairo 1934, Beirut 1973, Beirut-Cairo 1983) shows the influence of the English romantics. The third, Talh al-dagh, was published posthumously (Cairo, 1983, Beirut 1973). His by no means complete poetic works, Diteen NadjI (Cairo 1961), mistakenly includes poems by Kamal Nadjat. Further diwans have appeared, Diteen Ibrahim NadjI (Beirut 1973, 1980 and 1988), as has other poetry, Fi ma’bad al-layl (Beirut 1977, Beirut-Cairo 1983), and Rajat al-mahdul (Cairo 1958). Amongst other works he translated Dostoyevsky’s Crime and punishment, and poetry by Baudelaire, Le s Fleurs du mal (Cairo 1954). Though editor of al-Kissma magazine, his fictional writing is of much less importance. He founded the monthly medical magazine Hakim al-Bayt in 1934.


NADJIB AL-DAWLA, Afghan commander in northern India during the 18th century, whose power-base was in Rohilkand, where he founded the town of Nadjibabad [q.v.].

Involved in the confused struggles for power in Dihli during the reigns of the fa’endants Mughal Emperors Ahmad Shoh Bahadir [q.v.] and Alamgir II in the 1750s, as opponent of the Nawab-wazir of Awadh (Oudh) [q.v.], Sadaf Djang, he worked closely with the Afghans under Ahmad Shoh Durrani [q.v.] and received from him in 1757 the title of amir al-umara and custodianship of the Emperors’ Alamgir II. At this period, strong pressure was being exerted on the Muslims’ position by the expansionist Marathas [q.v.], and in 1759 Nadjib al-Dawla invited Ahmad Shoh Durrani to intervene in India for a fourth time, himself fighting at the third battle of Pannipat [q.v.] (14 January 1761), when the Marathas were decisively crushed. A few days later, Nadjib al-Dawla returned to Rohilkand, where he became regent and virtual ruler for the puppet Shoh 4 Alam II, holding the title also of Mir Bakhtsi. His main preoccupation was to ward off the militant Sikhs from the upper Doab and to stem pressure from the Durrani ruler Suraj Mal and his successors (repelled in 1765). He thus managed, with consummate military skill and diplomacy, to maintain the integrity of the truncated Mughal empire before retiring with failing health to Nadjibabad (March 1768), leaving power in the hands of his deputy Dabija Khun. But a massive Maratha invasion of Hindustan in 1770 brought him back to negotiate a settlement with them just before he died in October 1770.


NADJIB MUHAMMAD SURUR (1932-78), a leading experimental Egyptian dramatist, director, actor and poet. He studied law at the College of Law and drama in Cairo and Moscow, working for several years in the Arabic section of Radio Moscow. Back in Cairo in 1964 onwards, in a flourishing era of Egyptian theatre, using Brechtian devices, he utilised the Egyptian folk heritage and music, and classical and modern poetry as source material for his colloquial plays, telling the story of the struggle of the ordinary Egyptian people for social justice against foreign and local forces of oppression. In his verse tragedies, Yasin wa-Bahiyya, Y Sitti Bahiyya, Y Bahiyya wa khabbirini (published in his critical work Hijr al-i’t marasih, Cairo 1966), ÄÄ, yad layl, yad kam, he tells the epic story of the eponymous ill-fated lovers. In the seventies his plays Khali li-Ayn al-Shams and al-Kalimih al-mukaddasa (unpublished), were performed. Several of his dramas, the tragic folk tale of Hasan and Na’ima Min ayn agih na’t, the prose play al-Hukma (published) and al-Dhahab al-Arnab (unpublished), on the aftermath of Black September, were not performed in his lifetime. He translated and directed Chekhov and successfully adapted Bertolt
Brecht's The Threepenny Opera (1928)/Malik al-Shahhdtin, setting it at the time of the British occupation of Egypt. Four different versions of his poetry, al-Tadhkird, al-Najjasdt: wine and other spirituous drinks, dogs, swine, which are purified by tanning. On purification, see TAHARA, GHUSL, WUDU.

NADJIBABAD, a town in the western part of the Rohilkhand region of modern Uttar Pradesh state in India (lat. 29° 37' N, long. 78° 19' E), the centre of a tahsil of the same name in the Bijapur District. The town was founded by the Afghan commander and waiz of the Mughal Emperors, Nadji al-Dawla [q.v.], who in 1168/1755 built a fort, Pathagafh, one mile to the east. Sacked by the Marathas [q.v.] in 1186/1772, it passed two years later to the Nawabs of Awadh [q.v. (Oudh)]. Nadji al-Dawla's great-grandson Mahmud participated in the Great Rebellion of 1857-8, and his palace was destroyed. In 1961 the population of the town was 40% Muslim. According to the 1961 census, the total population was 34,310.


NADJIB AL-DIN KUBRA [see KUBRA]. According to the Shafi doctrine, as systematised by al-Nawawi (Minhaj, i, 36 ff.; cf. Ghazali, al-Wadjiq, i, 6-7), the following are the things impure in themselves (nadjasdt): wine and other spirituous drinks, dogs, swine, mayta, blood and excrements; and milk of animals whose flesh is not eaten.

Regarding these groups, the following may be remarked. On wine and other spirituous drinks of the arts. KHAMR and NADJIB. —Dogs are not declared impure in the Kur'an; on the contrary, in the description of the sleepers in sūra XVIII [see AL-KAHF] the dog is included (verses 17, 21). In Hadith, however, the general attitude against dogs is very strong, as may be seen in Kalb. Goldzircher considered this change due to an attitude of conscious contrast (muhalla) to the estimation of dogs in Zoroastrianism. It must not, however, be forgotten that the Jews also declared dogs to be impure animals, just as were swine. The latter are already declared as impure in the Kurgan; on the contrary, in the descrip-

TAHARA. According to the Shafi view regarding the human corpse may be a residuum of it. The impurity of infidels is based upon sūra IX, 28, where the polytheists are declared to be defiled (nadjaz). The Sunni schools do not follow the Shafi in the expression of this verse.

The nadjasdt enumerated above cannot be purified, in contradiction to things which are defiled only (mutanadjazasdt), with the exception of wine, which becomes pure when made into vinegar, and of hides, which are purified by tanning. On purification, see TAHARA, GHSUL, WUD.}

NADJM AL-DIN KUBRA [see KUBRA].

NADJM AL-DIN RAZI DAYA, Abu Bakr Abd Allāh Muhammad b. Shahāwar Asadī (575-654/1177-1256), Šuʿfī of the Kubrawī order [see KUBRA, NADJM AL-DIN] and author of several important works in Persian and Arabic. He left his native city of Rayy at the age of twenty-six and travelled widely in Syria, Egypt, the Hijāz, Ḳirák, and Adharbaydžan. He ultimately turned eastwards, passing through Nishāpūr before arriving in Khārazm where he became a murūd of Nadjm al-Din Kubra [q.v.], eponym of the Kubrawīya. Kubra assigned his training to a senior disciple, Nadjd al-Din Baghdādī (d. 607/1210), and it is to him that Dāya refers as “our master”. He is strangely silent concerning Kubra himself, although he sometimes cites the Persian quatrains that are attributed to him.

At a date that cannot be precisely determined, Dāya clearly is a restless man, even by the peripatetic standards of the age—left Khārazm to resume his wanderings in western Persia. Sensing the onset of the Mongol storm, he abandoned his family in Rayy (by his own admission), and after a return visit to the Hijāz travelled by way of Hamadān, Ḳarbāl, and Dāyr-bakr to central Anatothia, arriving in Kayseri in Ramadān 618/October 1221.

Sālādah Martin of Toledo had offered a house to many scholars and mystics, and among those Dāya is reputed to have encountered there was Ṣadr al-Dīn Kūn(y)awī, Ḥalāl al-Dīn Rūmī and Ṣawād al-Dīn Hanafīs [see nābūg]. Living swine are not impure according to the Mālikīs. The Shīʿa add to the things mentioned above the human corpse and the infidels. The human corpse was one of the chief sources of impurity according to Jewish ideas (cf. already Num., xix). A current in early Islam tending to follow the Jewish customs in ceremonial law was very strong; the Shīʿa view regarding the human corpse may be a residuum of it. The impurity of infidels is based upon sūra IX, 28, where the polytheists are declared to be defiled (nadjaz). The Sunni schools do not follow the Shīʿa in the expression of this verse.

The nadjaz enumerated above cannot be purified, in contradiction to things which are defiled only (mutanadjazasdt), with the exception of wine, which becomes pure when made into vinegar, and of hides, which are purified by tanning. On purification, see TAHARA, GHSUL, WUD.
Kirmānī. The first figure of note he met was Shīhāb al-Dīn Abū Hāfṣ ʿUmar Suhrwardī; Dāya crossed the border with him in Maṣyaʿa after the latter was returning from a mission to the Sufījīs Ḍālī al-Dīn Kaykūbād [q.v.]. Before his arrival in Maṣyaʿa but also that he had already decided to dedicate it to Kaykūbād (Historie des Seldjoucides d'Asie Mineure, Turkish text, ed. M.Th. Houtsma, Leiden 1902, 226). The two recensions in which the Mīrṣād exists may explain the contradiction. One was completed soon after his arrival in Kayseri and intended as "a gift to true seekers and veracious lovers", and the other in Sivas, in Radjab 620/August 1225, dedicated to Kaykūbād.

Despite the generally acknowledged excellence of the Mīrṣād and the encomium to Kaykūbād with which it concludes, Dāya was evidently disappointed by his reception in the Saldjuk capital of Konya, for which it concludes, Dāya was evidently disappointed and the encomium to Kaykūbād with only that Dāya had completed the work in question—Mīrṣād al-ʿibādī lālā rūḥ al-maʿāṣī—before his death by another Kubrawī, ʿAbī al-Dawla Simmānī. Dāya took up this commentary at Sārat al-Bakara and was able to advance it as far as Sārat al-Nadīm; the major portion of it is thus his. His relentless insistence on discovering metaphysical points for nearly every verse of the Kurʾān sometimes verges on the arbitrary and the artificial, but there can be no denying the popularity and influence of the work. It has never been printed, but substantial portions of it are quoted in a tafsīr of which several printings do exist: the Rāḥ al-bayān of Ismāʿīl Ḥakkī al-Būrūsawī.

Dāya also wrote several minor works, of which Risāla-yi Rāʾīš u ʿalā—"a preliminary essay for certain sections of the Mīrṣād"—deserves mention.


NADĪRJAN, a city in northern Yaman and a major urban centre in the Arabian Peninsula in ancient times. It was an agricultural, an industrial, and a trade centre, owing all this to the facts of geography. It was celebrated for its cereals, fruits and vegetables and also for its leather and textiles, situated as it was in the midst of a fertile awādī, which also bore the name Nadīrjān. Its importance as a caravan city was owed to the fact that it was located at the intersection of two main caravan routes, one that ran from Ḥadramawt through Ḥijāz to the eastern Mediterranean and another that ran to the northeast through Yāmāma to Mesopotamia-Trāk.[9]

It was important enough early in the 4th century A.D. to attract the attention of Imruʾ al-Kays, "king of all the Arabs" (d. A.D. 328), and three centuries before, it was captured by Aethlus Gallus, whom Augustus dispatched against South Arabia. But it was really in the 6th century that it attained international fame through an extraordinary sequence of events, the prime mover of which was the introduction of Christianity into the city in the preceding century, by one of its native merchants (Ḥayyān or Ḥannān).
Although the initial Christian impulse came from Hira, where Hayyân was baptised, other Christian recruits flocked into Nadjran from Byzantine Syria and from Ethiopia, all of which made Nadjran the main centre of Christianity in South Arabia. Various Christian denominations existed side-by-side in Nadjran, but Monophysitism was the one that prevailed.

Around A.D. 520 the Judaizing king of Himyar Dhu Nuwâs [q. v.] captured Nadjran and faced its inhabitants with the dilemma of either apostasy or death. Consequently, many of the inhabitants of Nadjran became martyrs. The Christian world, represented by Byzantium and Ethiopia, responded by sending a joint expedition against South Arabia, the former contributing a fleet, the latter an army, which under the command of Negas Ella-Asheba conquered South Arabia around A.D. 525 and converted it into an Ethiopian dependency and a Byzantine sphere of influence for some fifty years. This half-century was the golden period in Nadjran's history, during which it functioned as an Arabian martyropolis, a city of martyrs, a great pilgrimage centre for the Christians of the Peninsula. Monophysitism and the cult of relics in the 6th century received a great impetus from the blood and bones of so many martyrs in Nadjran. The chief among them was al-Harih b. Ka'b, the sayyid of the tribe of Banu Nadjran, the chief tribe in Nadjran; and as St. Arethas, he became a saint of the Universal Church.

The Ghassanids, the Arab allies of Byzantium in Oriens, together with the Persian-ruled Christian states of the Levant, were disposed to Christianity, and Nadjran was possibly the Christian protective power, Ethiopia.

The Christian confrontation which was to have included a Christian protective power, Ethiopia.

The year 570 brought about a sharp reverse in the fortunes of Nadjran when the Persians occupied South Arabia. The region was no longer under the domination of a Christian protective power, Ethiopia. Zoroastrian Persia was hostile to both Christianity and Byzantium, and naturally, Nadjran as a great Christian centre was adversely affected. But it was the rise of Islam and the Muslim conquest of Arabia that finally dealt Christian Nadjran a fatal blow, and this eclipse and final extinction during the Islamic period falls into three phases: (a) in the Meccan period of Muhammad's mission (610-22) the Kûrân is well disposed to Christianity, and Nadjran was possibly implied in Sûrat al-Burujid (13XXXV, 8-9) in which there is reference to the Ashâb al-Kûhåd [q. v.], (b) in the Medinan period (622-32), there was a hardening of attitude. In 650, a delegation from Nadjran came to Medina. This was a significant Muslim-Christian confrontation which was to have included a mubâhâla [q. v.], an objurgation, but the Nadjranites decided to withdraw from the contest. The Prophet then let the Nadjranites practise their religion, but demanded from them the payment of the mahr and contributing one or more singing slave girls (khulûq) to the Prophet, and he ordered to evacuate the city, which they did, and they emigrated to Trak where most of them settled in a locality called al-Nadjraniyya not far from Kûfa. But apparently not all of them left the city, since Christians are attested in Nadjran in later Islamic times, including bishops in the 9th and 10th centuries.

Nadjran survived its evacuation by most of its Christian inhabitants. Some of the Balhârât evidently converted to Islam and decided to stay on in their city, but apparently evacuated the pre-Islamic site at a later date in favour of a locality a few miles to the north-west, which grew into Islamic Nadjran. Situated in the midst of the harsh desert, Islamic Nadjran continued to prosper and remained an important centre in the economic life of the region. Its chiefs were influential in early Islamic times, especially as the mother of the first Abbâsîd caliph al-Saffah (750-4) was Rayata, a woman from Banû 'Abd al-Madân, who were thus referred to as al-Aghâwî, the maternal uncles of the Abbâsîds.

Ancient pre-Islamic Nadjran, nowadays called Ukhdûd, survives as a heap of ruins to the southeast of the present-day city of Nadjran, which is in the province of Asir [q. v.] in Saudi Arabia, but in the consciousness of mediaeval Christendom it vividly survived as the city of the Arab martyrs, as it still does in the churches of the Christian Orient.


Irfan Shahîd
AL-NADR B. AL-HÂRÎTH

Irfan Shahîd
AL-NAJDAR B. AL-HÂRÎTH
'Abd al-Dar in the group of the Ashâb al-Awlaqûn [q. v. in Suppl.], and two Kurânic verses containing precisely this expression (VIII, 31; LXXXIII, 18) are stated to have been specifically connected with him. The Kûrân is likewise said to have alluded to this personage, amongst other enemies of the Prophet, in various passages, notably VI, 8-9, XLV, 6-7-7-8. He fought at Badr [q. v.] in the pagan ranks and was captured. Muhammad then killed him personally and 'Ali cut off his head with a blow of his sword, but the fact is disputed since a hadîth says that the dammed who will suffer the cruellst punishment on Judgement Day are those who have killed a prophet or whom a prophet has killed. The most accredited version is that 'Ali b. Abî Talib executed him in cold
blood after having secured him in bonds (sabr) in a place called al-Safra; but ... must have been a town already fairly well developed and forming part of the IdrTsid realm and governed by Muhammad b.

---

Bibliography: In addition to the references in the article, see: Dajwiz, Hayouwim, iv, 161; Ibn Kutayba, Ma'sarf, 154, 576; Buhuri, Hamasa, 434; Abü Tamamm, Hamasa, i, 406; Ibn Hisham, Sir, i, 358-9, 359, 481, 571, 643, 655, 710, i, 42-3; Tabari, i, 1230, 1304, 1335; Mas'udi, Murji', 32-3; Abü Kallaf, Ghamara, Tab. 17. ii, 441; Aghani, i, 10-11 ed. Beirut i, 30-1; Ibn Rashid, 'Umda, i, 30; Zubayri, Nasab Kways, 255; Nawawi, Tabikhu al-asma', 593; Ibn Hadjar, Isba, no. 871; Ibn Abi Usaybi'a, i, 113-16; Zamakhshi, Kharbas, on Kur'an, XXXIX, 6.

(Ch. Pellat)

AL-NADR B. SHUMAYL b. Kharaqa al-Mazini, Abü '1-Hasan, Arab scholar who, born in Marw al-Rúdhi, 1224-740, was brought up by his father. He led a miserable life there, but was able to derive instruction from the most famous masters of the time (see Pellat, Milieu, passim), notably al-Khall b. Ahmad (q. v.), whose K. al-Asar he was to enrich by an introduction. He probably lived for some time (allegedly 40 years, which must be an exaggeration) among the Bedouins, whom he was also able to question at the Mirbad (q. v.). He was interested in the various branches of knowledge cultivated in his time and became an expert in matters of lexicography, grammar, poetry, hadith and even fikha and the history of the Arabs. Since his activities were not bringing him adequate means of subsistence, he decided to return to his native land, with which he must have kept up links. In Basra he had nevertheless acquired such renown that, according to tradition, not less than 700, even 3,000 (sic) traditionists, fuqaha, grammarians, etc. came to greet him on the Mirbad at the time of his departure and expressed their regret at seeing him go; he replied that he would be ready to stay if anyone would guarantee a measure (kaydaga) of beans for him each day, but no one was willing to promise this. It seems that Abü 'Ubayda (q. v.) had exploited this incident in his book on the mauthil (q. v.) of the Arabs. He therefore returned to Marw, where he held the office of kadi and "made the Sunna dominant" (azhara al-sunna), which was one of his specialties. It was there that he had occasion to frequent al-Ma'mün's madjlis and to display to him his knowledge of grammar and poetry; he accordingly received from the prince and his entourage a rich reward. He is said to have died in Dhu 'l-Hijjah 204/May-June 820, but the year 203 is also mentioned.

AL-Nadr b. Shumayl's work was copious, judging by the lists given by his biographers, but none of these works has survived. Probably the most important was the K. al-Sifat fi 'l-hujja in 5 volumes, of which the Fihrist (52, ed. Cairo, 17; ed. Tehran, 58; cf. Szegén, GAS, viii, 50) provides a fairly detailed summary. This work was a kind of dictionary or encyclopaedia—the first of its genre—and it was used by authors fairly near to it in time, such as Abü 'Ubayd al-Kasim b. Sallam (d. 224/838 [q. v.]) in al-Qarib al-musannaf. His other works bear witness to his erudition and to his intellectual curiosity: Qarib al- hadith, al-Ma'ani, al-Wadha or Matthil al-'Arab wa-mansukhuh, al-Anwa', al-Qim and al-Qams wa-l-kamar.

(Ch. Pellat)
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Sulayman. This accordingly marks a definite stage, but one whose distant origins cannot be brought into the clear light because of the lack of documentation. However, the preceding stage whose origin is at the same time the origin of the leading dynasties working towards a unification of both sides of the western Mediterranean, and of the trans-Mediterranean commercial movements, brought Nedroma definitively into being, strengthening its urban character and its main functions, well noted by al-Idrisi.

Hence the Almoravids provided it with an important mosque and minbar, clearly reminiscent of that in the famous great mosque of Cordoba, as was the case according to G. Marçais. Such attention on the part of these prestigious rulers was well-deserved, since, according to al-Bakrī, the diversity of its agricultural produce, and the nearby inlet to the sea, that of Māṣīn, making possible maritime transactions, gave Nedroma the merited appellation of “a considerable town”. In this way it acquired a religious dignity and even an official character, shown in the acquisition of typical urban features. But under the Almohads it was unable to claim any other dignity, considering its geographical position. At all events, the founder of the dynasty assigned to it a strategic role, which at the same time entailed a depopulation of the Traras, given the importance of the military contingents from this region which followed the monarch towards Marrakesh in the 10th/12th century, the Kūmaya.

Whatever the case, the unification of the two coasts of the Mediterranean was beneficial in that it permitted the continuation and the intensifying of multifarious exchanges, material and cultural in origin, in the latter case, of the Andalusian heritage of Nedroma as visible at the present day in its musical heritage, the origin of certain families and, above all, in deep-rooted cultural traditions.

Regarding the appearance of the “Abū al-Wādīdīs [q.v.], this is marked by the strengthening of links with their nearby capital, Tlemcen [see TILMA]. The two towns, both enjoying the charm of the Traras mountain chain and the proximity of the coast, came to complement each other. Nedroma became a place of rural retreat for certain rulers of Tlemcen and their descendants, as happened with Abū Ya'qūb Yūsuf when he renounced the throne in 749/1348. The residence takes the shape of a fortress, the Kasaba, of which some traces are still visible below the Maghnīyya road, to the south of the heart of the old town, and whose toponym kṣar es-sōldān still today recalls a lively chapter from that brilliant period.

Throughout this latter period, the town's being thrown back on its own resources necessarily increased by continual emigration to the urban centres and also abroad, to France, movements not always by the less privileged classes but in good measure by the relatively better-off and by those who acquired a bilingual culture in particular. The first official school opened in 1865, and one can trace from 1880 onwards the emergence of the first elements of the present-day élite, seen in the physician M. Nekkāch, the first doctor from the colony itself to practice in Oran (Sari, 1990) and Si M'hamed ben Rahal, a personality of the political, religious and literary world from the end of the 19th century (Djeighlou, 1977), illustrating the continuing effects of the ancient heritage of Nedroma, even though the town is still affected by the rural exodus caused by the national war of liberation and its consequences in a frontier zone, which efforts to stabilise the population have not succeeded in stemming; its population of 17,175 in the 1987 census shows a rate of growth below the national average.


(NADWA [see DĀR AL-NADWA].

NADWA AL-'ULAMA', a Muslim educational and reform society established at Kānpūr (Cawnpore) in north India in 1310/1892 (moved to Lucknow in 1316/1898) to (a) evolve a new educational system by amalgamating the "old" and the "modern" curricula, and (b) to eliminate sectarian differences among Muslims. As Nadwa, as it is popularly called, failed to impress upon other madrasas with regard to the vigour of artisanal activity and the continuation of the irrigated system of agriculture in the rural hinterland of the town. Cotton goods were spun there, showing how the town adapted to the new conditions caused by change, both internal and those common to the Maghrib, and also to the whole Mediterranean-Atlantic region. It was as a result of these two activities, henceforth the exclusive ones of the town and its hinterland, that the commercial effects began to affect the whole Trara region and beyond, into the areas of traders coming from Tlemcen, Maghnīyya, Orūdā, and even Sefrou and 'Abyān. However, the medieval period, Nedroma had a garrison representing the bayūk of the West, bringing with it some oppressive effects but more often inciting the citizens to further efforts, the origin of the remarkable diversity of artisanal activities before the French occupation of Algeria (see Nedroma 1954-84).

Throughout this latter period, the town's being thrown back on its own resources necessarily increased by continual emigration to the urban centres and also abroad, to France, movements not always by the less privileged classes but in good measure by the relatively better-off and by those who acquired a bilingual culture in particular. The first official school opened in 1865, and one can trace from 1880 onwards the emergence of the first elements of the present-day élite, seen in the physician M. Nekkāch, the first doctor from the colony itself to practice in Oran (Sari, 1990) and Si M'hamed ben Rahal, a personality of the political, religious and literary world from the end of the 19th century (Djeighlou, 1977), illustrating the continuing effects of the ancient heritage of Nedroma, even though the town is still affected by the rural exodus caused by the national war of liberation and its consequences in a frontier zone, which efforts to stabilise the population have not succeeded in stemming; its population of 17,175 in the 1987 census shows a rate of growth below the national average.

to adopt its suggested curricula, it established in 1898 at Lucknow its own educational institution, Dār al-ʿUlām, which is now more famous than the society itself.

During the first half of the 19th century, English-language schools had cropped up all over British India but certificates of the usually state-run madrasas teaching basically Dāris-i Niẓāmī, the curriculum laid down by Mullā Niẓām al-Dīn (d. 1679) to produce qualified newmadrasas to join the state machinery. After the events of 1857 and the subsequent attitudes of disfavour towards Muslims by the British, the former started to establish private madrasas geared only to imparting religious education. The first such madrasa, Kāsim al-ʿUlūm (now known as Dār al-ʿUlūm), was established at Deoband in north India in 1865 and soon a chain of similar private madrasas sprang up all over India.

It was soon felt, especially by Shibli Nuṣānī [q.v.], that new madrasas should be set up in order to integrate the ‘old’ and the ‘new’. The new movement was called Tabākī-i Iṣlāḥī Niẓāb (‘curricula reform movement’). The ‘reform’, however, did not exceed the deletion of some old textbooks and the introduction of some new ones on history, geography, mathematics in addition to English, as well as the replacement of Persian by Urdu as the medium of instruction.

Nadwa aroused great controversy in its early years among the Muslims of India. Opponents published dozens of pamphlets against the society, which they considered another form of the Ḥalīlī movement of Sayyid Ahmad Khan. Supporters of the Nadwa responded with counter-pamphlets (some of these are found in the Nadwa library).

Annual conferences to popularise its ideas and to ensure mass participation in various Indian cities continued from 1894 to 1927 (printed and ms. reports are available in the library and archives of Nadwa). The only other general conference was the institution’s 85th anniversary celebrated in 1975 (report in Muhammad Hasan, Rūḍūd-i ʿlāmān, Lucknow 1976).

Nadwa has its own big library which includes 630 rare books and 3,000 ms. It published an Urdu journal, al-Nadwa (1904-12, 1912-16, 1940-5) and an Arabic journal al-Dīḍā (1932-5). Currently, its various wings publish three periodicals, monthly al-Islāmi, al-Rūḥānīyya wa al-dīnīyya fi l-Hind, Madrasa ca. 1965, 34-52; Sayyid Muhammad Ikram, Maqāṣid al-Kaʿthf, Lahore 1979, 187-93, 221-48; Muḥir al-Hakīk, Muslāmān aur seclar Hindustān, New Delhi 1973, 47-81. More material will be found in the following works on personalities closely connected with the Nadwa’s early years: Sayyid Sulaymān Nadwī, Ḥayāt-i Shibli, Aʿzamgarh 1943; Sayyid Muhammad al-Ḥasan, ʿArād-i Muḥir al-Hakīk, Lucknow 1964; Aḥmad al-Hanī ʿAlī Nadwī, Aḥmad al-Hayāt, Lucknow 1970; Shams Tabriz Khan, Sadrāy Dūng, Lucknow 1972.

NADWĪ, Sayyid Sulaymān (1884-1955), Indian scholar of Islam. He was born at Desna, near Pañā, on 22 November 1884. After receiving traditional Urdu and Persian education in his village and neighbouring towns, he joined Dār al-ʿUlūm of the Nadwāt al-ʿUlāmī [q.v.] at Lucknow in 1901 and graduated in 1906. His talents were recognised by Shibli Nuṣānī [q.v.] who became his mentor and appointed him as the assistant editor of al-Nadwa magazine in 1907. He also started teaching kāthf and Arabic literature in Dār al-ʿUlūm (1908-13) and in 1923, became the chairman of its educational committee (Muḥir al-Hakīk al-dīnīyya), a post which he held for over two decades. He helped Shibli in his Surat al-Ḥakīk project launched in 1910, and later completed this encyclopaedic work on the life of the Prophet (vol. i-iii published during 1924-38) after Shibli died leaving it incomplete in 1914. The incomplete seventh volume of this work was published posthumously in 1980.

In 1915 Nadwī established the Dār al-Musannīfīn at Aʿzamgarh [q.v.], the most notable Muslim research institution in India, and launched its magazine Maʿarif a year later. He took part in Indian nationalist and Muslim politics in the 1910s and 1920s and was a member of delegations sent to London (1920) and the Hiḍāyat (1924, 1926). As a rare recognition in those days, Nadwī was awarded an honorary D.Lit. by the All-Indian Muslim University (AMU) in 1943.

He was appointed the Chief Justice (Kādī al-Kudūt) of the princely State of Bhopāl [q.v.] as well as the rector of its Dājāmī’s Maḥārīkīyya in June 1946. His status was devalued after the absorption of Bhopāl into the Indian Union in 1947, but he stayed on until April 1950. He migrated to Pakistan in June the same year and was appointed in August 1952 as the chairman of the Idara Taʾlimīt Islām, an official body instituted to assist the new government in framing the constitution according to the teachings of Islam.

Nadwī, generally considered to be the greatest
Indian Muslim scholar of this century, died at Karachi on 23 November 1953. An enlightened traditionalist, Nadwi later reverted to rigidness in the wake of initiation in 1940, by the Sufi murshid. His name is mentioned in the first place. Thus there is no trace of him in Ibn Sa'd's Tabaqat, in which one would expect him to be included among the mausulûn Successors of Medina (ed. Sachau et alii, v, 208-29), which, by all standards, presents a seemingly exhaustive list. Ibn Hadjar, Tahâdhib, x, 413, quotes Nafi's text in its current editions may not be complete, the reason why Nâfi did not receive mention among Medina's Successors in Ibn al-Djâzwî's Sifat al-salâkhûn, ii, 42 ff., or for that matter in a number of comparable sources, remains to be explained. In sources other than hadith he turns up only occasionally as a purveyor of legal as well as historical data. He never does so, however, as a person whose historicity could be postulated, acting or speaking against a tangible historical backdrop, but rather as a mechanical inâd insert. If Nâfi was indeed a historical figure, he received singularly little attention in all those sources which are otherwise typified by their generous treatment of Nâfi's peers, those who preceded him as well as those who came later.

His fame rests mainly in his alleged position in inâd collections. One inâd in particular was considered by al-Bukhârî (q.v.) as the soundest in the entire tradition literature: Mâlik b. Anas (q.v.) — Nâfi — 'Abd Allah b. 'Umar — Prophet (cf. Ibn Hadjar, Tahâdhib, x, 6). Mâlik is said to have reached his death in 179/795, namely ca. eighty-six (lunar) years, and if he did not hear traditions directly from Nâfi, he must have been still very young at the latter's death, which fell sometime between 117 and 120 (735 and 738). And this does not tally with another piece of information describing Mâlik as still a shâbî, or (in a variant) even a fâtî, some 14 or 17 years after Nâfi's death (see Ya'kîb b. Sufyân al-Fasâwî, K. al-Mafâla wa'l-târikh, ed. A. D). All of this makes the indications shâbî or fâtî for Mâlik in the year 134/751 are taken as factual, he must have been born approximately at the time Nâfi is recorded to have died, a computation more in line with Mâlik's year of death, and this especially in view of the life expectancy for a man in those days. (For studies on the 7th and 8th century practice of artificially stretching one's age into the past, see Bûhî.) On the basis of the latter chronology, traditions on the alleged authority of Nâfi cannot have reached Mâlik in a way other than as written material, which must have come into his possession a good number of years after Nâfi's reported year of death.

That Mâlik may eventually have come by one or more şahîfîs (q.v.) in circulation which purportedly contained traditions recorded by Nâfi on the authority of Ibn 'Umar and others, is not entirely out of the question, although this is suggested nowhere in the sources. Transmitting traditions according to the procedure that goes by the technical term 'ard or mu'ârâda (which means that someone claimed that he had "presented" a şahîfî in which he had copied a certain master's traditions to that master for approval, after which he was free to transmit them to his own pupils) was a practice which seems to have come into existence some 110 years after the death of the Prophet (cf. al-Fasâwî, ii, 137). The general practice...
was that these pupils then passed on to their pupils what they had copied on the direct authority of the first master, with or without mention of the intermediary, the original owner of the hadith. (For a convincing example of this practice, compare the techniques used by the early sources involving Nāfi’s person for the most part equally non-committal. The one alleging that 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz [q.v.] sent him to Egypt to teach the population the sūran (Ibn Ḥadāj, Tahdīb, x, 414), is questionable, not only because of the doubtless topical mention of 'Umar II, but also because it has not left a trace in the source best known for information on Egypt. al-Kīnī’s K. al-Wāṣīt wa l-badī‘. Nāfi did receive a brief reference as one of the fuḥādas of the 2nd/8th century in al-Ya’qūbī’s Taqīd (cf. index s.n.), but that is about all. However, if Nāfi had indeed been a fīkh expert, it is incomprehensible why the early sources such as the pre-canonical musannafs (by Ibn Hadjar, 'Āmmār at VII, 258; Juynboll, Muslim tradition, index, s.v. “age trick”; idem, The role of mu‘ammārin in the early development of the isndād, in WZKM (1991). For the technical terms “common links”, “single strands”, “main clusters”, isndād “bundles”, “snowing under”, etc., see idem, Some isndād-analytical methods illustrated on the basis of several woman-demeaning sayings from hadith literature, in Al-Andalus, x (1989), 343-94; idem, Some notes on the earliest fuqahā of Islam distilled from hadith literature, in Arabica, xxxix (1992). For “seeming” or “artificial common links” as well as an analysis and categorisation of Nāfi-supported traditions, see idem, Nāfi, the mañila of Ibn 'Umar and his position in Muslim hadith literature, forthcoming in Isl., hx (1995).)

NĀFI b. al-ʿAZRĀK al-Ḥanāfi al-Ḥanẓali, Abū Rāghīd (said to be the son of a freedman of Greek origin who was a blacksmith; al-Balāḏurī, Futūḥ, 56), Ḥarīridjīte who played quite a considerable role in Islamic history as leader of an extremist fraction of that sect known after him as the Azarikā [q.v.] or Azrākīs, who lived on substantially after his death. See ibid. (G.H.A. Juynboll)
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It may be added that the term rawatib is used especially for the supererogatory salats preceding or following the mākātib; they belong to the first subdivision.

In Shi'ite folklore naafisī is the widest term; by managhghabat the daily and non-daily supererogatory prayers are designated.


NAFISA, AL-SAYYIDA, a mausoleum situated to the south of the Fāṭimid city of al-Ḳāhira in the northern part of the cemetery area of the City of the Dead (al-Ḳārāla), to the south of the Mosque of ʿAbdād b. Ṭūlūn in the direction of the sepulchral mosque of al-Šaffāt. Among the female saints [see WALI] in Cairo next to Sayyida Zaynab bint Muḥammad-ād b. Tulun in the direction of the sepulchral complex of Imam al-Shafīʿī, a “Mawlid” and Imam al-MuḥSA` (Sukayna) “Sitt Sekīna” (Sukayna) “Sitt Nefisa” takes a very prominent place. In the official documentation, they belong to the first subdivision.

NAFISI, SA, Persian scholar, fiction writer and poet, was born on 8 June 1896 in Tehran. His family on his father’s side had a long medical tradition, which also included his father, ‘Ali Akbar Nafisi (d. 1303/1924), who held the title of Nāẓim al-Albāb, and was a distinguished physician of his time. Nafisi received his early education in Madrasa-ye ʿSharaf and Madrasa-ye ʿIlmīyya, and in 1288/1909 went to Neuchâtel, in Switzerland, for further studies. His family wanted him to go into medicine. In Neuchâtel, Nafisi joined the Collège Latin and learned Greek and Latin, which were necessary for one’s enrolment in Swiss and French medical schools. After a year’s residence in Switzerland, Nafisi went to France. In 1290/1911 he published his first work, a translation concerning dental care. From his residence in Switzerland and France, Nafisi acquired a great love of the French language and its literature. Hence on returning to Iran in 1297/1918 he was hired to teach French in the nationally famous Akdasiyya School and in the Saint Louis Catholic School, later called the Tehran School. In Tehran he was drawn to the capital’s literary milieu. He became acquainted with the celebrated poet Malik al-Shu’arā’ Muḥammad-Taki Bahār (1886-1950), and helped him in the production of his literary journal, Dānīghadā, which appeared from April 1918 to April 1919. Nafisi’s publishing experience contributed to his appointment in 1918 as editor of Falāḥat wa tidjārat, a journal issued by the Ministry of Agriculture, Commerce and Public Welfare. He held this job until 1921 and also worked with the ministry in several other positions, finally ending as director of its advanced business school.

Subsequently, he served under the Ministry of Education teaching history and literature in various institutions. When Tehran University was founded in 1935, Nafisi joined its staff, and in Shahrivar 1315/August-September 1936 he was confirmed as professor to teach the history of Islam until 1325/1946. He was also elected as one of the first permanent members of the Iranian Academy. In 1949 he took premature retirement from teaching, but returned to the university in Bahman 1337/January-February 1959, and joined its College of Literature. During his career he made numerous trips to foreign countries, where he was frequently invited by universities, cultural societies and government bodies. A few years before his death he was appointed to the government’s Educational Council as well as to the board of trustees for the Pahlavi Library. Towards the end he settled down in Paris, visiting Iran periodically. He attended the International Congress of Iranologists when it was convened in Tehran from 31 August to 7 September 1966. This was his last visit to Iran, for he died in Tehran on 12 November 1966.

Saʿdī Nafisi was a prolific writer and the author of an exceedingly large number of books, monographs and articles. His scholarly and literary activity covered a wide and varied field which included political and literary histories, accounts of poets and their writings, editions of manuscripts, lexicons, original works of fiction poetry, and translations from foreign literature. Among his better known literary works is the collection of historical short stories entitled Māh-i Nakšab (‘Moon of Nakshab’), first published in 1328/1949. He also wrote three novels, namely Parangī (1311/1932), Nīma rāb-bikātī, Nīma rāb-bikātī, and Sholagāt (1317/1939).
NAFISI S., SAFID — NAFS

(‘Halfway to paradise’, 1332/1953) and Atish-hd-yi
nihufta (“Hidden fires, 1339/1960). His important
translations include Homer’s Iliad (1334/1955)
and Shakespeare’s Othello. In addition to Fa’lah
and Dagi,” mentioned earlier, he edited three other
djournals, Umrid Sharid and Payam-i nau. He
commanded a facile pen, and his prose style has
won generous acclaim for its clarity and lucid
expression.

Ahmad, 463-75; and ‘Sargush-hd-i man’ by Sa’d Nafisi, 477-84; Moud, Dzighgdkd-yi Adaby-yi
Tabrzn, xiv/3 (1346/1967) (articles by various
writers as well as a chronology of Sa’d Nafisi’s life and a bibliography of his works);
Parimaz Nafisi (ed.), Yadhdma-yi Sa’d Nafisi,
Tehran 1351/1972; eadem, ‘Umri b’d Sa’d Nafisi, in
Payam-i nauh, x/1 (1972); ‘Abd al-Husayn Zar
rinkkdb, Dar bani-yi Sa’d Nafisi, in ibid.; J. Green,
Iranian short stories, a bi-bibliographic survey,
Costa Mesa, Calif. 1989; Muhammad Sadr
Hashimi, Tdrk-h-irdiyd y madjdlli-I Iran, i-v,
Ishafhn 1363-4/1984-5. (Munibur Rahamn)

NAFS (A.), soul. Nafs, in early Arabic poetry
meant the self or person, while rdbh meant breath and
wind. Beginning with the Kur’an, nafs also means
soul, and rdbh means a special angel messenger and a
specific divine quality. Only in post-Kur’dnic
literature are rdbh and nafs equated and both applied to
the human spirit, angels and qinn. Since the
two concepts of nafs and rdbh are so closely connected, both
will be considered here.

I. The Kur’dnic uses. A. Nafs and its plurals
anfus and nasama; b. ruh and ruh al-
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vital and the other discriminative, or d. the discriminative soul is double, sometimes commanding and sometimes forbidding.

V. The influences that affected the post-Kur'anic uses of both nafs and ruḥ were the Christian and Neoplatonic ideas of ruḥ with human, angelic and divine applications, and the more specifically Aristotelian psychological analysis of nafs. These influences are clearly shown in the records of the religious controversies.

A. Al-‘Ashʿarī [q.v.] (H. Ritter, Die dogmatischen Lehren der Anhänger des Islam von Abu ʿl-Ḥasan Aḥmad bin Ḥamad al-ʿAshʿarī, Istanbul 1929) reports the Rāfiḍiyya doctrines of the incarnation of ruḥ Allāh in Adam and its transmigration through the prophets and others (6, 46), as well as the conflicting positions that man is (ṣūm) only, body and spirit, and spirit (ruḥ) only (61, 329 ff.). His creed of the orthodox (290-297) omits any statement about the nature of man.

B. Al-Baghdādī [q.v.] (al-Fārāb baʿy al-fārāb, Cairo 1328) records the same heretical doctrines about man’s nature (28, 117 ff., 241 ff.), says the transmigration theories were held by Plato and the Jews (254) and describes the incarnation beliefs of the Rāfiḍiyya (287). His position is that “the life of Adam is a temporal and the soul is eternal,” and so on to the tenth (288) who is the ruḥ of sura LXXVIII, 56.

C. Ibn Ḥazm [q.v.] uses nafs and ruḥ interchangeably of man’s soul (Kitāb al-Fisāl fī l-mīrāj, Cairo 1317-21, v, 66). He excludes from Islam all who hold metempsychosis views, among whom he includes the philosophic-philosopher Muhammad b. Zakariyyāʾ al-Rāzī (98, 90 ff., iv, 187-228). He rejects absolutely any of the sayings of the Ḥārām-iyya of the continual recreation of the ruḥ (iv, 69). He taught that Allāh created the spirits of all Adam’s progeny before the angels were commanded to prostrate to him (sūrā VII, 171), and that these spirits exist in al-Barzākhi [q.v.] in the nearest heaven until the angel blows them into embryos (IV, 70).

D. Al-Shārāstānī [q.v.] (Kitāb al-Mīlāl wa l-nīḥāḥ, ed. Cureton, i, London 1842), in his description of the belief of the pagan Arabs concerning survival after death, does not use the terms nafs or ruḥ, but says the blood becomes a wrath-like bird that visits the grave every hundred years. One of his most important sections (203-40) deals with the orthodox and heterodox doctrines of ruḥ. Al-Shārāstānī [q.v.], or true believers, debate with al-Ṣāḥibī [q.v.], who are dualists, emanationists and gnostics. His account of the views of the Sāḥibī who faithfully reflects the doctrines of the Ikhwān al-Safāʾī (Rāṣūlī, Bombay 1935), who taught that man is a whole compounded of a corporeal body and a spiritual nafs (i/2, 14), and that the substance (gauhar) of the nafs descended from the spirit (gauhar). But al-Shārāstānī rejects the Neoplatonic idea that human souls (nafsī) are dependent upon the souls of the superhuman spirit world (al-nafsī al-rūḥānīyy) (210, 224-5), and the Hermetic doctrines that the nafs is essentially evil (236) and that salvation consists in the release of the nafs from material bodies (226-7). He applies the term rūḥānī to all spirits, good and evil (213). His description of the natural man (216 ff.) with three souls, vegetative, animal and human, each with its own source, place and powers, resembles that of the Ikhwān al-Safāʾī (Rāṣūlī, i/2, 48 ff.). Indeed, the Aristotelian analysis of the human soul as given in De Anima, and handed on by Alexander of Aphrodisias and Porphyry, had been adopted with little modification by the Muslim Encyclopedia of Islam, VII
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philosophers, such as al-Kindī [q.v.], al-Fārābī [q.v.], each of whom wrote a Kitāb al-Nafs, Ibn Sīnā [q.v.], who wrote two, and Miskawayh [q.v.], whose Tahāfut al-rūḥānīyy has the same immaterial (1) and functional (7) psychology for its ethical basis. Al-Shārāstānī achieved the long-needed interpretation of the conflicting usages of nafs and ruḥ in the Greek and Christian heritage, and in the Kur’ān and Muslim tradition. But the philosophers, even with his support, were not able to force the Greek psychology upon orthodox Islam. The maturakūlimin [see KALM] and the great majority of Muslims broadened the Kur’ānic terminology, but retained the traditional views of the nature of the soul as a direct creation of Allāh having various qualities.

VI. Aristotle’s principle of the incorporeal character of spirit had nevertheless found a permanent place in Muslim doctrine through the influence of Islam’s greatest theologian, al-Ghazālī [q.v.]. In al-Tahānawī’s Dictionary of the technical terms, ed. Sprenger, Calcutta 1862, are extracts of the doctrines of al-Ghazālī on man’s ruḥ and nafs. He defines man as a spiritual substance (gauhar rūḥānī), not confined in a body, nor imprinted on it, nor joined to it, nor separated from it, just as Allāh is neither without nor within the world, and likewise the angels. It possesses knowledge, cognition and reception of the intellectual accident (547 at top; cf. Tahāfut al-falāṣīf, Cairo 1302, 72). He devotes the second section of al-Risāla al-ladunyya (Cairo 1327, 7-14) to explain the words nafs, ruḥ and kāb (heart), which are names for his simple substance that is the seat of the intellectual processes. It differs from the animal ruḥ, a refined but mortal body in which reside the senses. He identifies the incorporeal ruḥ with al-nafs al-mutamāma (ruh), and al-ruḥ-amin of the Kur’ān. He then uses the term nafs also for the “flesh” or lower nature, which must be disciplined in the interests of ethics.

VII. This position of al-Ghazālī’s was that of the theistic philosophers in general, as well as of some of the Muʿtazila and the Shīʿa, but it has never dominated Islam. The great analytical philosopher and theologian, Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī [q.v.], could not bring himself to accept it. In his Maftûḥ al-ghayb, v, 435, commenting on sūrā XVII, 85, he quotes as the opinion of al-Ghazālī the statement that is in the latter’s Tahāfut (72; cf. also al-Rāzī’s Mubāṣṣar, Cairo 1323, 164), but on 434 (I. 9 and 8 from below) of the Maftûḥ, he acknowledges the strength of the corporeal doctrine, and in Mubāṣṣar wa al-ṣāliḥ, on the margin of the Mubāṣṣar, 117, he definitely rejects as baseless (kaftāl) the view of the philosophers that the nafs is a substance (gauhar) which is not a body (gauhar) and not corporeal.

VIII. Al-Bayḍāwī’s [q.v.] system of cosmogony and psychology is given in his Tawāwīl al-anwār (lithograph ed. with commentary by Abu ʿl-Thanāʾ al-Ishāshānī and gloss by al-Ḍurqūjānī, Istanbul 1305, 285 ff.; Brocklehurst, P, 533, S, 742-3). He discusses the classes of incorporeal substances: 2. the heavenly intelligences; 3. the souls of the spheres; 4. the corporeality of human souls; 5. their creation; 6. their connection with bodies; and 7. their survival. His cosmogony follows: Allāh, because of his unity, created only one Intelligence (ṣāliḥ). This Second Intelligence, that emanated first (al-ṣāliḥ) from Allāh, is the cause (illa) of all other potentialities and is not body (gauhar), nor original matter (hayal, kaftāl) or (sūrā VII). It is the second cause (ṣāliḥ) of another intelligence with soul (nafs) and sphere (falak). There emanates from the second a third intelligence and so on to the tenth (288) who is the ruḥ of sūrā LXXVIII,
38 (cf. al-Baydawi's Anwar al-tanzil, ed. Fleischer, ii, 383, 1, 4), whose effective influence is in the world of the elements and who is the progeny of the spirits (aruṣ) of mankind. Below these intelligences are the high or heavenly angels, which the philosophers call al-nafs al-falakiyya, and the low nafs, which are in two classes: earthly angels, in control of the simple elements and the earthly souls, such as the reasoning souls (anfus nāītah) controlling particular persons. In addition (285), there are the incorporeal substances, without effect or control, who are angels, some good (al-muḥarrīkān) and some evil (al-kurubiyyun) and the dīnān, who are ready for both good and evil. This is the classification he refers to in his comment on sūra II, 28 (ed. Fleischer, i, 47, 25). His psychology resembles that of al-Ghazālī, whom he mentions (294). For the incorporeality of the soul (tağarrud al-nafs) he presents five arguments from reason, four Kurʾānic verses and one tradition. His commentator remarks (300) that these prove only that the soul differs from the body.

He then argues that all nafs is created when their bodies are in and is not close to the body, but is attached as the lover to the beloved. It is connected with that rūḥ which comes from the heart and is generated from the finest nutritive particles. The reasoning nafs produces a force that flows with that rūḥ through the body, producing its proper functions. These rational functional powers are perceptible, which are the five external senses, and the five internal faculties of the sensus communis, imagination, apprehension, memory and reason, and the active (al-muḥarrīkān) which are voluntary (lightyārīyān) and natural (tabīʿiyān).

IX. The dominant Muslim doctrine concerning the origin, nature and future of al-rūḥ and al-nafs is most fully given in the Kitāb al-rūḥ of Ibn Kayyim al-Dāwjīyya [q.v.] (Haydarābād 1324). Of his 21 chapters, Ibn Kayyim devotes the 19th to the problem of the specific nature of the nafs (279-342). He quotes the summaries given by al-Ashʿarī (op. cit., 331-5), and by al-Rāzī (Mafāštī al-khāyān, v, 431-4). He denies al-Rāzī’s statement that the muṭakallīmūn consider man to be simply the sensible body, and says all intelligent people hold man to be both body and spirit. The rūḥ is identified with the nafs, and is itself a body, different in quiddity (al-muḥākaya) from this sensible body, of the nature of light, high, light in weight, living, moving, interpenetrating the bodily members as water in the rose. It is created, but everlasting; it departs temporarily from the body in sleep; when the body dies it departs for the first judgement, returns to the body for the questioning of Munkar and Nakir [q.v.], and, except in the cases of prophets and martyrs, remains in the grave everlasting bliss or punishment until the Resurrection. He rejects (256) Ibn Hazm’s doctrine that Adam’s progeny are in al-Baraṣχ [q.v.] awaiting their time to be blown into embryos. He presents 116 evidences for the corporeality of the rūḥ, 22 refutations of opposing arguments and 22 rebuttals of objections. He represents traditional Islam.

X. The earlier Sufis had accepted the materiality of the rūḥ. Both al-Kūṣayrī [q.v.] (al-Risāla, with commentary of Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī and gloss of al-ʿArūṣī, Bulāk 1290, ii, 105 ff.) and al-Hudūwī [q.v.] (Kashf al-mahdūb, ed. Nicholson, London 1911, 196, 262) call the rūḥ a fine, created substance (ṣūr) or body (dīnān), placed in the sensible body like sap in green wood. The nafs (al-Risāla, 103 ff.; Kashf al-mahdūb, 196) is the seat of the blameworthy characteristics. All together make the man.

In addition to the philosophical position of the immateriality of al-rūḥ that al-Ghazālī had made orthodox, another interpretation of spirit developed which is essentially philosophical. Ibn al-ʿArabī [q.v.] (H.S. Nyberg, Kleine Schriften des Ibn al-ʿArabī, Leiden 1919, 15, 11, 7 ff.) divides “things” into three classes: Allāh, Who is Absolute Existence and Creator, the world, and an undefinable tertium quid of contingent existence that is joined to the Eternal Reality and is the source of the substance and the specific nature of the world. It is the universal and common reality of all realities. Man likewise is an intermediate creation, a barakat (22, 42) of Allāh and the world, bringing together the Divine Reality and the created world (21, 42) and a vicegerent connecting the eternal names and the originated forms (96). His animal spirit (rūḥ) is from the blowing of the divine breath (95), and his reasoning soul (nafs nāītah) is from the universal soul (al-nafs al-kulliyya), while his body is from the earthly elements (95-6). Man’s position as vicegerent (45-6) and his resemblance to the divine presence (21) come from this universal soul, who has various other names, holy spirit (rūḥ al-kudus), the first intelligence (51), vicegerent (khālīfa), the perfect man (45) and the rūḥ of the world of command (ʿālam al-amr), which al-Ghazālī held to be Allāh’s direct creation (122). In his Fūsūl, lit. ed., with commentary by al-Kashānī, Cairo 1965, he says that al-Ghazālī himself is in a form which thus becomes the place of manifestation of the Divine Essence. This place receives a rūḥ, who is Adam, the khālīfa and the perfect man. He discusses (Nyberg, op. cit., 129 ff.) the essence and properties of the rūḥ, quoting among others the view he says is ‘attributed’ to al-Ghazālī which is in al-Tahdīf (as above). He finds the differences on divine haraṣṣ, since all agree that the rūḥ is originated. In his tractate on the nafs and rūḥ (M. Asif Palacios, Tratado acerca del conocimiento del alma y del espíritu, in Actes du XIIème Congrès international des Orientistes, Paris 1906, iii, 167-91), he describes how men may reach the distinction of “the perfect man” through the cultivation of the qualities of the rūḥ and the suppression of the nafs.

Ibn al-ʿArabī’s contemporary, the poet Ibn al-Fārīd [q.v.] (Nicholson, Studies in Islamic mysticism, Cambridge 1921, ch. iii), at times identifies his own rūḥ with that from which all good emanates (al-Taʾṣīʾa al-kafūrā, on margin of Divān of Ibn al-Fārīd, Cairo 1319, ii, 4-5) and with the “pole” (kuḥ) upon which the heavens revolve (113, 115). Al-Kashānī, the commentator of al-Taʾṣīʾa, explains that this identity is with the greatest spirit (rūḥ al-ʿarṣād) and the greatest "pole". The compiler of the commentaries on the Divān states (ii, 196) that incarnation (ḥulūl) and union (ittihād) with Allāh are impossible, but there is real “passing away” (fanāʾ) and attainment (waqāf) of the rūḥ and nafs in the nafs of Allāh, for His nafs is their nafs.

ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Dīlānī carries his position of existential monism on to strict animistic pantheism. In al-Insān al-kamīl, Cairo 1334, the terms rūḥ al-kudus, rūḥ al-ʿarṣād and rūḥ Allāh stand for a special one of the aspects of the Divine Reality (al-Hakīk), not to be embraced under the command “be” nor created. This spirit is the divine aspect in which stand the created spirits of all existences, sensible and intelligible (94). Existence itself subsists in the nafs of Allāh, and His nafs is His Essence (gūlim). Moreover, every sensible thing has a created spirit (rūḥ) (194). One of the aspects of the angel of sūra XLI, 52, who is named the command (amr) of Allāh, and who is an aspect of Allāh as above, is given to the rūḥ mentioned...
in the verse. That angelic and divine ruh thereby becomes the Idea (hakika) of Muhammad (95-6) and he thereby... 27-49; C. Glasse, Nafs and Ruh, in idem, The concise encyclopaedia of Islam, London 1989, 295-6, 338; T. Seidenstickes, [more text]
NAF{T}. 1. In pre-Islamic times. The Greek word *naphtha* is probably borrowed from Semitic, for in Akkadian literature from Northern *Irāk* the word *naṣṭa* is well attested. There the substance could be easily found and its special qualities soon discovered. In Sumerian it is described as “mountain oil”, in contrast to “fish oil” and “vegetable oil”. In Aramaic it has been linked by assonance with the root *n-p-t*, which commonly describes oozing blood or dripping water, but the link is weak and it is safer to assume the nominal stem has been simply borrowed in Greek.

Akkadian literature distinguishes between clear and dark naphtha. Esarhaddon, for example, describes a “well of white naphtha” he discovered, but one of the melodic poems speaks of human skin turning “as black as pitch or naphtha”. It may be thick enough to eat, according to a description of a particular dream, or thin enough for the oleomancer to mix with water.

The ancient physician would make an ointment by compounding naphtha with fish oil or honey, but it may well have been a painful treatment since political rebellion was discouraged with the threat of making dissidents “eat bitumen, drink donkey’s urine, and be smeared with naphtha”.

The danger of using naphtha as fuel is emphasised within Judaism by the prohibition on using it for lamps, but this legislation produced questions about whether that law should apply equally to the Jews of Cappadocia, who were presumably used to handling it.

The word does not occur in Biblical Hebrew, where vegetable oil seems to have been the normal fuel source, but its discovery is graphically described in the intertestamental book of Maccabees where the legend of Nehemiah’s sacrifice is recounted.

Nehemiah chose to make an important sacrifice after he had rebuilt the temple in Jerusalem. To mark the solemnity of the occasion he sent to Persia for a secret substance, which the earlier exiles were supposed to have hidden there, and this was added to the sacrifice. Was everyone present when the heat of the rising sun caused a sudden explosion on the altar. According to tradition this was the event that gave rise to a word in Hebrew, *naphtha*, apparently from the important root *p-t-r*, “free, ran-som”; moreover it also provided the King of Persia with his first revenue from oil. The historical, philological and theological presuppositions of this story need careful scrutiny.

Bibliography: For the references to Akkadian literature, see The Assyrian dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, Chicago 1955–, s.v. *naṭṭa*; for references to Early Judaic literature, see M. Jastrow, A dictionary of the Targumim ..., New York 1950; for the story of Nehemiah, see II Maccabees i:18-ii:15. (M.E.J. Richardson)

2. In the mediaeval Byzantine and Arab-Islamic worlds.

This term is used in the Arabic sources on one hand as a generic, vague appellation for a substance which is basically petroleum (see 1. above), and on the other it is applied for the specially-prepared incendiary weapon frequently used on mediaeval warfare.

*Naft*, often accompanied or replaced by the term *nār* (= fire), corresponds to the Greek term *hygron pyr* or modern *pyran* (see above). In the context of war, the term was first applied by the root-culture Egyptian author Ibn Mangûli [p.v. in Suppl.] in his *Aḥkām* clearly identifies *nafsīnār* with the Greek liquid fire.

The *nafs*-carrying ships called *harrākā* in the Arabic sources correspond to the Byzantine ships known as *jyrphoros* or *kakadosiphoros* vessels. It is obvious, therefore, that no thorough study of either the use of *naft* by the Arabs or the *hygron pyr* of the Byzantines can be undertaken separately, and that only through a comparative study of both Greek and Arabic sources can we understand the function of this formidable weapon, whose limited direct effectiveness seems to have been enhanced by its strong psychological impact (a typical example of the uselessness of a monolithic approach to a study of *naft*/*hygron pyr* is the recent work by Th. Korres, *'Hygron pyr'*, en opio tis Byzantinēs nautikēs taktikēs Thessalonikī 1989, based solely on the Greek and Latin sources).

A study of the substance involves the following problems: origin and dating of this invention, its composition and its method of launching, the last two affected by a constant development of *naft*/*hygron pyr* over the centuries.

*The Hellenistic origins of naft/hygron pyr*

Incendiary weapons have been widely used in warfare since ancient times. The Byzantine sources, nevertheless, report that a special incendiary weapon was invented by the Byzantines in the last quarter of the 7th century. Theophanes (9th century A.D.) explicitly states that a certain Kallinikos from Syria invented it, and Th. Korres points out that it was successfully supplied in the Arab siege of Constantinople (674-8) (Chronicon, ed. C. de Boor, 354, II. 13-17). The Byzantine sources report that Greek fire was again successfully launched during another Arab siege of Constantinople in 717-18. In addition, the Arab Kūthāb al-ʿUyānī, which was written much later, probably in the 13th century A.D., but which contains material from earlier sources, also mentions explicitly that during this same siege, *naft* was used by the Arabs (for this siege, ibid., 24-33).

Most probably, the so-called invention by Kallinikos was simply a perfection of an old weapon in advanced form. He must have brought to Constantinople the tradition of Hellenistic science, during which period a system of missile-shooters and incendiary weapons was used, along with a number of catapults in land and naval warfare (see G.E.R. Lloyd, Greek science after Aristotle, London 1973, 96-9; K.D. White, Greek and Roman technology, London 1984, 217 f.). The most revealing artistic evidence of an advanced incendiary weapon is a graffito in an Alexandrian tomb dated to the 1st century B.C., published by A. Schill (Alexandrinische Dipinti ... 1, Leipzig 1905, pl. 1) and, recently, by L. Casson (Ships and seamanship in the Ancient World, Princeton 1971, fig. 115). It depicts a vessel with a firebasket hanging from two poles projected from the prow; as has been correctly pointed out by W.W. Tarn (Hellenistic military and naval developments, Cambridge 1930, 145), when the enemy ships rammed prow-to-prow, the baskets would fall on the other ship’s deck and set it on fire.

The Hellenistic and Roman periods were marked by the writing of treatises on warfare as well as the construction of numerous war machines, including those involving fire. Some of the most important authors of these periods are: Ktesibius of Alexandria (3rd century B.C.), Philo of Byzantium (ca. 200 B.C.), Marcus Vitruvius Pollio (ca. 25 B.C.), Hero of Alexandria (ca. 60 A.D.) and Dionsius of Alexandria (2nd century A.D.). The last one, Dionsius, invented a rapid-fire-repeating catapult, an automatic weapon called *polyphoros* (J.G. Landels, Engineering in the Ancient World, London 1978, 183 ff.). These must have been the sources for a number of Arab manuals.
of warfare (for these older treatises, see A.G. Drachman, Ktesibios, Philon and Heron, a study in ancient pneumatics, Copenhagen 1948; E.W. Marsden, Greek and Roman artillery, technical treatises, Oxford 1971). In late Roman times, various incendiary mixtures which became the basis of later developments, i.e. sulphur, resin, asphalt and pitch swathed in oakum soaked in crude oil were used, (R.J. Forbes, Studies in ancient technology, i, Leiden 1955, 101), and in this light, we can infer that Kallinikos' chemical composition was not an outstanding innovation, but simply a convenient synthesis of well-known materials placed on ships and used in a systematic way along with other missiles, at a time which is marked by a drastic change in naval warfare, i.e. the abandonment of the ram. Such composition would include the basic element, i.e. crude petroleum. No secret formula was involved, but a variety of formulations applied according to the nature of each warfare action, and Byzantine folklore about a divine secret kept zealously by special families is obviously sheer mythology (H.R.E. Davidson, The secret weapon of Byzantium, in BZ, iv [1973], 61-74).

The question which naturally arises is how the parallel development of naft took place in the Arabo-Islamic world. Byzantine nautical and naval warfare practice was, as noted above, immediately adopted by the Arabs, but the written Greek tradition appears much later, well into the 'Abbasid period. It was also during the late Hellenistic and Roman periods that stone-throwing catapults were mounted on ships and used for naval warfare. If we take into consideration that in the late Roman period various incendiary mixtures were invented or perfected, as for example that described by Vegetius (4th century A.D.), which was fixed to an arrow, i.e. a mixture of sulphur, resin, asphalt and pitch to which crude oil was added, we understand that the elements for the invention of Kallinikos already existed in the late Roman tradition and that he simply perfected the 'Greek fire'. (For various incendiary mixtures in Roman times, see Forbes, loc. cit.)

**The Islamic period**

Kallinikos' perfection of Greek fire based on the Alexandrian legacy came at the turning-point of some important changes in naval warfare in the Eastern Mediterranean. In late Roman times, speed and the use of ram became again important after an obvious neglect in Hellenistic times. Procopius, writing in the middle of the 6th century, describes the *dromon* as a light warship. A century later, at the famous battle of *Dhdt al-Sawdn* A.H. 341/1255, a pumpkin-shaped *dromon*—which were closely interwoven with the naval warship, *dromon* was the butt of the attack from the Asiatic invaders, and that relying chiefly on Kallinikos' fire, they were able to resist for several centuries. (N.D. Cheronis, It may be rightly said that Constantinople was the butt of the attack from the Asiatic invaders, and that relying chiefly on Kallinikos' fire, they were able to resist for several centuries). The Byzantine sources concerning the use of naft, collected and translated by Mercier and Canard, by the middle of the 7th century the Muslims were using naft and its use accelerated with the passage of time (see M. Canard, Textes relatifs à l'emploi du feu grégeois chez les Arabes, in B. Et. Ar., vi [1946], 3-7).

Several Arabic treatises dealing with warfare include important information concerning naft, sometimes accompanied by drawings (M. Reinaud, De l'art militaire chez les Arabes au moyen âge, in JA [Sept. 1848], 193-237; K. Huuri, Zur Geschichte des mittelalterlichen Geschützwesens aus orientalischen Quellen, Helsingi 1941; A.R. Zaky, Military literature of the Arabs, in Cahiers d'Histoire Égyptienne, ser. VII, fasc. 3 [1955], 149-60; N. Muhammad `Abd al-'Aziz, al-Thayl wa l-riyada, Cairo 1976). The most commonly used of these treatises is the work of Hasan al-Rammah, ed. A. Abádí, *Furúsíyá wa l-mandrib al-harbiyya*, 2 vols., Baghda 1984. Valuable also is the work of the 13th century author Mardîj or Murđa Ibn al-Tarsusî, ed. and tr. Cl. Cahen (Un traité d'armurerie composé pour Saladin, in BEO, xii [1947-8], 102-63).

The most valuable of the furúsíyya works on Greek fire are those of Ibn Mangî, most of which are not published. In his *Alkâm*, carelessly edited by M. `Abd al-Rahîm, there are passages referring to the Greek fire translated from the *Naumachia*, written by Leo VI in the middle of the 10th century (Christides, Naval warfare in the eastern Mediterranean (6th-14th centuries), in *Orientalia*, iii [1984], 137-148). Ibn Mangî equates the hygon *pyr* of the Byzantine sources with al-naft and/or när. He even used the Arab term al-nár al-majnâ'a, for the Greek *ekswmenon pyr* (made-up fire).

Naft/Greek fire was used by the 'Abbasid armies (see e.g. the *naftâ'inn, naft-thowers, and their naftâ'în, equipment for hurling it, used by al-`Askîn against the Khurrami rebel Bâbâk in 222/837, al-Taban, iii, 1215), through the periods of the Bâyids and Saldjûks (see Spuler, *Iran*, 493-4) to that of the Mongols (Chinese naft-thowers in the army of Hulegu, see *Cimb hist. Iran*, v, 341). During the Cruising Wars, it was mainly used for land warfare [see *Hînd, iv*, at vol. III, 475b-476a], and although sporadically used at sea as late as the 15th century, it was finally replaced by gunpowder [see Bârûn].

**The composition of Greek fire**

An examination of all sources—Arabic, Greek and Latin—reveals that there was no secret recipe zealously kept by any party, but undoubtedly there was a great variety of incendiary mixtures whose numbers grew steadily. One cannot therefore accept the statement in the otherwise useful work by Cheronis, "It may be rightly said that Constantinople was the butt of the attack from the Asiatic invaders, and that relying chiefly on Kallinikos' fire, they were able to resist for several centuries". (N.D. Cheronis, Chemical warfare in the Middle ages: Kallinikos' prepared fire, in *Journal of Chemical Education*, xiv [1937], 361).

In the Greek and Arabic sources, the core ingredients of naft/Greek fire included sulphur, pitch, quicklime and cypress resin, which thickened the mixture, and in the Arabic furúsíyya literature are
The launching of naft/Greek Fire

This is a complex problem which needs further research by means of a thorough correlation between the literary evidence of Arabic and Greek sources with the numerous drawings in Arabic sources, most of them still in unpublished manuscripts. These drawings emphasise the use of pots, made mainly but not exclusively, of clay. Thus in an often-cited drawing of an Arabic manuscript, such fire bombs appear prominently on various places of the ship (see Pászthory, Über das "Griechische Feuer", fig. 2). Such fire bombs, according to the literary Arabic sources, could be thrown from a basket attached to the main-mast (from the crow's nest) by hand. A great variety of machines for throwing fire pots appear in Arnaýbāhš’s Al-Anik reproduced in Khānāna al-sīlah, ed. N.M. Abd al-Asīr, Cairo 1978. The Byzantine sources, and in particular Leo VI’s Naumachia, report that the main fire-thower is placed on the prow and some minor ones on the sides, while light fire-throwers were carried by hand.

The passage of Leo VI’s Naumachia, 1.6, is translated into Arabic and preserved in Ibn Mangīl’s Akbām (ed. Abd al-Rahīm, 21). The parallel examination of Leo VI’s text with the Arabic translation sheds some light on the position and function of this main fire-thower (see Christides, Naval warfare in the eastern Mediterranean (6th-14th centuries), in Graeco-Islamic war machinery (6th-14th centuries A.D.), to appear in Nubica [1993]).

From the literary and pictorial evidence it is obvious that both Arabs and Byzantines used various types of fire-throwing machinery based on tension or torsion or on the sudden releasing of heavy weights. Such machinery could be sometimes the same as that for stone-throwing, as is mentioned in the Strategikon of pseudo-Mauricius, in which the petrobolos (stone-throwing machinery) also launches chouzia (pots of earthware), full of fire, and moved by the power of antiharēmatēn (the release of heavy weights). While the function of the pot-throwing machinery can be easily understood, it is not easy to determine exactly the function of the machinery which launched directly naft/Greek fire (see the attempt by J. Haldon and M. Byrne in their edition of the above-mentioned work and their drawing).

The Arab fire-throwing machines, as well as those for stone-hurling, were further developed under Chinese influence which reached its peak during the Mongol period; during the 13th century, when the use of the magnetic compass passed to Europe [see Magry, Sjär. 2]. Chinese influence is definitely discernible in the construction of Arab-Islamic war machinery and fire bombs (see Christides, The transmission of Chinese maritime technology by the Arabs to Europe, in The American Neptune, 52/1 [1992], 38-45).

It should be noted finally that Ibn Mangīl mentions small vessels with great mobility equipped only with fire arrows which could sink large ships.


3. In the modern sense of oil: the Middle East and South East Asian oil industries.

1. Introduction

The discovery and development of oil resources in Islamic countries was, as elsewhere, initially dependent on the natural distribution of deposits and their exploitation by commercial interests with the...
necessary technical skills, capital availability and distribution facilities.

Early oil production was dominated by the United States and Russia at the end of the 19th century. As the 20th century emerged new oil fields were discovered in Europe, the East Indies, Burma and Iran, which became the precursor of the later immense importance of the Middle East area. Thus by the first decade of the 20th century oil discoveries were already occurring in regions of Islamic culture. The economic impact of oil and its accompanying technical advances and growing consumption has also been affected by contemporary political and nationalist influence.

Some countries began to limit the freedom of foreign private enterprise to operate within their borders by challenging the terms of the original concessions or even expropriating them and forming domestic companies as in Romania, South America and Mexico, particularly in the 1920s and 1930s. This process accelerated in the 1950s and 1960s as the established major oil companies faced greater competitive pressure and increasing demands from oil producing-countries with enhanced political prestige and rising economic expectations. Besides, demand for oil for industrial requirements grew as coal consumption declined as a result of the formation of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) on 4 September 1960 in Baghdad. The first phase of the oil era was drawing to a close. Members included (with date of joining): Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and Venezuela, September 1960; Katar, January 1961; Indonesia and Libya, June 1962; United Arab Emirates, January 1968; Algeria, July 1969; Nigeria, July 1971; Ecuador, November 1973, and Gabon, 11 June 1975.

The second phase, although still influenced by commercial considerations, emphasized optimizing revenue, asserting the sovereignty of national natural resources and exercising control over the pricing and production of petroleum products, and was essentially achieved by 1973. The first decade of OPEC's existence was one of aspiration, the second of positive consolidation and the third of adjustment to changing political and economic circumstances in the markets. Its response to problems has generally been one of action through consensus, but serious conflicting interests have inevitably arisen among the members, who by no means included all oil-exporting countries. While there has been an organization formed for Arab oil interests, OAPC (Organization of Arab Petroleum Countries) (January 1968), there has been no concerted Islamic approach, though individual countries have acted within their own concept of Islamic theory and practice. In general, considerations of real political and economic power rather than religious principles have predominated, though some countries have engaged in oil boycotts and embargoes in connection with Arab-Israeli hostility, or in conflict among themselves such as Iran and Iraq. Oil revenues have had a deep effect on the life style of Islamic countries which have had such an experience.

II. Individual Countries

1. South-East Asia

Indonesia [q.v.] declared itself an independent state in 1945, after which there began gradually the Dutch withdrawal from the islands formerly comprising the Dutch East Indies. Oil was struck near the north coast of Sumatra at Telega Tunggat in Langkat on 15 June 1885, but it was not till 28 February 1892 after a pipeline and a refinery were built that oil was processed for the first time by the Royal Dutch Company. On 8 January 1897 oil was discovered at Balik Papan in the Kutai Province of South-East Borneo. Oil was discovered in southern Sumatra in the Palembang district on 24 January 1897, becoming the most prolific field up to 1939, when the whole region was the fifth largest producer in the world. The oil installations suffered great damage during the Second World War. However, in the 1960s the oil industry had become the most dynamic sector of the economy and had replaced rubber as the principal export. It has a low sulphur content and in the 1970s became the most important single supplier of the Japanese market. The management and financial position of the national oil company, Pertamina, was under suspicion in the mid-1970s, but it has since recovered its reputation.

2. Middle East.

(a) Iran. Muzaффar al-Din Shah [q.v.] granted an oil concession in 1901 and oil was subsequently discovered after years of hard endeavour in difficult terrain on 26 May 1908 at Masjidi-Sulaymân.

In April 1909, the Anglo-Persian Oil Company was formed to exploit the Concession, and by 1913 a pipeline of some 130 miles had been completed and a refinery constructed at Abâdân which by 1950 was the largest in the world. The acquisition in 1914 by the British Government of a majority shareholding in the company caused added political complications to the inevitable concession and commercial disagreements, particularly during Rida Shah's drive to modernise the country. The concession was cancelled in 1932, renewed in 1933 and nationalised in 1951 while Dr Muhammad Muṣافîdî [q.v.] was Prime Minister. On behalf of the state company, the National Iranian Oil Company, an international consortium of companies drawn from the major oil companies and some American independent concerns virtually controlled the Iranian oil industry till the emergence of OPEC and the action taken by Muḥammad Rîdâ Shah [q.v.] in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The province of Khûzestân in south-western Iran has remained the principal location for oil fields.

(b) Iraq. This became the second area of oil importance in the Middle East when the discovery well drilled by the Iraqi Petroleum Company (IPC), an international consortium constituted to develop the concession, came in at Baba Gurgur north of Kirkûk on 27 June 1927. Oil was first exported in 1934. It became a highly politicised issue as a result of the Arab-Israeli confrontation from 1949 onwards and as a result of the coup d'état of Abîd al-Ḳarîm Kamûsin [q.v.] on 14 July 1958. It was fitting that the first meeting of OPEC was held in Baghdad. Like Iran, Iraq has been transformed by its oil revenues from an agricultural to an industrial society since the 1960s.

(c) Saudi Arabia. In 1944 geological evidence confirmed that the location of the greatest oil reserves was centred in the Middle East. The strategic, political and economic consequences of this development have been immense, especially in Saudî Arabia, whose austere and traditional Islamic way of life has had to face modernising influences, political problems and international exposure on an unprecedented scale. Tribal encampments have jostled with high-rise office blocks. In the search for alternative sources of oil outside the United States in the 1920s and 1930s, the Standard Oil Company of California obtained a concession from Abîd al-Ḳaṣîm Ibrâhîm Saud on 29 March 1933 and was joined by the Texas Oil Company three years later. Early in 1938 oil was first struck near Dharîrîn [Zahrân [q.v.]].

American interest has remained very strong, and
even during the Second World War the American Government, through its Petroleum Reserves Corporation, proposed taking a shareholding in Sa'ūdī Arabian oil and constructing a pipeline with a Mediterranean outlet. However, a refinery at Ra's Tanūra and later the pipeline were constructed while the company, renamed the Arab-American Oil Company (ARAMCO), expanded to include the Standard Oil Company (New Jersey) and the Standard Oil Company (New York), thus exclusively American owned. It introduced into the Middle East at the end of 1950 the 50:50 division of profits which had already been conceded in Venezuela, completely changing the concessional pattern and greatly increasing the revenue-earning capacity of oil with its economic implications.

(d) Syria has recently began the production and processing of oil, mostly for its own consumption.

3. The Persian Gulf

Oil was discovered in Bahrayn in May 1932, Kuwayt in April 1938, Kātār in December 1939, Abū Dhabī off-shore in September 1958 and on shore 1960. In 'Umān, production began in August 1967 and in 1966 and in Dubayy September 1965.

4 North Africa

Oil was discovered first in Algeria under French auspices at Hasi Messaoud (Hisy Mas'ud) and on the fringe of the Sahara early in 1956, and provided substantial revenues for the new state after the Accord of Evian in March 1962 with France regarding independence. In Libya, oil exports began in 1961, and with the coup d'état of Colonel Gaddafī (Kadhăfī) against King Idris in 1969, the new régime adopted a radical stance in oil affairs. Tunisia has minor oil production.

5 Elsewhere

Before 1939 there was some oil production in Egypt, but it was boosted in 1974 by legislation pro-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle East</th>
<th>Thousa...</th>
<th>% Share of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abū Dhabī</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubayy and Emirates</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Irāk</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwayt</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Zone</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Umān</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kātār</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa'ūdī Arabia</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Yemen</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Yemen</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Less than</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Middle East | 89.3 (49.2)* | 65.2 (55.3)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Africa</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asia</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEC</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

World         | 136.8 (88.9) | 100.0 |

* 1980

Source: BP Statistical review of world energy, June 1990
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle East</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu Dhabi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubai &amp; Other Emirates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>105.1</td>
<td>168.1</td>
<td>251.9</td>
<td>267.7</td>
<td>262.3</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>109.3</td>
<td>114.7</td>
<td>142.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>125.7</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>138.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>114.4</td>
<td>129.5</td>
<td>153.0</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Zone</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>119.4</td>
<td>148.6</td>
<td>287.2</td>
<td>343.9</td>
<td>409.8</td>
<td>491.3</td>
<td>233.0</td>
<td>212.2</td>
<td>256.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Middle East</strong></td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>176.2</td>
<td>261.8</td>
<td>338.3</td>
<td>463.6</td>
<td>564.3</td>
<td>896.8</td>
<td>975.1</td>
<td>1058.8</td>
<td>789.2</td>
<td>383.2</td>
<td>643.2</td>
<td>814.0</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total OPEC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total World</strong></td>
<td>278.2</td>
<td>672.1</td>
<td>1090.5</td>
<td>1352.6</td>
<td>1695.9</td>
<td>2145.0</td>
<td>2633.8</td>
<td>2954.3</td>
<td>3094.1</td>
<td>2903.6</td>
<td>2838.9</td>
<td>2926.7</td>
<td>3089.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BP Statistical review of world energy, June 1990
moting a policy of infitah opening-up to foreign investment, and the oil sector benefited from this change of policy.

Both parts of the Yemen have recently begun modest production, as has Malaysia.

III Economic statistics

An idea of the price levels for crude oil 1972-89, taking Arabian light crude as the marker, of the massive concentration of oil reserves in the Middle East; of oil production in Islamic countries 1938-89; and of the growth and decline of OPEC oil revenue figures 1963-86, is given in Tables 1-4 respectively.

Table 4
Total OPEC oil revenue (with countries included from year of full membership)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenue ($bn)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>122.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>114.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>192.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>192.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>192.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>275.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>192.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>275.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>247.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>123.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>123.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>123.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>123.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>123.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>123.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>123.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>123.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>123.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>123.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>123.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>123.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>123.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


NAFTA (NEFTA), a small town in the oasis of the same name in southwestern Tunisia, situated on the isthmus separating the depressions of the Shatt al-Djirad and the Shatt al-Qharsa. It is 473 km/295 miles from Tunis, 321 km/200 miles from Kayrawân and 35 km/21 miles from the Algerian border. This geographical position, added to an abundance of water resources, accounts for the role played by this town from year of full membership)
Tozeur were two flourishing and lively links, all the more so since the local agricultural production included a large range of sought-after crops and products, made possible by a carefully constructed irrigation system.

This, in general outline, was Nafta’s general evolution, but it was accompanied by a certain decline more and more marked as the caravan traffic fell into disorganisation. Nevertheless, this was to some extent compensated by the rise of maraboutism, making Nafta one of the main centres of important dervish orders like the Rahmaniyya, an order which was Algerian in origin and which provided asylum for certain figures in the resistance efforts of neighbouring countries in the 19th century, seen in the example of a Nacer ben Chora (Rey-Goldzeiguer, 513).

In recent times, the town’s evolution has been dominated by the fact of continued emigration, seen in the decline of population between 1936 and 1975, from 13,500 to 12,500, with a low point of 11,500 in 1966. However, during the last decade, since 1980 and since the opening of an international airport at Tozeur and the oasis’s modernisation, Nafta has been able to become integrated into the national economy by opening itself extensively to international mass tourism, even if the surplus working population cannot be entirely absorbed by these new activities. In tourism, even if the surplus working population can...
Djubba, the only wells in the central area of the sands (Palgrave, i, 91-9; Blunt, i, 187-92; Euting, i, 141-56; Folk and Mares, 173-228). Another route from the north-west was followed by the Nolde, while Gertrude Bell only skirted the south-western edge of the Nafud, using the wells at Hayzán. The pilgrim road from al-Ṭrāk, the Darb Zubayda [q.v. in Suppl.], only touches the eastern side of the Nafud, approaching it in the area of al-Tha‘labiyaa. Modern asphalt roads generally have avoided the deep sands of the Nafud. However, in the course of the 1980s, a highway was started across the Nafud from Hā’il to al-Dawāt.

**Bibliography:**

G.R.D. King

**AL-NAFÚSA,** in Berber Infusen, name of a Berber tribe. According to the common genealogical scheme (cf. Ibn Khālūd, Kitāb al-‘Ibar, i, 107-17), the Nafusa are one of the four branches of the large body of the Butr, whose name derives from their chief Madāghī al-‘Abtar. At present, the dwelling place of the Nafús is south-west of Tripoli in Libya, on the slopes of the same name (al-Nafūsa, Djabal) which from the frontier between Tunisia and Tripolitania tends eastward, and if taken in the largest sense, comprises the regions of Nālūt, Fassāsūt and Yefren. The inhabitants of this region are generally called Nafûs, although, in a genealogical sense, this name can be applied to some groups only. Probably the name Djabal Nafûs (in Berber adwar n Infusam), which originally belonged to a part of the plateau, was extended to a large area between Wāẓzen and Yefren on account of the fact, that of the tribes inhabiting it, the Nafûs were of prominent importance. This use of the name in its widest sense is also to be found in the book by İbrahim b. Sulaymân al-‘Ibânî, Rothaiya, Relation, in which all the territories of Yefren, Fassasö and Nafûs are described.

The scarce data on the history of the Nafûs which we possess, are to be found, for the largest part, in Arabic sources. In the Greek and Latin authors of pre-Islamic times there is no single sure allusion to them. The name occurring in Corippus’ Johannis (second song, l. 146, Quaeque nefanda colunt tristis mon-tana Nausa), does not refer, in all probability, to a place or a tribe of Tripolitania, but rather of the Aurès (Awra), its plateau or its neighbourhood. The fact that Navus represents a form closely connected with Nafûs proves only that the name was widely spread among the Berbers.

In Islamic times, the name is recorded for the first time in connection with the capture of the town of ‘Ayrās; this event is mentioned in H. Tripoli, ed. A. Mares, 23 (1966, passim); ‘Idāri (i, 2-3), during the siege the inhabitants called to their aid the Nafûs, who came to their aid. At that time they were residing also in the vast plain of Djâfârâ, situated between the Djâbal and the sea; one of their chief towns, if not their capital, was ‘Abdrâ on the coast (Roman Sabratha, formerly Phoenician), west of Tripoli, which by Ibn Khâlūd (‘Ibar, i, 181, l. 8) is called “the city of the Nafûs”. This town was taken by surprise and plundered by a body of cavalry sent by ‘Amr. This raid was probably undertaken not only to continue the conquest farther westward, but also to punish the Nafûs, whose territory ‘Amr had invaded in order to conquer it (cf. al-Bakrî, 9, 10), and which he had to abandon by order of the caliph.

According to some sources, the Nafûs at that time were Copts (cf. M. Norberg, Southern Arabia, 188, note 18), according to others they were Jews. Our latest local information makes it probable that Christianity had spread widely among them, though the conversion of single groups to Judaism is not excluded. In fact, traces of Byzantine basilicas have been found on the plateau, e.g. at Temêldâ, ‘Iṣrânîn, etc., which are also mentioned in some sources and which must have been used by large numbers of the indigenous population.

When the Arabs had conquered North Africa, the Nafûs of ‘Abdrâ and of the coastal region retired, according to the common opinion, to the plateau, where they remained hostile towards the conquerors. A fresh study of the Tripolitana population, however, makes it clear that a part of them must have stayed in their old dwelling-places, where they intermarried with other tribes and, in course of time, became arabised. In fact, there are tribes in the Western Djâfârâ and in Tripoli, the town and its surroundings (the regions of al-Sāhil, ‘Ayrâs, etc.), that, according to the local genealogy, derive from the Nafûs. Apart from their ethnic tradition, there is the fact, recorded in several sources, that after the first case of intervention of the Nafûs in the affairs of the town of Tripoli—which may have been partly due to a Christian opposition to the Muslim invasion—they wanted, under successive dominations, to make their presence felt and their influence preponderant in the northwestern region of Tripolitania, so that the outlines of the history of the
small, but strong and civilised Berber unit may be supposed to be the following. Having its centre in the plateau, it intended to make itself, as often as possible, its dominion in the coastal region and thus keep the control of the main way of communication between Egypt and Ifriqiya, which ran along the coast and which was followed by the various expeditions to the Maghrib. Even at present, such aspirations may be stirred in the minds of the most cultivated of these populations, to such an extent that some of them have reckoned with an eventual reoccupation of their old territories in Western Džafara.

The period in which the Nafusa, according to the sources available to us, were most vigorous and active and took a part in the events happening in North Africa, was that of the great Kharidjī [q.v.] revolts, which began in 12/739-40 and did not cease until the beginning of the 4th/10th century, i.e. before the era of the Fatimids. When the Wahbi [see AL-WABIYYA] doctrines began to spread among the North African populations in the 2nd/8th century, they embraced them and so joined the rebellious movement of the Berbers against the Arab conquerors, a movement which, prepared by several other causes, found also some support in the Kharidjī heterodoxy. The Nafusa embraced the Ibādi [see AL-IBADIYYA], i.e. the more moderate form of the Kharidjī doctrine, which was very ever faithful to it with heroic attachment. In alliance with other Berber tribes, either Ibādi or other branches of the sect, they repeatedly made war upon the Arab governors of Ifriqiya.

In 140/757-8 they elected as their imām, probably with the intention of founding an Ibādi principality—an intention which manifested itself also at other times—an Arab called Abū '1-Khātāb al-Malzūzī [q.v.], one of the missionaries of Ibadism in North Africa. Under his command and in conjunction with other Berber groups, they occupied Tripoli, fought against the inhabitants of Lebda (see AL-SUFRIYYA) Wafārdjuma, who had sacked Kayrawān where they had settled, and against the armies sent by the ʿAbbaṣids to reconquer Ifriqiya. Finally, in 144/761-2, Abū '1-Khātāb and a large number of his followers perished near Tawurgha (Tawīrghā) in a great battle against the general Muhammad b. al-Asrār al-Khuzaʿī, the governor of Tripoli.

Another well-known imām of the Nafusa was a Berber, Abū Hātim Yaʾkūb al-Malzūzī [q.v.], whose enterprises survive in oral tradition on the plateau, which speak of his 375 encounters with the Arabs. He was killed in battle in 155/771-2.

When the Ibādi kingdom of the Rustamids [q.v.], which had Tāhert as its centre, had been founded, the Nafusa did not elect an imām of their own any more but formed a part of this kingdom under a governor who depended upon it. Some of these governors, e.g. Abū ʿUbayda ʿAbd al-Ḥāmid al-Diğanjūnī (of Iğen-iğan) and Abū Mansūr Ilyās (of Tendemmira), are often praised by the Berbers of the Džafar for their importance and ability in maintaining the interests of Ibādism, and also for their learning and piety.

The Nafusa were a valuable support of the Rustamids, of whose principality they formed the eastern bulwark. Being near the territory of the Aghlabids [q.v.], they shared to some extent the vicissitudes of this state which had arisen in Ifriqiya in the beginning of the 3rd/9th century. The town of Tripoli was in the possession of those princes; western Džafara, on the other hand, till near the Sea, and probably also part of eastern Džafara, was in the power or under the influence of the Nafusa. When Tripoli was beleaguered in 267/880-1 by the Tulūnī prince al-ʿAbbās [q.v. in Suppl.], who, having revolted against his father Ahmad, sought to conquer Ifriqiya at his own risk, the Nafusa were called to aid, and, appearing without delay, they defeated the army of the invaders (according to other sources, their help was invoked by the inhabitants of Lebda). This fact, which reminds one of the first siege of Tripoli by the Muslims, proves clearly the influence which the Nafusa possessed in northeastern Tripolitania and it accounts also for the severe blow dealt to them in 283/896 by the Aghlabids, when Idrīšī Ilīb, Ahmad, who led an expedition from Tunis to Egypt, found his passage through the coastal region of Tripolitania barred by the Nafusa. The bloody battle of Mānū, which was followed by acts of terrible cruelty inflicted upon hundreds of Nafusa prisoners, and which is narrated in a more or less anecdotal form in the Sunnī as well as in the Ibādī sources, is ascribed, ultimately, to the desire of the caliph to punish the Nafusa who were the principal support of the heretical state of Tāhert; or to the resentment of the Aghlabids at acts of emnity committed by the Berbers, as well as in the humiliation they had suffered when the expedition of the Tulūnī al-ʿAbbās, which was directed against them, had been averted by the Nafusa, to whom this exploit became a point of glory.

In reality, however, taking into account the whole political situation as well as the historical antecedents, it is evident that that battle, which is still mentioned in the oral tradition of the Ibādīs as the most terrible disaster they ever suffered, was the inevitable encounter between the Aghlabid power and the supremacy of the Nafusa exercised in the former's immediate vicinity and even in its own territory.

When the power of the Aghlabids as well as that of the Rustamids had been destroyed by the Fātimids [q.v.], the Nafusa found themselves face to face with those new masters of Eastern Barbary. There exist reports of an instance of their strenuous opposition to the Fātimid power, which endeavoured to subdue them in 310/922-3 and which defeated them in the following year.

There are, however, reports concerning the part taken by the Nafusa, or at least by tribes from the plateau, in the great Khāridjī rebellion, which was led by Abū Yazīd [q.v.] and which ended with the victory of the Fātimids. Probably the Ibādī populations of the Džafar, although having given up the idea of forming one large autonomous state, endeavoured to avoid any dependence upon the various kingdoms and empires which successively held the supremacy in North Africa, while the latter, on the other hand, endeavoured, as far as possible, to obtain a footing also in the mountainous region which forms the strategic key to the plain stretching towards the coast.

When the Almohads [see AL-MUWAHHIDUN] undertook the conquests of eastern Ifriqiya under ʿAbd al-Muʾmin (554-5/1159-60), the Nafusa were also subordinated by him. Their territory became the scene of violent struggles and massacres, of raids and partial conquests during the long period of the revolt of the Banū Ǧanāyin [q.v.] who attempted to restore the Almoravid empire and who, from 580/1184-5 onwards, for nearly half-a-century and with varying success, fought chiefly in eastern Barbary. In these fights, Arabs of the tribe of Dabbūb (belonging to the Banū Sulaym), who were called Dżafariyya during the well-known invasion of the Banū Hilīl and Sulaym, took part. Some clans of the Dabbūb, especially the Mahāmīd and the Dżawārī, settled in the coastal region west of Tripoli, where the Nafusa had exercised their power before. Yet the great mass of the latter
must have retired to the plateau not at the time of the conquest but in consequence of the Arab invasion.

The Nafusa remained in nearly the same attitude of defence of their independence, defending the supremacy in Ifrikiya of the Hafsid dynasty, and, afterwards, of the Ottomans. While other populations in the neighbourhood gave up their Ibadism in order to embrace Sunnism, and consequently became arabised, the Nafusa stuck to their faith and to their Berber vernacular, withdrawing themselves to the rough crags of their mountains, and from time to time taking part in the acts of hostility and in the rebellion which the interior opposed to the efforts of the government of Tripoli to maintain its own authority and, chiefly, to levy taxes.

In the 19th century, the Ottomans, after having retaken in 1251/1857-8 the direct administration of Tripoli, had to fight long and bitterly for the conquest of the plateau of the Nafusa also. The struggle lasted, with varying success, till 1274/1857-8. In this period the Arab tribe of the Mahamid had the largest share in the defence of their independence, during the supremacy of the Turks. In reality, however, he was an Arab and the Arab tribe of the Maḥāmīd had the largest share in the wars, while the Berbers, according to all appearance, did not take part in them on a large scale. During the Italian occupation of Tripolitania, which began in 1911, the Nafusa were at first hostile in accordance with their old aspiration to found an independent Ibadī kingdom which should extend up to the Sea and include the region of Sabratha. Defeated in 1913 by General Lequio near al-Asaba, they offered their submission to the Italian authorities and subsequently became faithful subjects during the period of Italian rule.

Human settlement of the Djabal Nafusa has historically been associated with groups seeking refuge. The Berbers moved away from the invasions of the Arabs of the Banî Hilâl and Banî Sulaym [q. v.], in later medieval Islamic times, while the Jews escaped from Tripoli during the incursion of the Spanish in the 16th century (H. E. Goldberg, Case dwellers and citrus growers: a Jewish community in Libya and Israel, Cambridge 1969, 11). In the Gharyân, the main district of the Djabal at the time of the Italian occupation of Libya immediately preceding the First World War, there was a population of 22,000 persons, of which 14,985 were Berbers, 4,870 were of mixed Arab-Berber origin, 9,295 were Arabs, 400 were Culegli [see kül-oglu] and 300 were Jews. At that time, many of the Arabs were nomadic or semi-nomadic while the Berbers and Jews were sedentary (E. de Agostini, Le popolazioni della Tripolitania, notizie etniche e storiche, Parte Ia, Tripoli 1917), living in troglodyte dwellings (Goldberg, op. cit.). In 1963 the Muḥāfaẓa of Gharyân contained 76,700 persons, of which 17 per cent was nomadic. (M. Alawar, Urbanization in Libya, in E. Joffe and McLachlan [eds.], Social and economic development of Libya, London 1982, 331-53). Estimates suggested a population of 204,300 persons in the district in 1988 (Encyclopaedia Britannica Book of the Year 1990, Chicago 1990, 639).

Important demographic changes took place in 1948 following the flight of Jews. In the period after the flight of Jews in 1948, the population grew rapidly in the region at 4% annually (IBRD, World development report, Oxford 1989, 215), though many males lived in large cities such as Tripoli while keeping their families in the villages of the Djabal.

The Djabal Nafusa has a limited but thriving agriculture. Dryland farming on the top of the scarp is confined to tree crops, including figs, apricots, almonds and olives. Tobago is grown in the Gharyân area and kitchen garden crops are widespread. Grain, principally wheat, is produced in great quantities at the foot of the scarp on lands traditionally owned by the people of the Djabal. Cultivation of the man-made terraces on the scarp face has generally been abandoned in recent decades. There has been little inducement for the Djabal Berbers to farm as the economic advances of recent years have been in improved roads, communications, housing and health facilities (M.M. Buru, The Tripoli agglomeration land-use changes and land-use options, in Buru, S.M. Ghanem and McLachlan [eds.], Planning and development in modern Libya, London 1985, 110-29).


K. S. McLachlan
AL-NAFUSI, ABI SAHIL AL-FARISI, Iḍābi scholar of the Rustamid family, who lived in Tibret [q. v.] in the 3rd/8th century. Some say that he was one of those who by their learning and religious zeal helped to make that town famous. He was a compiler of what the gardening and industry of the Djabal, 1982, 668 [270]). "It is the information pointing to the non-existence (ṣurūta) that is being talked about". It is the opposite of affirm-
tion (ṣāgāḥ), which the same grammarian defines as being "the information pointing to the existence (ṣouqād) of what is being talked about" (Paris, B.N. ms. arabe 4067, fol. 148, 1. 27). Concerning the links which exist between negation and affirmation, Ibn Ya‘ish declares: "Know that negation depends on (‘alla ḥassāḥ) affirmation, since negation being the denial (ṣīghāḥ) of affirmation, it is necessary that it should be in accord (‘alla waqfī) with its expression and that there should be no difference between them except that one is a negation and the other an affirmation." (Sharh al-Muṣāṣal, vii, 107)

Following Sibawayh, the Arab grammarians enumerate six particles (ḥurūf) whose signification (ma’nā) is negation; three of these (mā, lā, in) can be used in a verbal or nominal phrase, and three of them (lam, lammā, lan) only in a verbal phrase. In a verbal phrase, the six particles negate the action, at the same time placing it in a temporal framework: (1) mā, followed by a verb in the imperfect indicative, negates an action in the present (kāīd); followed by a verb in the perfect aspect, it negates an action in a past still close (mukarrah) to the present; and in combination with the conjunction li- followed by the subjunctive, mā also expresses the denial (ṣīghād) of the action. (2) lā, followed by a verb in the imperfect, negates an action in the future; followed by a verb in the imperfect apocopate, it negates an order, i.e. expresses a prohibition (ṣīdhab). Followed by a verb in the perfect, it may, under specific circumstances (e.g. lam ya‘kul wa-lā shariba "he did not eat or drink"); lā continues a previous negative), negate an action in the past, or it expresses an optative (du‘ā?). (3) lam, followed by a verb in the unaccomplished apocopate, negates an action in the past. (4) lammā, followed by a verb in the unaccomplished apocopate, negates an action in the past nearest (akrab) to the present. (5) lan, followed by a verb in the imperfect subjunctive, negates an action in the future; being more strong and energetic (ahlabhān) than lā, it strengthens (akkada) negation in the future, just as the particles sa-and sānfa strengthen affirmation in the future. (6) in, like mā, followed by a verb in the perfect indicative, negates an action in the present; followed by a verb in the perfect aspect, it negates an action in the past.

In a nominal phrase, the particle mā can mean the negation of the predicate in the present; from the viewpoint of rection, the norm (kiṣāṣ) is that it exercises no rection; but the Hindāzīs assimilate it to the verb laya, making it entail the vowel /a/ in the noun in initial position (muḥādāt), and the vowel /i/ or the preposition bi- and the vowel /i/ in the predicate. But in opposition to this, the Banū Tamīm do not allow it any rection. More rarely than mā, the particle lā can be employed like laya, but only when the noun in initial position is indefinite (nakīra); likewise the particle in, which, in combination with illā, expresses an exception (iṣṭiḥrā), but without exercising any rection. Finally, the particle lā is used before the noun in first place in order to deny it categorically. This is the negation in totality (istiḥrād) of the class (diğm), which certain grammarians also call "exemption" (tabrās); if the noun is indefinite, the particle entails the vowel /a/ without tanwiʿ (or -a in the fem. sound pl.); if the noun is definite, (mu’nāfī), the particle exercises no rection.

Bibliography: G. Troupeau, Lexique-index du Kūsāk de Sibawayhi, 204-5; Mubarrad, K. al- Mukttadah, ed. Uṣayma, iv, 188-201, 357-88; Ibn al-Sarrādī, K. al-Usājī, ed. Fallī, 92-7, 379-408; Ibn Ya‘ish, Sharh al-Muṣāṣal, ed. Cairo, i, 105-9, viii, 107-110; G. TROUPEAU) NAFZA (Nefsra), the name of a Berber tribe (ethnic: Nafsi) belonging to the group which the mediaeval genealogists and historians mention under the name of Butr [q.v.]. It had spread out over a large part of Barbary, between Irīfiyā [q.v.] and Fās, passing through the region of Constantine, Oran, Tiemcen and the Rif. In contemporary Tunisia, to the east of the massif of Kroumirie [see Gjumair], there extends the country of the Nafzas, a fertile region fringed with woodlands abounding in game. Near the Djabal al-Abyad, at ca 150 km/96 miles to the west of Tunis by road and 140 km/90 miles by railway, a station on the Tunis-Tabarka [q.v.] line bears the name of Nafza. In the manner of other Berber tribes, sections of whom had crossed the Straits of Gibraltar, the Nafza established themselves in particular in the valley of the Guadiana, upstream from Mērida [see Mārīda], where they had a strong hold named Ḥiṣn Umm Dja‘far. There was also a group at Jātīva [see Gqatība], but it was the first one which played the most important rôle on account of their connections with the Umayyads. It happened that ʿAbd al-Rahmān I al-Dākhil [q.v.], whose mother was a Berber captive originally from this tribe, had spent some time before crossing into Spain in the principality of Nakūr [q.v.], on the Moroccan coast of the Rif inhabited precisely by some of the Nafza, who henceforward continued to have privileged connections with Cordova. The Berbers seem to have been proud of the numbers of šubkā and kāfīs belonging to this tribe who became famous in Spain.


NAFZAWA, a tribe belonging to the group which the genealogists distinguished under the name of the Butr [q.v.] and which formed one of the two great Berber peoples, the other being the Barānis [q.v.]. They seem to have become fixed fairly early in Libya and to have spread over all the Maghrib, where the elements which are encountered there sporadically were largely sedentary or sedentarised. Mediaeval authors mention Naf zawa as far as Sīdjīlmaṣa and even as far as Awdaghūst [q.v.], but this tribe is known above all today for having given its name to a region of Tunisia to the south-south-east of the Ghott el Djerid [see Aqgħrān]. The Nafzawa (Nafzaoua in European usage) had their administrative centre, during the French protectorate, at the place Ghič (Kébīl), the seat of an Office for Native Affairs, whose archives contain documents of a geographical, ethnological or economic nature; since Tunisia’s achievement of independence, a second Delegation has been created at Douz.

The Nafzawa, whose history is essentially the same as that of the Dierdīr/Sīdjīlmaṣa [q.v.], only played a secondary rôle, and authors cite them mainly because the geographical peculiarities of the region allowed it
to serve as a refuge for rebels or for authorities in difficulty. More than its history, it has been the terrain of travellers and researchers (see BIBL.). Economists and sociologists have been especially concerned with the way of life of the population, which has evolved considerably since the beginning of the century, notably, as the consequence of a movement of gradual sedentarisation of the semi-nomads stimulated by the increase in drilling of artesian wells which favour the increase in the cultivation of land and the extension of palm groves in the oases, the main one of these last being El Gla (al-Kulay'a), to the south of which regions suitable for nomadism, still practised by the 10,000 Marázig, stretch as far as the Erg (‘Irk [see ŞAKR] and Ghadjéâm [q.v.]). Finally, one should not forget that a part of the Nafzawa area is made up of salt marshes (sabkâ, pl. sabdâb), which justify the expressive title which P. Moreau gave to his monograph, *Des lacs de sel aux chaos de sables: le pays des Nefzaouas*, Tunis 1947.

The great richness of the region lies in its date groves (see NAKL), which are treated with more and more care, since they provide the population with very appreciable resources and contribute moreover to the settlement of persons. In this regard, the studies of P. Moreau from the first decades of the 20th century, from 1889, a figure of one million was approached in 1967. The mediaeval geographers and travellers take care to place an emphasis on the abundance of these trees growing in the oases around some centres of population which they cite. In this context, they remark that the tribe which, at some indeterminate date, gave its name to the region, had already given this name to a place situated six days' march to the west (in reality, to the south-south-west of Kayrawân [q.v.], at three days' march from Gabès [see KANSA]), According to their description, this population centre was surrounded by a stone and unfired brick wall pierced by six gates; it had a Great Mosque, baths and flourishing markets, and had groves of dates, olives and various other fruit trees suitable for agriculture. The Ordinaries of the region canals which furrowed it, but this comparison is separately published several articles on the Nefzaouas: IBLA, in UNESCO, *Parcours Maraziq,* Talbi, index; P. Seran, *Moeurs et coutumes d'un village berbère,* Paris 1952, and *Lexique du parler arabe de Marazig,* Paris 1958.


NAFZAWA — NAGAR

NAGAR, the name of many towns and cities in India (Skṛ. *nagára* "city"). Those of significance for Islam are as follows:

1. Nagar, familiar name locally for Ahmadnagar [q.v.], being even used on signposts. C.R. Singhal, *Mint-towns of the Moghal emperors of India,* Bombay 1953, 7, describes a coin of typical Ahmadnagar fabric with the mint-name is simply Nagar.

2. Nagar, a large town in Karnataka, some 55 miles west of Shimoga, once a capital of local *nâdâs,* captured in 1176/1763 by Haydar ʿAli [q.v.], and so for a short time known as ʿHaydarnagar; Haydar ʿAli
established his principal arsenal and a mint there.

3. Nagar = Nagar Kot, with its stronghold (Kot) and fortification on the Kangra valley in the western Pindari (now Himachal Pradesh), was an important centre of Hindustani pilgrimage at the intersection of trade routes, which brought immense wealth to the temple of Devi there. This (or possibly another temple within the fort) was plundered in 399/1008 by Mahmud of Ghazni (Bada'uni, Muntakhab al-tawarih, i, 12), it fell to Firuz Shah the Tughluqid in 762/1360, (Bada'uni, ibid., i, 248-9) when the temple was again plundered. A rebellion in ca. 980/1572 (Bada'uni, ibid., i, 162-1; Bada'uni refers also to his own visit there in 1590/950) led to its being garrisoned by the Mughals, and Akbar's visit to it ten years later is recorded (Akbar-nama, iii, 348). It fell to the Sikhs in 1773 until the district was ceded to the British in 1846. The town and fort were destroyed in the 1905 earthquake.

4. Nagar nagaran, the original name of the fort on the Hari Parbat, outside Shrinaragar, Kashmīr, where Akbar later built his own fort. (J. BURTON-PAGE) NAGAWR, modern spelling Nagaur, Nagor, a town and district in the division of Jodhpur in the Rajasthan state of the Indian Union, formerly within the princely state of Jodhpur in British India; the town lies in lat. 27° 12' N. and long. 73° 48' E. at 750 feet above the sea level, 260 km to the northeast of Jodhpur (see JODHPUR), and in 1971 had a population of 36,435.

The walled town is said to have derived its name from its traditional founders, the Naga Radjrjuts. In the later 12th century it was controlled by the Cawhan dynasty lasted for over a century until Muhammad b. Tughluk, but this must refer to a restoration, since the style and the surface decoration are more consonant with the buildings of Shams al-Din Itutmish; a fine Kur'anic inscription above the gateway is in a typical 7th/13th century chancery script. The Shamsi tal'āb, the Shamsi 'idgāh and the Shamsi masjid, in earlier writers attributed to Shams al-Din Itutmish, are in fact rather of Khuldī periods, are set into the upper walls of the buildings, faced by a makṣūra-screen of five arches, similar in type to mosques of Gudjarat. Other mosques of a similar period (Ek minār kī masjid, Sūrī masjid) are also trabeate, but the Akbarī masjid of 972/1564-5 is entirely arcuate, in the early Mughal style. There are many small mosques of Mughal reigns up to Awrangīzīb in the various mudābāls of Nagawr, which is the present name for the town.

The history of this area, which roughly corresponds to Gondwāna, has been profoundly influenced by the long range of the Sātpura hills through which the Burhānpūr–Aṣgarāgh gap provided the chief route from Hindustān to the Dakhan. When the Muslim invaders first came into contact with Gondwāna, it contained four independent Gond kingdoms: the northern kingdom of Gahār-Mandālī; two central kingdoms with their capitals at Dēogarh and Khērīa respectively; and a southern state with its capital at Cāndā. In the reign of Akbar the imperial forces overran the northern kingdom, forcing it to pay tribute, despite the heroic efforts of the Dowager Rānī Durgāvati. After this, the political predominance of the Gond chiefs shifted to Dēogarh which in its turn also suffered from the aggressive schemes of the Mughal emperors. Early in the reign of Awrangīzīb, a punitive force under Dīlīr Khān entered both Cāndā and Dēogarh with the result that, in 1681/1670, the ruler of Dēogarh embraced Islam at the price of the restoration of his kingdom (Alamgiri-nāma, 1022-7). Both these states paid tribute to the emperor through earlier buildings, including one from the time of Muhammad b. Sām, and several of the Khāldī and Dandānī periods, are set into the upper walls of the fort. The oldest standing monuments, and the finest, is the Buland Darwaza, also known as Darwaza-yi Tārīkīn, a gateway leading to the enclosure around the shrine of Shāykh Hamīd al-Dīn. An inscription refers to its construction in 733/1333, i.e. in the reign of Muhammad b. Tughluk, but this must refer to a restoration, since the style and the surface decoration are more consonant with the buildings of Shams al-Dīn Itutmīsh; a fine Kur’ānic inscription above the gateway is in a typical 7th/13th century chancery script. The Shamsī talāb, the Shamsī ’idgāh and the Shamsī masjid, in earlier writers attributed to Shams al-Dīn Itutmīsh, are in fact rather of Khuldī periods, are set into the upper walls of the buildings, faced by a makṣūra-screen of five arches, similar in type to mosques of Gudjarat. Other mosques of a similar period (Ek minār kī masjid, Sūrī masjid) are also trabeate, but the Akbarī masjid of 972/1564-5 is entirely arcuate, in the early Mughal style. There are many small mosques of Mughal reigns up to Awrangīzīb in the various mudābāls of Nagawr, which is the present name for the town.


(C.E. BOSWORTH and J. BURTON-PAGE) NAGIR = [see HUNZA and NAGIR] NAGPUR, the name of a city, district and division of the state of Maharashtra in the Indian Union, formerly in the Central Provinces of British India; the city lies on the Nag river in lat. 21° 10' N. and long. 79° 12' E.

The history of this area, which roughly corresponds to Gondwāna, has been profoundly influenced by the long range of the Sātpura hills through which the Burhānpūr–Aṣgarāgh gap provided the chief route from Hindustān to the Dakhan. When the Muslim invaders first came into contact with Gondwāna, it contained four independent Gond kingdoms: the northern kingdom of Gahār-Mandālī; two central kingdoms with their capitals at Dēogarh and Khērīa respectively; and a southern state with its capital at Cāndā. In the reign of Akbar the imperial forces overran the northern kingdom, forcing it to pay tribute, despite the heroic efforts of the Dowager Rānī Durgāvati. After this, the political predominance of the Gond chiefs shifted to Dēogarh which in its turn also suffered from the aggressive schemes of the Mughal emperors. Early in the reign of Awrangīzīb, a punitive force under Dīlīr Khān entered both Cāndā and Dēogarh with the result that, in 1681/1670, the ruler of Dēogarh embraced Islam at the price of the restoration of his kingdom (Alamgiri-nāma, 1022-7). Both these states paid tribute to the emperor through
a Muslim agent stationed at Nagpur in the Islamic period, for the Peshkhanda of Lahauri describes its capture by Khan Durrân in 1047/1637 (for a still earlier identification, see Hira Lai, 10).

The most famous ruler of Dêogah was the converted Gond chief Bakht Buland, who visited the court of Awragiz [Ma'dâhâr-i Alamgiri, 273]. Because of his contemptuous attitude he was replaced by another Muslim Gond named Dîndâr (ibid., 340). For some years after this, Bakht Buland remained in imperial service, until, escaping from imperial control, he once more raised the standard of revolt in Dêogah (Khâtî Khân, Mutâdâkhab al-lUbûb, ii, 461). Although Dêogah was recaptured for a time by Awragiz's forces, Bakht Buland remained in open rebellion and was never really subdued. Eventually, under this able ruler the Dêogah state comprised the modern districts of Chandwâra and Betûl, together with portions of Nâgpur, Seoni, Bhandâra, and Bâlaghât. The last important Gond ruler was Chân Sultân who died in 1152/1792. It was he who fixed the capital at Nâgpur, which he converted into a walled town.

Internal dissensions led to the intervention of Raghudji Bhonsla, who was governing Berar [q.v.] on behalf of the Maratha Peshwa [see MARATHAS] on the advice of the court of Awrangzâb. On the outbreak of war between the British, and, in 1803, after the battles of Assaye and Poona [q.v.], the Peshwa, and to his capital at Nagpur, which he converted into a walled town. The fortress was repeatedly strengthened, among others by five huge new bastions. The fortress was repeatedly strengthened, among others by five huge new bastions, after the Battle of Mohâcs in 1526. After the Battle of Mohâcs, the Ottoman empire lost a useful pretext for disavowing, when expedient, the rights of the Peshwâ, but in practice reference was usually made to Poona on important matters, usually made to Puna [q.v.] on important matters, such as the succession. Burhan Shâh's descendants continued to occupy the rank of state pensioners, and the representative of the family resided at Nâgpur in British Indian times with the title of Râddâ or Sanshâhnâk. Raghudji's reign witnessed a great influx of Kumbis and other Marâthâs into Nâgpur. The treacherous attitude of his successor Dînâwî led to his defeat by the combined forces of the Nizâm of Haydarâbâd [q.v.] and the Peshwâ, and to his abdication of the latter's supremacy.

It was under Raghudji II that the Nâgpur kingdom attained its greatest extent and included practically the whole of the later Central Provinces and Berâr, together with Orissa and certain of the Guti Nâgpur states. Unfortunately for the solidarity of his kingdom, he joined forces with Sindhiâ against the British, and, in 1803, after the battles of Assaye and Argâon, was compelled to subscribe to the treaty of Dêogàon, by which he was deprived of a third of his dominions (Aitchison, i, 415-17). He was succeeded in 1816 by his son, Parsodji, an imbecile, who was murdered in the following year by the notorious Appâ Sâhib. On the outbreak of war between the British and the Peshwâ in 1817, Appâ Sâhib attacked the British Residency but his troops were defeated in the brilliant action at Sibâlbadh. This resulted in the deposition of Appâ Sâhib, who was succeeded by Raghudji III, on whose death, in 1853, without heirs, Raghudji III, on whose death, in 1853, without heirs, the administrative power of the Marathas declined by the Viceroy Lord Dalhousie to have lapsed to the Paramount Power.

The British administered Nâgpur by means of a Commission until the formation of the Central Provinces in 1856. Then after independence in 1947, Nâgpur became the capital of Madhya Pradesh state and then after 1956 the district headquarters of Maharashtra state, alternating with Bombay as the seat of the state legislature. Modern Nâgpur city (population in 1971, 866,144) is a major industrial and commercial centre (especially for textiles and metalworking), situated as it is at the junction of road and rail routes connecting Bombay and Calcûutta, Delhi and Madras. It has had a university since 1922 and possesses an institute for Islamic religious studies, the Djamâ'iyât-i 'Arâbiyya. The Muslim community includes Bohorâ and Khâdîja Ismâtîlîs as well as Sunnis; the total Muslim population of the Nâgpur District in 1961 amounted to 154,861, almost all Urdu-speaking.


(COLIN DAVIES*)

NAGYVARAD (Ottoman Turkish: Warâd, Warâd, Warât, etc., Romanian: Oradea, German: Großwardein), an important town originally in the Hungarian county of Bihar, part of Transylvania after the creation of this principality, centre of an Ottoman vilayet [q.v.] between 1660 and 1692, and today a town of minor regional significance in Romania with a considerable Hungarian population.

As a fortified place since the 10th century and as a seat of a bishop since the 11th century, Vârad acquired early importance among Hungarian towns. Partly destroyed by the Mongols in 1241, it flourished again in the 14th and 15th centuries.

After the Battle of Mohâcs [q.v.] in 1526 and especially after the capturing of Buda [see BUDÁN] by the Turks in 1541, the strategic importance of Vârad near the Ottoman-Transylvanian border came into the foreground. The fortress was repeatedly strengthened, among others by five huge new bastions, following Italian models, during the 16th century. The place was in Habsburg hands between 1651-7, then it belonged to Transylvania again. The fortification resisted a five-week long Turkish attack in 1598.

Under the 17th-century princes, a remodelling of the inner castle was realised, according to Italian examples again, with a pentagonal structure resulting in a solidary masterpiece of Central European architecture. A new Ottoman siege was feared in 1659, consequently the town itself was also strengthened. This attack, led by the serdar [see SAR-DâR] Köse 4Ali Paşa in July-August 1660 was successful in the end, due to two main factors, besides the overwhelming Turkish superiority in numbers: they were able to drain the fosse, and an explosion annihilated most of the defenders' war materials. The terms of surrender were quite mild: beside permission to leave freely, the transportation of the prison-house, with semi-finished Bible texts, together with the archives of the local chapter was permitted. After the prince of Transylvania, Ákos Barcay, was forced to accept the loss of Vârad and its dependencies to the Turks (cf. I. Hakkî Uzunçarşî, Bârcasy Akez'ün Erd îrâdîlgîna ait baz ortayîr vizîksalar, in Tarih Dergisi, iv [1952], 62-5) a vilâyât was created here. Its first beşgirî [q.v.] was a certain Sinân Paşa, who possessed his place and Adât âyetPairsanî, 434, f. 7a). The yearly revenue of the mîrîmân [q.v.] of Vârad amounted to 948, 700 [fene] in 1665 (cf. Başbakanlık Arşivi, Taup defteri, 795, p. 9. The ter-
ritory of the province contained extensive regions east of the Tisza river in the counties of Bihar, Doboka, Kis-Perem, and Kőrös-Szombathely, Kraszna, Szabolcs, and Szatmár; most of these names were also used as nábyte denominations by the Turks. Beside the sandjak of Várad, a separate liūt was established around the castle of Szentjobb (Ottoman: Sendik, Romanian: Siniob); its sandjişkes' income was usually low: 115,948 [penz] (cf. Tapu defteri, 795, p. 76).

The tīmar defteri of 1705/1665 enumerates 6 kébêsz: 29 zīsmet and 235 tīmar in the liūt of Várad, while 1 kébiş, 2 zīsmet and 46 tīmar in the liūt of Szentjobb (ibid., pp. 3-87). The seal jacket probably consisted of two kadáa [q.v.], for a kadá [q.v.] can be demonstrated in each of Várad and Szentjobb respectively.

The Grand Vizier Königluiu Mehmed Pasha [q.v.] had a large wakil [q.v.], here and in the neighbouring sandjaks, a rare phenomenon in Ottoman Hungary (published by Imre Karácson, Türk-magyar oklevélű, 1533-1789 ['A collection of Turkish Hungarian documents'], ed. Thalloczy Lajos, Krcsmarik Janos Torok-magyar oklevelű, [penz], for a kadá [q.v.]). Among historians and Islamic scholars, however, the term Nahda is seldom used. It does not feature in the indexes of works such as, for example, Albert Hourani's Arabic thought in the Liberal age, 1878-1939, Oxford 1962, nor in Montgomery Watt's Islam, Cambridge, Mass. 1961. Even younger orientalists such as Peter Gran (Islamic roots of capitalism, Egypt 1760-1840, Austin, Texas 1979), or Charles Wendell, (The evolution of the Egyptian national image, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1972), speak of "reformist" Islam, of umma, of nationalism and of watan ('homeland'), but not to Nahda, nor in Nadav Safran's Egypt in search of political community. An analysis of the intellectual and political evolution in Egypt 1804-1952, Cambridge, Mass. 1961, where there is reference, at the end of the book, to "New Dawn", but the term Nahda is not used. It does not appear in Z. Islam au Proche Orient, Paris 1960, by Jean-Paul Roux, who refers to "reform of Islam" and "modernism" but not to Nahda, nor in Montanini's La pensiero islamico contemporaneo, Rome 1962, where after some resistance, the public was ultimately to follow them...
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Inces". After Bonaparte's conquest, Egypt regained
under Muhammad 'Ali [q.v.] a de facto independence
which permitted the diffusion of religious reformism,
in association with literary openness, but distinct in its
origins. Muhammad 'Abdul interpreted the religious
law having regard for the needs of his society: he sought to "purge" Islam of the practices of sects which exploited popular credulity. He called for a reform of education and the reformulation of Islamic doctrine in the light of modern thought. Following his lead, Kāsim Amin (1865-1908 [q.v.]) campaigned for the "Liberation of women" Tahār al-mawār (1899), and Ahmad Luṭfī al-Sa'īyid (1872-1963 [q.v.]) for the constitutional solution of political problems, according to the spirit of the early centuries of Islam. Their "reformist" ideas gained many converts in the Arab world (Khāyār al-Dīn, 1810-90, or Muhammad Bayram, 1840-89, in Tunisia, [q.e.]; the Alī family in Baghādā; Tahār al-Dī'ārī, 1851-1920, in Syria; etc.) where the aim was to reconcile traditional and modern areas of knowledge in a spirit of openness to the world, without destroying the values of Islam and Arab identity.

It is paradoxical that, in the wake of the reformists, the "ulāmā" themselves, as Gibb writes, "contributed to the spread of secularism, for in the Muslim world it is the authority of the religious leaders that orders the tendency to worldliness among the educated classes was counter-acted" (Gibb, Modern trends in Islam, Chicago 1947, 51). But, as R. Brunschwig points out, "this (reformist) notion is less revolutionary than the use of such terms could suggest: it avoids any kind of iconoclasm, since it is definitively in the return to the example of the first Muslims or at least to the authentic pursuit of the reform orders than the counter-action, giving rise instead to feelings of frustration and rejection."

This movement of rebirth and awakening, marked by faith in the future and by a deep confidence in the inevitable progress of societies, gave rise, in the mid-19th century, to two complementary manifestations. The one, endogenous, sought an internal revision of the Islamic phenomenon, and this is what is known as "reformism". The other, exogenous, was born out of East-West contact and is correctly defined as "modernism". From 1819 onward and until the beginning of the 20th century, a number of writers, Syrians in the main, undertook a campaign of resistance to what was considered the excessive modernisation of the language and of literary genres. Philologists, encyclopaedists and essayists were at pains to restore "purity". The Bustānīs [q.e.], among whom, Butrus al-Bustānī, 1819-82, edited the first Arabic encyclopedia, Dārārat al-ma'ārif, the Yāẓidiṣīns (including Nāṣr al-Yāẓidiṣī, author of makāmat, of poems inspired by al-Mutanabbi, of treatises on grammar, rhetoric, etc.) demanded the cultivation of "elegant" language and literary forms, in other words, purged of Turkish, dialectal or western influences, but also adapted to contemporary civilization.

This was an intermediate period, the time of the "almost-novel" kitāb yakād yakūn kisṣa, to borrow a felicitous expression of Mārūn ʿAbdū (Rauṣāwāt, 131). Compositions still retained the memory of works of the past, for the, purist, pioneers, or were designed as imitations of Sir Walter Scott, or of Quinou Père et Fils and of moving melodramas, for the modernists. The First World War, with the Za'aynab of Muhammad Husayn Haykal [q.e.], inspired by the daily life of his society and by personal experience, was to mark the end of this stage of imitation and a return to authenticity.

The "pre-Za'aynab" period is thus characterised by the existence in the Arabic countries of works which represent, in the one case, the continuation of genres such as the makāma or the riḥla (account of a journey) and, in the other, a "renewal" animated by moralising or philosophical novels, by the genre of the historical or melodramatic novel. In the first group, suitable examples are the Tahārīṣ.
The new philosophical, ideological, political, social and economic ideas lacked a suitable vocabulary for their expression. It is in this respect that the press was to contribute significantly to the formation of a language capable of stating new ideas by the re-use of ancient words or by direct borrowings (ṣūr, naft, sayf for “oil”, wayan for “homeland”, duwali, instead of dawli, becoming “international”), by the manufacture of words with affixes (lā-nihāya “infinite”). The press transformed the language still more profoundly with the introduction of a more clearly defined tense system (in addition to the existing concepts of perfect and imperfect aspects) by means of the intensive use of composite verbs. It made syntax more flexible through the further development of the relative clause and other grammatical forms borrowed from Arabic dialects or from foreign languages. This evolution proceeded gradually, in such a way as to circumvent the obstacle of the purists. Hypocritically, the press denounced its own “faults” in articles intitiled: “Say... and do not say...” Kul... wa-la taki... It continued to use flowery rhetorical figures of speech in the analysis of social and political problems, and even rhymed prose, so that the tradition and the innovation were simultaneously exposed. But the pastiche twisted the traditional formulas and clichés in such a way as to infuse them with a new meaning.

Thus, progressively, the press became the principal forum of innovation. Being open to political and social essays and even to popular science, to information received from abroad as well as to serial fiction, short stories and theatrical articles, it contributed to the development of vocabularies suitable for these various manifestations of culture. It was all the more audacious as the press was also, in most cases, by novelists, playwrights and adapters impatient for change.

Besides the weekly official journal published from 1828 onwards under the title al-Wâkâ al-misrijya and edited by al-Tahtawi from 1842, a non-governmental press, often created by Syro-Lebanese expatriates in Egypt, developed very polemical attitudes. Wâdi il-Nâjî (1866) entered into a vigorous debate with al-Danâsib, which had been edited in Istanbul by Ahmad Fârsî Shidâyî since 1860. The weekly Nuzhat al-afkâr (1869), was directed by Ibrahim al-Muwâlihî and 'Uthmân Djalal, in other words by a writer-novelist and a much-respected translator.

It was most of all during the decade of the 1870s and thereafter that the organs of the press proliferated and became decisive in the liberating effort of the Nahda. The first important periodical, al-Dinân, edited by Butrus al-Bustâni, appeared from 1870 to 1886, at which date it was forced to cease publication under the censorship of Abd al-Hamîd II, and pub-
The novel thus creates dualist worlds where the Good are in conflict with the Bad. It is then shackled by the manifestly moralising intention of the author, his vision of the grandeur of the Arab past, of the danger of over-servile imitations of “western-style” life, of pretence, of ignorance, of ambition, of snobbery, etc. (cf. N. Tomiche, Naissance et avatars du roman arabo-novelliste Zaynab, in Arôles Islamologiques, xvi [1980].)
were bringing into being new approaches to life and thought.

(5) This period also saw the proliferation of works characterised by eponymous heroines and serialised romances that further boosted the circulation of newspapers: 

_Dhāt al-khādēr_ (1884) by Sa‘īd al-Bustānī; 
_Zabūyat al-bān_ (1890) by Ahmad al-Sarrāf; 
_Zahīdat al-ḥabān_ (1897) by Ahmad Sa‘īd Baghdādī; 
_‘Ādhrā_ al-Ḥind (1897) by Ahmad Shawkī; 
_Zāhadāt al-Andalus_ (1899) by ‘Abd al-Rahmān Ismā‘īl; 
_al-Futūh al-rīfijīyya_ (1905) by Muhmūd Khayrāt; 
_al-Murshīd_ (1905) by Ya‘qūb Sārinf; 
_‘I‘yā‘ al-ḥadīth_ (1906) by Nikūlā Haddād; 
_‘Ādrith_ Dughūsīyya (1906) by Muhmūd Tahrīr Hakkī.

At the turn of the 20th century there also appeared female magazine editors and novelists: Hind Nawfal founded _al-Futūh_ (1892), Maryam Mazhar, _Maryam Majward_ (1896), Alexandra Afrīnī, _Maryam Majward_ (1898), to these names may be added short stories of some of the most important essayists and novelists such as Marie Atnūn Haddād, Malak Friṭī al-Taymūriyya.

This public could be formed at an early age, from school-days, although it must be remembered that only privileged children had access to schools. Mārmūn Ābdūd relates (Rawsūd, 122) that in 1900, his teacher encouraged the pupils to read _al-Danār_ by Adīb Isḥāk, _Kanz al-ṣaghir_ by Ahmad Fāris al-Ṣhiryākī, _Zāhadāt al-ḥabān_ and _Mushqād al-abṣāl_ by Francis Marraṣ (q.v.). Labība Hās’hīm’s magazine _Fatīh_ (q.v.), which appeared from 1906 until the eve of the Second World War, with an interval during the years of the First World War, was disseminated in girls’ schools by the national education authorities of Egypt, Lebanon, Syria and Irāk.

But the _Nahḍah_ bore within itself the seeds of its own dissolution. Aroused by foreign ideological movements, it evolved nationalist and anti-colonialist concepts which inspired a defiant attitude towards the Western powers. The pen and politics were then often seen as mutually complementary, as in the case of Muhmūd Sānit al-Būrūdī (1839-1904 [q.v.]), an eminent poet but also a nationalist minister, exiled to Ceylon for more than seventeen years (1882-1900), after _Urābī’s_ insurrection and the occupation of Egypt by the British.

Beyond doubt, the _Nahḍah_ had instigated a profound change in patterns of thinking. It had loosened the attachment of Arab societies to traditions reckoned as inappropriate to modern civilisation and to the achievements of science and medicine. It had disseminated notions of liberty, of respect for the individual, of constitutional democracy. But the foreign source of this evolution and of these achievements remained painfully obvious, the more so as intellectuals, ideologists and political theorists proved themselves incapable of founding a coherent system, Arab or Muslim, of ideas conforming to modernity. Recourse to European concepts, in societies outraged by colonialist aggression, became increasingly intolerable. In the aftermath of the First World War, the _Nahḍah_ lost one of its essential elements: it lost the hope (not so long before, still a certainty) of constructing a future combining the best features of the European present and of the Arab past.

The victory of the western Allies was followed by the imposition of mandates [q.v.] and various colonialist arrangements. The West discovered then (and is continuing to discover) with amazement that peoples whose national dignity had been injured will turn to their cultural and religious heritage, however mediaeval and obscurantist this may be, and find there the words and the weapons to express its anger.


_Nahḍah_ al-balāgha ("The Way of Eloquence") is an anthology of dissensions, letters, testimonial and sententious opinions, traditionally attributed to ‘Ali b. Abī Tālīb (d. 40/661 [q.v.]).

The authorship of this work has been an issue attended by constant and lively polemic, from the Middle Ages to the present.

Ibn Khālidī (d. 681/1283 [q.v.]) seems to have been the first to raise doubts concerning the _Nahḍah_. "It is not known," he writes, "which of the two brothers, al-‘Ādī (d. 406/1015 [q.v.]) or al-Murtādā (d. 436/1044 [q.v.]) put together this work. Some assume that the compiler would also be its author, but that he would have attributed it to ‘Ali (Wafaydā, Beirut 1966-78, iii, 295).

The majority of later writers, beginning with al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1348 [q.v.]; _Mīzān al-sīrīdī_, Beirut 1963, iii, 124), continuing with Ḥadīdī Khālidī (d. 1067/1657 [q.v.]; _Khāf al-zawīn_, Tehran 1947, ii, 1991, and concluding with Brockelmann (i, 405, S 1, 794 f.), have in their turn revived these suspicions.

Mislaid by the surname al-Murtādā ("the one accepted by God"), which appears on the frontispiece of the ms. of the _Nahḍah_ in the B.N. (no. 2423, fol. 2b), de Slane concluded that the reference could be to al-Šarīf al-Murtūdā. He also attributes the work to the latter (Cat. des mss. arabs B.N., Paris 1895, 425; cf. Veccia Vaglieri, _Sul _Nahg al-balagha_, in _MMIA_, viii [1958], 13 f.).

However, al-Murtūdā is a surname often used to designate ‘Ali, not only among the Shi‘is but also among the Sunnis (cf. Ibn Abī ‘l-Hadīd, _Mawṣū‘ah_, Beirut 1972, 137 and _Šarīf Nahḍah al-balāgha_, Cairo 1962-7, xi, 120; Ibn Arabī, _La Profession de foi_, tr. R. Deladrière, Paris 1985, 209.).

Furthermore, it is stated explicitly, at the end of the ms., that this is a collection of the sayings of ‘Ali (kisāb..."
Nahdž al-balagha min kalâm... 'Ali b. Abi Talib; B.N. fol.

As leader of the Wafd he had certain advantages—he claimed that the Wafd was the Egyptian people—

Moreover, it has been possible to identify a considerable number of passages, accompanied by complete imāds dating back to the time of 'Ali. These texts have been recounted by ancient scholars of repute such as al-Tabari (d. 310/923; Ibn al-Kalbi, d. 260/873), the Muḥammad b. Mas'ūd al-Dhībāzī, and many others (cf. Diblī, Encores à propos de l'authenticité du Nahdž al-balagha, in Sl, lxxv (1992), 33-56.

For the compilation of this book, it is most likely the work of al-Rādi. In three of his works, the latter refers to the Nahdž, Ḥakā'ik al-ta'wil (Najaf, undated, v, 167), al-Maṣā'id al-nahawwīya (Cairo 1971, 59, 140, 171) and Khāṣṣ al-ʿaṭṭa (Najaf 1949, 87). On the other hand, the compiler evokes, in the Nahdž, these latter two writings (i, 254, and ii, 263, respectively).

Whatever the case may be, the Nahdž al-balagha is one of the great masterpieces of Arabic literature. Through the centuries, it has gained considerable admiration.

As its title reliably indicates and in accordance with the aspiration of its compiler, this book asserts the "joys of the Arabic language" (Nahdž, i, 2). The powerfulassone of its prose, its sometimes studied rhetoric, its remarkable eloquence, its gripping images, its sober, unpolished and relatively obscure mode of expression, Bedouin wisdom and sensibility blended with Islamic delicacy and vision—all of these constitute the literary worth of the Nahdž. This is supplemented by further values, moral and social. In fact, this book has a tireless appeal, full of fervour and sincerity, on behalf of faith in God and in His Prophet, of piety, of integrity, of justice and of rising above the vanities of this world.

Since its first appearance, the Nahdž has been the object of a considerable corpus of commentaries, translations and studies, some 210 titles, according to H. al-ʿAmili in his Sharḥ Nahdž al-balagha, Beirut 1983. The Nahdž al-balagha has been edited on numerous occasions with, in particular, the annotations of Muhammad ʿAbduh, Beirut 1885, Cairo 1903, 1910, and of al-Maṣrī, 1925. Subhī al-Sāliḥ has published it recently, with a glossary and a wide-ranging index (pp. 560-583), Beirut 1983.


Among the commentaries, that of Ibn Abī 'l-Hādīd remains the most important. With its eight volumes, this monumental book is a truly encyclopaedic work, a literary as well as a scholarly achievement (for the other commentaries, see Brockelmann; Husayni, op. cit., 247-314; H. al-ʿAmili, op. cit., 35-106.)

and in free elections he usually gained a large majority. In 1936 he led the party to victory, formed a government and headed the all-party delegation which negotiated the Anglo-Egyptian treaty which gave the country nominal independence. In 1937 disputes between himself and Fārūk led to his dismissal and the Wafd was beaten in rigged elections in 1938. The previous year, Nahḥās had been shot and wounded by the Royalist greenshirts, a fascist-type organisation.

During the Second World War, the British authorities became worried by the increasingly pro-Axis attitudes of the Egyptian government, when the British ambassador, Sir Miles Lampson, made his famous démarche in February 1942 forcing Fārūk to dismiss the government and appoint Nahḥās prime minister. This by no means meant that Nahḥās was pro-British, but he stood firm during the advance of Rommel towards Alexandria. The reputation of the Wafd was somewhat in decline, however, as being seen as having been put in power by the British, accused of corruption and inefficiency and suffering from the autocentric methods of Nahḥās and the baleful influence of his wife. As long as Lampson was there he was safe, but during his absence abroad Fārūk took the opportunity to dismiss Nahḥās in October 1944.

He took no further part in Egyptian political life. If the Wafd was the people, Nahḥās as its leader was to his funeral in 1965 was the occasion for a large, sym pathetic demonstration.


AL-NAHĪKĪ, Süleyman, an Ottoman poet and translator who lived in Istanbul in the second half of the 11th/17th and first half of the 12th/18th centuries. After having learned the art of calligraphy from the distinguished penman Hāfīz ʿOthmān (d. 1161/1697-1700; cf. Siğdili-i ʿOthmān, iii, 421-2), he became a junior clerk at a public office (sc. the yemi-teri kalemi). In 1109/1697 he went to Persia as secretary in the suite of the ambassador Mehmed Paşa (cf. ŞO, iv, 210, and F.R. Uner, Osmanlı seferreri ve sefaretnameleri, Ankara 1968, 11, 18, 241). After his return he became the head clerk (diwan efendisi) of Dāmād ʿAlī Paşa [see ‘Alī PAŞA, DĀMĀD]. In 1131/1719 he went to Vienna in the suite of the ambassador İbrahim Paşa (cf. ŞO, i, 120; Uner, op. cit., 52-3), and upon his return was rewarded for his services with the appointment to head an office of revenue accountancy (sc. the baş-malāsis sağlıkları). Finally, in 1132/1719-20, he was granted one of the highest positions in the Treasury (defterdar-i ğazi-i īmān). He died in 1151/1739-9 (as the chronogram on his tombstone is reported to attest: Bu Süleyman Nahfišt râhna e-Fāthi) and was buried outside Topkapı in Istanbul.

Nahfišt made a name for himself both as a translator and a poet. His Turkish Dīwān contains mainly ghazels in the so-called Şâhlâmâ style which captivate through their affectionate tone. In addition to this Dīwān, he composed a series of nars on Muhammad bearing the title Hilyet el-emnüş as well as poems about the Prophet’s birth (muʾawit), the hajja and the miraculous journey (miqrat). Also well-known is a takkāmîn in Arabic, Persian and Turkish on the celebrated Arabic poem by al-Būṣīrī (q. v.) entitled al-Kaosākīl ahbār-i barāyī (which came to bear the name al-Burdā). The work was printed in 1127/1715 with an anti-British campaign which Fārūk did nothing to hinder. In the elections of January 1950, the Wafd was once again returned to power and Nahḥās immediately demanded the withdrawal of the British and the unification of Egypt and the Sudan. As he made no progress in negotiations, he unilaterally abrogated the 1936 Treaty and declared a state of emergency. A period of great tension with Britain ensued, culminating in the burning of Cairo on Black Saturday in January 1952. Nahḥās proclaimed martial law for the country. As long as Lampson was there he was safe, but during his absence abroad Faruk took the ageing, rather discredited politician and the dynamic anti-British minister. This by no means meant that Nahḥās was dismissed him from its leadership and his wife was tried on charges of corruption, was heavily fined and her property confiscated. Nahḥās was deprived of his civil positions in the Treasury (defterdar-i shlkk-l thdni). Finally, in 1290/1899 he executed their coup in July 1952. He flew back in the belief that the Wafd was to be restored to power. It was too late. The tension between Britain and Egypt continued to rise and culminating in the burning of Cairo on Black Saturday in January 1952. Nahḥās proclaimed martial law and appointed himself military governor. The next day Fārūk yet again dismissed the Wafd.

Nahḥās was in Europe when the Free Officers executed their coup in July 1952. He flew back in the belief that the Wafd was to be restored to power. It was too late. The tension between Britain and Egypt continued to rise and culminating in the burning of Cairo on Black Saturday in January 1952. Nahḥās proclaimed martial law and appointed himself military governor. The next day Fārūk yet again dismissed the Wafd. He took no further part in Egyptian political life. If the Wafd was the people, Nahḥās as its leader was to a certain extent the embodiment of the leadership of the people. He was the natural leader of the majority, the majority which the Wafd considered its inherent right. He was a popular figure in Egypt, valued for his contributions to the struggle for independence, and his funeral in 1965 was the occasion for a large, sympathetic demonstration.

Bibliography: E.G. Ambros, ‘Ahb Allâh b. Muhammad, a member of the extremist Muslimadîyya (q. v.) sect. ‘Ubayd Allâh b. Suleyman b. Wahh, who was al-Muʿtadid’s vizier between 279/892 and 288/901, appointed him in recognition of past services, to the influential post of ʿāmil (director of taxes) of the Baduraya district (director of taxes) of the Baduraya district. Two years later he was dismissed after being accused by the Banu ʿl-Furât of embezzlement (al-Tanukhi, Niğâr al-muḥâdara, vii, Damascus 1438/1943, 16-18; Hâlîl al-Sâbî, Taʾrîkh al-Wuzara*, ed. H.F. Amrodez, Beirut 1904, 76-7). Both he and another member of the Muslimadîyya, al-Fayyâd b. ‘Ali b. Muhammad b. al-Fayyâd (executed under al-Muʿtadid, r. 279-892/992), wrote works reflecting the K. al-Sirāt of ʿIsāb b. Muhammad al-Nâkhī, al-Ahmâr al-Kûfî (d. 298/899) of the ʿAlîyya (or ʿAyniya) sect. Al-Fayyâd’s work is entitled al-Kāṣîr, the title of al-Nâkhī’s work is not recorded (al-Masâvîd, Murûd, ed. Pellat, ii, 258, § 1135; Ibn Hazm, al-Fisâl fi ʿl-
milal wa 'l-ahwa3 wa 'l-nihal, ed. M.I. Nusayr and CA. Umayra, Beirut 1405/1985, v, 47; for “al-B-h-n-kl” read “al-Nahiki”). Neither text is extant.

Two other members of the family are: (1) Abu l- 'Abbās 'Ubayd Allāh (or 'Abbāl Allāh) b. Ahmad b. Nahik al-Nakhā'ī (fl. mid-3rd/9th century), who is credited with a K. al-Nawādīr (al-Nadijūshī, Riḍgīl, ed. al-Zanjānī, Kumm 1407, 232 no. 615; cf. al-'ūsī, Fihrist, Beirut 1403/1983, 133 no. 448; Ibn Shahrārūh, Muḍīm al-'ulamā', Nadraj 1380/1961, 75 no. 501) and who transmitted many usul works to the Turkish Republic with the specialization in agricultural activities, successfully taking over from the hazardous collection of wild honey.

With Islam, the bee’s beneficial nature for humanity was clearly described in sûra XVI of the Kur‘ān entitled precisely al-Nahl “the Bees” and in which it is stated (verses 68-9): “Your Lord has revealed to the bees: Establish your dwellings in the mountains, in the trees and in the places built by men, then eat all the fruits. Follow meekly in that way the paths of your Lord.” From the bodies of the bees comes forth a drink of various hues which is a healing for men”. The Prophet Muhammad confirmed this divine protection on several occasions; according to one of his hadiths, “Every fly is destined for hellfire, except the bee”. He said further, “Among the small creatures, there are four that should not be killed: the ant (namla), the bee (nahīj), the shrake (sūrdah) and the hoopoe (hadbudh)”. Finally, speaking of honey, he declared, “For you [Muslims] there are two remedies: the Kur‘ān and honey”. Besides, among the paradisiacal delicacies reserved for the elect are promised “Rivers of purified honey (anhar min asāl muqabil)” (XLVII, 15). Several other maxims of the Prophet illustrate the bee’s place as a model for the every Muslim, as much in his private life as in the heart of the community; after the fashion of the industrious insect, all his acts will aspire to the good and the beautiful and reject the bad and the ugly. The physiological process of making honey (al-ṣayr) in the body of the bee staying unexplained among the scholars of Antiquity, the Muslims saw in it a clear sign of divine intervention beyond human comprehension.

On the scientific level, it must be noted that the Arabic-speaking naturalists who spoke of the bees, such as al-Dżāḥīz (3rd/9th century), al-Kāzimīnī (7th/13th century) merely reproduced what had been said by Aristotle (History of animals, Fr. tr. J. Tricot, Paris 1957, i, 341-9, ii, 655-73) and then the poet Virgil (Georgics, Book iv) and Pliny the Elder (Historia naturalis, Book ix), and they add nothing new. Despite this, we find, in the 4th/10th century, an excellent synthesis of all that was known until then about bees in one of the Epistles of the Khwān al-Safā’ī [q. v.] in which (Rasīl, Beirut 1957, ii, 201 f.) the representative of the bee race makes a vibrant indictment of man who, in every age, has exploited for his own profit the hard work of his fellow bees. Later, it is the authors of treatises on agronomy who, in applied zoology, deal with bee-keeping and, more especially, the Hispán-Arab agronomists such as Ibn Baṣṣāl of Toledo (5th/11th century) and Ibn al-Awāwām of Seville (7th/13th century) [see Fīlāhā, ii, Muslim West]. Finally, some practical information was supplied by the “calendars” on times for different operations which are necessary in the practice of bee-keeping, such as the Calendar of Cordova (text and Fr. tr. Ch. Pellat, Leiden 1961) and the Cinq calendriers épiogriques (text and Fr. tr. Pellat, Cairo 1986).

The internal life of the hive (khāliyya, ‘asāla, kisārā, šārā, muqāra, maḥl, Maḥrīgb dāb, dābha, Širīn minzīla, Kurb, Turk. koan) was quite well observed after Aristotle, and the three social categories comprising a community of bees were already recognized. This community formed from a swarm (dāb, ṣawal, ḥiz, ḥaṣār, Maḥrīgīfār, sār) is grouped around the “chief” (ṣārūb, amīr, maḥl, Kurb, agelīli, Pers. pādghāb, Turk. kural) who reigns...
as sovereign and who, in fact, is the queen; but it was not until the 17th century that the two naturalists, Dutchman Swammerdam (1635-85) and the Frenchman R. Ferchault de Réaumur (1683-1757) discovered that this monarch is a female and that she is the only one who lays the eggs in the cells of the honeycomb after having been fertilised outside by the males. Until then, no-one had discovered the exact origin of the seed (hâr, biżr) which gives birth to the larvae of the broodcomb (nasîl, divorce; dsâl, dajâl); it was most often attributed to the class of workers (sasâlîh, 'amilât) who constitute almost the whole population of the hive and who, alone, ensure its existence by producing the bee-glue ('ikhrîh, qâhîm, dundâ'), wax (qâhîm), Pers. mâmûr, Turk. balânmûru) and honey (qâsâl al-âsâl, 'asâl, qâsâl, 'ulân; mîrân; Turk. bal, Tamâhak, turweeêt). The third category of bees, in the hive, is that of the drones (yâmâmûn, pl. yâmâmûr, Kabyler âsgirrûn, pl. igzermûn, Turk. ârak arsî), males who are useful only for the fertilisation of a new young queen at the time of her exodus with her first swarm (daysam, lûth, ridî, jârûd) to find a new hive; as soon as their unique function as sires is completed, they are inexorably rejected and suppressed by the workers.

Since the distant time when man had the idea of settling and beginning to occupy their concern to search for a precarious natural refuge, bee-keeping remained "fixist", that is to say, the honeycombs were welded to the wall of the dwelling. It was only in 1780 A.D. that the Swiss F. Huber imagined the "moving section" (nâhitâ, pl. nâhuât), thus initiating the modern apiculturist technique known as "mobilitist".

The primitive hive, generally cylindrical in shape, could at first be made out of bark of cork-oak (Quercus suber). The French term ruche "hive" coming from the Low Latin rustus "stripped of bark") or clay applied to a framework of wood or wickerwork; it could also be a large earthenware jar with a lid, or a hut of plaited straw, or, finally, as in Persia, a large whitewashed calabash outside a protective plastered wall. Whatever the model of hive used, the harvesting of the honey (qâsuûn, te'ûâd), after fumigating (asâm, ayâm, qâsâlîh, qâsâlu) the interior by burning dry grasses or dung to neutralise the occupants, could only be done by smashing the "cake" (qâhdh, bûrûs, hîfîf) to detach it from the walls; the honey spread on them was recovered with the aid of wooden scrapers (mâshqaru, mishqarû, mishqarû, minaas) of different kinds. The modern hive in stores (kâfîr, pl. kâfîrûn) with its moving sections, has greatly facilitated this operation; likewise, the fluting (dâmgh) in sheets of the wax forming the bases of the honeycombs, invented in 1857 by J. Mehring, further adds to the simplicity of the handling and considerably reduces the flow of honey. The architecture of the wax comb has never ceased to arouse admiration; the geometry of the assemblage of alveoles or cells (nasîlûrûn, pl. hukâbûn, pl. thûkabûn) in hexagonal section in which the eggs (sîmiyûn) of the broodcomb are enclosed and the young bees (akhûr) develop, appears as a work of genius in the eyes of architects, for it does not leave the least interstice or space unoccupied, and the Arab authors see in this also divine inspiration. In every land and at every time of the year, the bee-keeper (âsil, 'asâl, nakhâlî, marâbîh li-nâhlî, Mağhrûbî hukâbû, pl. thûkabûn) has always had to struggle against the many parasites and enemies of the bees, both within the hive and outside it. On the inside, he has to eliminate the intruders attracted by the honey: ants, mice, field-mice, shrews and, in particular, the death's-head moth (Archeroria atropos; qâsâl al-sâmsîm, abu 'l-hâsîl al-asmar). The parasites of the larvae are formidable, including the mebroe (Meleâ variegata) and its carnivorous larva or triongulin (murâbî 'l-nâhl, mûsâr), and the queen of the Benga bees, attributed to Tembin.

The wax is also attacked by the wax moth (Galleria griesiella; qâsâl al-nâhl al-sâqârîh, nàrijyât il-qâsâl al-sâqârih) and the wax mite (Galleria cerella; qâsâl al-nâhl al-kâbirîh, nàrijyât al-qâsâl al-kâmbrîh). However, the larvae of the clarion (Clerus aparius; bûh li-nâhlî, tâliq li-nâhlî) which kills the bees to feed its larvae. The danger is even greater with certain insectivorous birds such as the bee eaters (Menops apiator and M. superciliosus, M. orientalis; waàrdû, rhûdûr, khâdûrû, khâdûrû). Maghrûb jâmûn), wood-peekers (Picus eritis, P. syriacus; nakhûr, bûhûr, nakhûbû, Maghrûb jâmûb, jâmûb hûlû, jâmûb jâmûb, bûhû, bûhûhû; liqâmû, liqâmû liqâmû, nakhûbû lîqâmû, lîqâmû lîqâmû, lîqâmû lîqâmû). Against these winged predators nothing can be done except to surround the hives with protective trellises.

As honey is made from different gathered nectars and as some time passes between its production and its collection, it may appear in several colours and various consistencies. On its formation, it is very runny (qâdîsî) and smooth-flowing (âsâdîth), and this is the new honey (ilmûr, sûrûmûr, sûrûmûr); then it conceals and hardens (hâmît, qâdsî) In the comb of a hive, it stays fluid (qâhîm, qâhûhû), whereas wild honey ('ásal al-dârû, darâb, darâb), exposed to the air, becomes thick and white by natural alteration (idîrâmûb). In the lands of Islam, among the most-appreciated honeys were the one called bâlûa taken from the flowers of the honey mimosa (Acacia melilfera, samâ'îl, zâbûb, Yemên samur) and the one called 'arâbû plundered from the wild lavender (Lavandula vera; maqasmûn, khiydanûn). From Morocco to India, each region favourable for beekeeping had its famous honey, traded locally and exported. The Moroccan Sous also produced the excellent matûnî (see E. Fagnan, Extrait, 179) rivalling the honeys of Kabylia, Egypt and Persia. Besides, the geographer al-Idrîsî (6th/12th century [q.v.]) notes the commercial activity in honey and wax from Fâs, Tâhar, Aâlger, Constantine, Djidjelli, Mostaganem and Bône. He also mentions the important apicultural work of the rural populations of the region of Barka and the mountains of Cyrenaica, whose honey used to go directly to the market in Alexandria. In Egypt, furthermore, Cairo used to receive, at the beginning of summer and by river, the honey of Kûs and Lower Egypt; the Egyptian beekeepers each year were able to carry out a removal of the hives, by boats, to areas where selected plants were the most abundant. The Egyptians used to consume large quantities of honey; it was, with dry raisins (zâbîh), a principal element in the drink called shamâtî of which they were very fond (al-Makrizî-Bouriant, Khâtât, i, 125) as well as in another alcoholic drink, bitî, a mixture of honey and wine. In the 4th/10th century, at the court of the Fâtimid caliph al-'Azîz bi'llâh (366-96/976-98), the annual consumption of honey was five bitârûn (about 225 kg) (see Rossetti, Coticum domestica). At the same period, the geographer Ibn al-Fâkîh al-Hamadhînî reports (tr. H. Massé, Atrégié, 82) that the Egyptians "gain glory from their mead (qârâb al-âasâl) which is preferred in their land to the wine of Babylon on account of its sweetness, its perfume and its heavy taste."
power". Later (85-6), he adds: "The Egyptians say, it is in our country that there are the most slaves, honey in combs, sugar and candy and money... They also say, We have wax, honey and ostrich feathers!". Within the Near East, 'Irāk, Syria and Arabia equalled the Mediterranean countries in honey production, but, like that of Cairo, the scale of consumption of the large towns and capitals, Bagdad and Damascus, necessitated additional imports from Persia, with its famed honey from 'Issafān, whether in combs with the wax, or virgin and pure (see Ch. Pellat, Tabāṣur, 160) or in an extracted dry form (khiwadandhibin). It is known, moreover, that in Persia, in the 7th/13th century, the tax on beekeepers was paid in kind, in the form of so many thousands of litres (see A. Mazaheri, Vie quotidienne, 250-1), which shows production at a very high level.

The role of wax as fuel for lamps was not inferior to that of honey for feeding the Muslim populations, and one only has to recall the etymology of the French bougie, a corruption of the name of the Algerian port of Bidjāya [q.v.] which, in the Middle Ages, was one of the principal centres in the Maghrib for commercial relations with the Christian countries; wax there constituted one of the main products for export from the end of the 7th/13th century, an age in which the wax candle replaced the smoky and nauseating tallow candle. In the 12th/18th century, the English archaeologist-traveller Thomas Shaw mentioned (Voyages, i, 112) with regard to "Boujiah"/Bidjāya/Bougie: "The Kabyles also bring there on every market day a large quantity of oil and wax, which is transported to Europe and the Levant". On Bouja/Bouye (now al-'Aposinga [q.v.]) he also remarks (119): "...there is sent out from Bouja by sea a large quantity of corn, wool, leather and wax". Finally, he mentions (122), on this wax trade, the bank of the 'Compagnie des Français en Afrique' established in La Calle and exporting to France and Italy. The need in Christendom for wax resulted especially from the high consumption of candles by chapels, churches and cathedrals, as much for lighting as for the rites and ceremonies of the cult. This wax market began, in the 13th/19th century, to experience some decline after the discovery, by Chevreul, in 1811, of stearic acid which, in the commercial form of stearin, replaced the bees' produce for candles and tapers. While passing through Judea, Shaw noted there (Voyages, ii, 61) the abundance of wild honey which, he laments, was at that time no longer collected, the agricultural country-side being completely abandoned.

The extraction of the wax was carried out, as at present, according to the process of liquefaction with boiling water and pressing. But before obtaining the wax, it was necessary to purify (tasfya) the honey extracted from the combs by filtering (tarrab) through cloths to rid it of its dross of debris (qadahi), its scum (khushkanajubin) and dead bees (maskrah), so as to obtain a perfectly virgin honey (mudhal) which was preserved in water-skins of different capacities (mis'āb, batta, hamit, humit, Tamabak akerreb) to facilitate its transport. The prudent beekeeper only took a third of the honey from the hive, the rest being the nourishment necessary (kuwadara, ʿa, wathbi) for the occupants until the following season. The treatment of the harvested combs, firstly those empty of honey (muqadrah), was cleared of the bees' produce in the form of oil. The prudent beekeeper then worked a screw (muṣyrā, muṣyrār) worked by hand was the most widespread in the countryside and, notably, in Kabilia (see A. Hanoteau, La Kabylie, i, 533-7). The combs emptied of honey are packed tight in pressing bags (tulātā, Kablye tasnain) of horseshair or alfalfa, then put in boiling water and pressed; the liquefied wax ran into the pots serving as moulds to form, on becoming cold, loaves ready for sale. The whitening of the wax by grailing was not practised.

We are not able to enumerate all the pastries, side-dishes and sweets in which honey formed an essential ingredient, each land of Islam having its own specialities. It was the main sugary substance along with dates, for sugar cane (kahsū hindī, kahsū al-sukkar) was only cultivated in the delta regions of the Euphrates and Nile, and sugar from beet (tamandar, shavandar, bandjar, sausala, Maghribi lift wars, lift halī) was not made until the beginning of the 13th/19th century. A very early Arab foodstuff was talbina, a mixture of honey and flour or bran and which, according to a badiyī reported by ʿĀṣiga, was "a tranquiliser (mailām) for the sick". It is certain that honey possesses many specific virtues, and ancient Greek and then Arab therapeutics recognised almost all of them. Al-Damirī (Hayāt, ii, 348) cites some of them for us, the majority of which are recognised by modern medicine. In the words of the Ancients, honey, a hot and dry element, is diuretic and laxative; it is a powerful tonic, an effective antidote against poison and rabies and an excellent preserver of perishable goods, meats and fruits, when they are brushed with it. Mixed with rice, it is a beneficial eye-lotion to cure cataract and other eye infections and, made into a salve, it gets rid of nits and lice. Finally, massaging with wax or chewing it helps to relieve worries and anxieties. Nowadays, medical authorities recognise in honey its richness in dietetic elements, its beneficial action in cardiac equilibrium, its hepato-protective and sedative role, its antiseptic properties and its effectiveness in increasing the rate of haemoglobin of the blood. The same authorities conclude that the regular use of honey is a ticket to health and that it should be made part of the daily diet of sportmen. We may thus conclude that the Qur'ānic statement "From the bodies of the bees comes forth a drink of various hues which is a healing for men" is amply confirmed.

In the literary field, bees and honey have not attracted much attention from Arab poets; they have not, on this theme, equalled the lyricism in Latin of a Virgil (Georgics, Book iv, 565 ff.) or a Columella (De re rustica). Before Islam, it is in the works of the two famous "vagabond" poets (su'lāk, pl. sa'ulāk), al-'Sallībarī [q.v.] and Ta'abbāta al-Shāmī [q.v.], that we find mention of the gathering of wild honey. The former evokes, in his Lāmiyat al-ʿArab (verse 30), a familiar scene of his wandering life spent close to nature, that of the gatherer of honey (muqassīl) from the wild swarm. The second poet did not hesitate to go to plunder the honey in a grotto of the territory of the Banū Hudhayl, his enemies; he narrowly missed becoming a victim, for the Hudhalī, taking him by surprise, barred the entrance of the grotto to him, but he managed to escape from them through a crack in the rock in which he emptied his honey, letting himself slide on it with his waterskin. He boasted of this enterprise in ten verses (see Maqāmāt baddīgī, i, 16). In the time of the Prophet Muhammad, the Hudhalī poet Abū Dhu'ayb [q.v.] composed two fine poems on the subject of wild bees and the collection of their honey, a familiar occupation of the people of his tribe. Thereafter, we must wait until the mid-13th century when the Andalusian Ibn Shuhayd (382-426/992-1035 [q.v.]) assigns five verses to the plunder-seekng bee (Dīwān, ed. Ch. Pellat, Beirut 1963, 141), while Kuṣhādīm (d. after 350/962 [q.v.]) describes in six verses a candle given to him as a present (Dīwān,
Baghdad 1970, 235). The wax candles of the court of the Artukid prince of Mardin, al-Mansur Nadjm al-Din Ghazi (693-712/1294-1312), excited the admiration of the poet Sa’di of Shiraz (q.v.), and the Libnis, 1989, fasc. i, 125; A. Mazaheri, La vie quotidienne des Musulmans au Moyen Age (Xe au XIIe siècle), Paris 1951, 249-51; Ch. Pellat, Le Kitâb al-tabassur bi-l-tiâjara, tr. in Arabic, ii/2 (1954), 160; M. Rodinson, Recherches sur les documents arabes relatifs à la cuisine, in REI (1949), 39-165; Sâ’tdî, al-fihrist fî fikhl al-lugha, Cairo 1929, 199-202, 450-2; Thomas Shaw, Voyages de Mr. Shaw dans plusieurs provinces de la Barbarie et du Levant (Fr. tr. from English), The Hague 1743, i, 112, ii, 61; H. Eisenstein, Einführung in die arabisiche Zoologie, Berlin 1991, index s.v. Bienen (F. Viré)

NAHR (A.), pls. anhâr, anhar, etc., running water, hence a perennial watercourse, river, stream of any size (thus opposed to a wadi, a watercourse filled only at certain times of the year or a sayl, a periodic torrent).

1. In the Middle East. Al-Mas‘ûdi lays down that “all running water is a nahr, the place where water flows out is a spring (‘ayn); and the place where a great amount of water is found is a bahr” (Murûdî, i, 281 = §304). In fact, the latter term [q.v.], or its equivale;ent nahr, was borrowed from the Hebrew names of rivers and extensively-irrigated Mesopotamia (e.g. Al-Mas‘ûdi, Nahr Ubulla, Nahr Sharat, Nahr Isâ, in the last instance named after the constructor of the canal, the ‘Abbasid prince ‘Isâ b. ‘Ali b. Abd al-Malik al-‘Abbâs, uncle of the caliphs al-Saffah and al-Mansûr).

Nhr appears in all the Semitic languages, including Akkadian (nârû), Ugaritic and Epigraphic South Arabian (“nhr” “irrigation channel”), Beeston et alis, Sabac dictionary, 94), with the exception of the Ethiopic ones. Fränkel surmised that nhr first came into Arabic when the Bedouins of riverless Arabia came into contact with the peoples of Mesopotamia and their rivers and canals (Afram. Fremdspr., 285).

It is, of course, a frequent term in the Kur‘an, running waters, streams and fountains being features of Paradise (see, e.g., ii, 21, 292, 28, 13, 13 and passim), a vision doubt forming a pleasing vision for the first Muslims, whose background was that of the parched Arabian peninsula, where the few running waters and springs were precious sources of rest and refreshment for men and their herds.

Bibliography: See A. Miquel, La géographie humaine du monde musulman ii, Paris-The Hague 1980, 113 ff. See also for water in general, its legal aspects and its role in irrigation, Mâzâ; for subterranean irrigation channels, Kanâtî; for navigation on rivers, Mîlahâ and Safînâ; and for water-raising devices on rivers and canals, Nâ‘ûrâ and Sârîyâ. (C.E. Bosworth)

2. In Muslim India.

Canals were certainly known in India before Muslim times, but there was a great extension of their use in the early Dîlî sultanate, certainly under Chîvâhî al-Dîn Tughluk and his son Muhammad b. Tughluk (some documents in the anonymous Sûrat Fîrûz Shâhî, ms. Bankipore, 159-61). The canal systems were greatly expanded under Fîrûz Shâh of the Tughluk dynasty, the best known man-made example...
being his west Djamna canal (later re-excavated and re-aligned under Shahjahan); "man-made" is used here because former river-beds, cleared of silt, which might fill up during the annual rains, were in use as natural canals. The man-made canals were of two classes, "perennial" and "inundation", the former drawing off water from a river at about low-water level, sometimes with the help of a weir (although this might reduce the water-supply lower downstream); "inundation" canals take water from rivers at a level considerably higher than the normal low-water level, and consequently provide water only in the ice-melt and flood seasons, say from May to September.

The essential purpose of the canals was for irrigation (few are navigable to any great extent), the intention of which was to bring larger areas under cultivation and thereby engender more revenue to the state; private construction of canals was therefore encouraged, and jurists decreed that the constructor was entitled to bakk-i shibr as 10% of the gross produce; if the canal had been constructed by the state on the sultan's behalf, then the sultan's bakk-i shibr went into his own privy purse. Shams al-Siraj al-Din Amiri has been ably interpreted by I.H. Qureshi, *The administration of the sultanate of Delhi*, Calcutta, 1907, G.C. The development of agriculture by irrigation and other means was regarded as so important by Muhammed b. Tughluq that he brought it under a special ministry, the diwan-i amir-i kahi (Diya) al-Din Barani, *Ta'rkh-i Firuz Shahi*, Bibl. Ind. ed., 129-30, gives details of these rulings, which have been ably interpreted by I.H. Qureshi. *The administration of the sultanate of Delhi*, Calcutta, 1907, G.C. The development of agriculture by irrigation and other means was regarded as so important by Muhammed b. Tughluq that he brought it under a special ministry, the diwan-i amir-i kahi (Diya) al-Din Barani, *Ta'rkh-i Firuz Shahi*, Bibl. Ind. ed., *passim*, see Index.

Other important canals constructed in the days of Muslim rule were the east Djamna canal of the early 12th/18th century, Firuz Shahi's Satluj canal, the Mughal inundation-canals taken from the upper Ravi, the Khânwâ in the Indus delta, and many more. The original works are now hard to trace, since they have been incorporated in a vast extension of canal resources made in British times. A comprehensive account of these works is in *Imperial gazetteer of India*, iii, 326-54; see also O.H.K. Spate, *India and Pakistan: a general and regional geography*, London 1954, 204-8, 465-77. 'Ali Mardan Khan's canal, which took water for the Red Fort at Dilih, tapped the Djamna some 100 km/60 miles upstream (see M2, 12). Bibliography: In addition to references in the article, see W.E. Baker, *Memoranda on the western Jumna canal ..., London* 1849. (J. Burton-Page)

**AL-NAHR** [see NUGJUM].

**NAHR AL-ÂSÌ** [see AL-SA].

**NAHR AL-MALIK** [see DIJLA].

**NAHR ÂBÎ FUTRUS**, the name used by the mediaeval Muslim writers for the modern river Yarkon which runs into the Mediterranean through Tel Aviv about 5 km. to the north of Jaffa. In the Bible it is called Me Yarkon, probably *"the Green Waters"* (Joshua, xix, 46). In the later Middle Ages and in modern times, the river assumes a new Arabic name, that of Nahr al-Awedjât, *"the Crooked River"*. The Crusaders called it *"La Grand Riviere"* (G.A. Smith, *The historical geography of the Holy Land*, London 1897, 116 n. 6).

The name Abû Futrus is the Arabic corruption of Antipatris, the fortress and town built in about 20 BC by Herod, in honour of his father Antipater, on the site of ancient Aegae (Josephus, Wars, ii, 15, xxi, 9; Acts, xxiii, 31). The site of Aegae-Antipatris—a hill near the springs which constitute the sources of the river—has been, through the ages, one of the most important strategic positions on the major route connecting Egypt with Syria. In modern times the river sources at Antipatris are called Ra's al-'Ayn or fountain head. The river forms the southern border of the Biblical plain of Sharon and northern border of Judea. In the 12th century BC it was the northern border of Philistine settlement along the coastal plain of Palestine. Some of the Muslim writers refer to the river as the border between Dünd Filastin and Dünd al-Urdunn (al-Ya'kubî, *Ta'rkh-i*, ii, 425-6, cf. idem, *Badîn*, 327), or as belonging to both the provinces of Filastin and Urdunn (al-Mas'udî, *Masấif*, vi, 75-6; §§ 2297-8). This reference is rather strange because the border between the provinces of Filastin and Urdunn was the same as the Byzantine border between Palaeastina Prima and Palaeastina Secunda, namely along the Valley of Jezreel and Beth Shean (Baysân) (al-Iṣâkhrî, 59).

The river being wide and deep, even in the summer could not be forced along the 30 km. of its running waters. In many places, especially near its sources, its vicinity was covered with swamps. The river, and the sand dunes to the north and south of it, decided the main course of the *Via Maris*, the major road between Egypt and Mesopotamia, which has remained the same since ancient times almost to the present day. Running along the Mediterranean coast after Gaza, it ran through the route of the road and in following the river-bed until Afeq-Antipatris, it turned northwards and eastwards towards Damascus (Smith, *op. cit.*, 116). The general direction of the route in the vicinity of the river from east to west explains the reference of the sources to the travellers and armies, moving along this route, as coming either from the east or from the west. Yâkût and Abu 'I-Fidâ' note that many great battles were fought along the river banks and that the winner was always the army that came from the west.

The examples which are given by these sources are: the victory of the 'Abbasid army led by 'Abd Allâh b. 'Ali, the killing of Abu Taghlib Hamdân by the Fâtimid general al-Fadl b. Sâhîh (Yâkût, iv, 831). Abu 'I-Fidâ' adds that in his time, the early 8th/14th century, the citadel of Madjdalyâbû to the east of the river sources was in ruins. The citadel was built over the ancient site of Migdâl-Afân *'Ayn al-'Âmîj*, which was partly rebuilt. In modern times the village was called Madjdal Sadîk. In 1948, during the first Arab-Israeli war, the village was deserted and fell into ruins.

Nahr Abû Futrus figures in the Islamic eschatological tradition. According to a tradition attributed to Ka'b b. Abî-Hârâm, *[etc.]*, the Muslims will have to fight the Dâjdîdâl *[q.v.]* near this river (*ma'kiluhum min al-dâjdîdâl nahr abî futrus*, Ibn 'Asâkir, *Ta'rkh-i al-Ta'rkh-i al-kabîr*, Damascus 1329, i, 52).

The passages concerning the river in Yâkût and
Abu 'l-Fida (Takwim al-buldan, ed. Reinaud, Paris 1840, 48) refer to some of the major events which happened in the vicinity of this river. In 1327/943 it was the scene of the final attempt of the last Umayyad caliph, Marwan b. Muhammad, to hold out against the 'Abbasid army under 'Abd Allah b. 'Ali in Syria. Unable to secure the support of the Arab tribes in Palestine, Marwan was compelled to withdraw to Egypt, where he found his death. 'Abd Allah b. 'Ali captured some 80 members of the Umayyad royal family and cruelly massacred them at Abu Futrus, probably in the fortress of either Ra's al-'Ayn (Antipatris) or Magdalyābā (al-Tabarī, ii, 47-8, 51; al-Maṣūdī, Murūd, loc. cit.; idem, Tanbih, 329; al-Ya'kūbi, Buldān, 327; idem, Tanbih, ii, 425-6; Ibn Khālidūn, Ḥarr, Būlāk, i, 131).

Early in 271/884, al-Muwaffak (q.v.), the brother of the 'Abbasid caliph al-Mu'tamid, tried to break the Tulūnid power in Syria, soon after the death of Ahmad b. Tūlūn and the succession of his son Kūmmārāwawayh (q.v.). The 'Abbasid army met the Egyptians near Abu Futrus and initially won the day, causing Kūmmārāwawayh to flee to Egypt. However, an Egyptian ambush, left behind under the command of Sa'd al-A'asar, fell upon the unsuspecting army of al-Muwaffak, winning a crushing victory for Egypt, by keeping out of the Turān's quarter the political power of the Umayyads in the year 131/943. The Battle came to be known as the "Battle of the Water-Mills", wāq'at al-tawābih, probably after the water-mills on the river (Ibn al-Atīr, Beirut, 1982, vii, 414-5; al-Makrīzī, Khtat, Būlāk, i, 321; Ibn Ṭahfrīrdī, Nuṣūm, ed. Popper, iii, 50).

In 365/977 Aftakīn, the Turkish mausel of the Buwayhid Mu'izz ad-Dawla, took over Damascus and tried to hold it with the aid of the Turkish al-'Azīz Nīzar, who had just assumed power after the death of his father al-Mu'izz. Aftakīn got the support of the Carmathians in Syria, and together they made an attempt to attack a few of the coastal cities of Lebanon and Palestine. Some of the Bedouin tribes of the area joined Aftakīn as well. In 367/977, al-'Azīz and his general Djuwarhīn met Aftakīn near Abu Futrus ("in the vicinity of Ramla"); they beat his armies and compelled the Carmathian leader to withdraw to al-Ḥasā. In spite of the victory, al-'Azīz was highly interested in the services of Aftakīn, who was taken to Egypt in great honour (Ibn al-ʿĀthīr, viii, 656-61; Ibn Khālidūn, Wajfayḥ, ed. Ibsīn 'Abbās, iv, 54 and index).

Another attempt at snatching Syria from the Fatimids was made by Abu Ṭalḥīlī Fadlādī Fāḍl b. Nāṣīr ad-Dawla the Ḥamdānī, who represented the Mawsili branch of the dynasty. He made common cause with the ʿUkaylīs of Syria and moved into Palestine, where he was met at Abu Futrus by the Egyptian army of al-'Azīz under his general al-Ṭafīl. Ṣālībī was abandoned before the battle by his ʿUkaylid allies, he was defeated and fell into the hands of the Bedouin leader of the Banū Ṭaṣiyī in the vicinity of Ramla. Dhuqal b. al-Muḍarrī b. Ǧārrār, who killed him and sent his head to Cairo (Ibn al-ʿĀthīr, viii, 699-700).

The next event connected directly with Abu Futrus is a battle fought between the Turīzūd leader Fakhr ad-Dīn (q.v.) and the Bedouin leader of northern Palestine Ahmad b. Turābīy. After returning from a five-years' exile in Europe in 1618, Fakhr ad-Dīn continued his policy of widening his rule over the sanjāq of Nābūlūs and ʿAjdūn. The Bedouin family of Turābīy led by Ahmad created a coalition of Bedouins and peasants in order to check his move southwards from the Lebanese coast. In 1622, the two armies met on the Abu Futrus river, now called al-'Ājdūnī, and Fakhr ad-Dīn's army was defeated. The defeat put an end to his plans to push into northern Palestine and marks the beginning of the deterioration of his power (al-Khālidī, Lubānī fī 'aḥd al-ʾArīm al-ʿĀjdūnī ad-Dīn al-Muṣīrīn, Beirut, 1936, 139 ff.).

During the operations in Palestine in the First World War, one of the major battles between the British army (mainly the 52nd Division under General Hill) and the Turks was fought on 20 and 21 December 1917, at the end of which the bridges over the river were captured to create a new British front, from which the attack on the Turks in Samaria and Galilee began.
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AL-NAHRAWĀLĪ (NAHRAWANI), KUTB AL-DIN MUHAMMAD (q.v.). Also AL-NAHRAWĀLĪ (NAHRAWANI), KUTB AL-DIN AHMAD (q.v.).
each time presented to Sultan Siileyman (r. 926-74/1520-66). In 943/1536-7 he accompanied the vizier of Bahadur Shâh [q.v.] of Gouradâr in his mission to secure Ottoman military assistance for his master. His second trip, in 965/1557-8, was for the Sharîf of Mecca, who sought unsuccessfully to have a troublesome Ottoman official replaced. Travelling through Syria and Anatolia, he recorded the details of his journey for inclusion in his book al-Fatevîd al-samsîyâ fi 1-rihîd al-Manûtayn wa 1-Rûmûyayn. Among his experiences were an encounter, near Kûtahya, with Prince Bâyezîd on the eve of hostilities with his brother, attendance in Istanbul at the funeral of the sultan's wife, Khârûm [q.v.] (Djumâdâ II/April 1558), and a meeting with the celebrated shykh al-Islâm, Abd 'I-Suûd Elendi [q.v.].

The probable date of Kûth al-Dîn's death in Mecca was 26 Rabi' II 990/20 May 1582. He was apparently survived by at least one son, Muhammad, who composed a book (Ithâbîd al-miânî...) for Hasan Pâsha, the long-serving Ottoman governor of Yemen (988-1012/1580-1604). Best known among his relatives, however, was a nephew, 'Abd al-Karîm b. Muhîbîb al-Dîn (961-1014/1554-1606), who succeeded him as muftî. Although Kûth al-Dîn himself never visited Yemen, two brothers, a nephew, and a son served there as muftîs.

Kûth al-Dîn's several compositions deal chiefly with religion, literature or history, and are described by al-Djasîr and Brockelmann. Some, including those on Hanafi ulâmâ' (Tabâkât al-Hanâfiyya) and halîfî (al-Djâmî li-kutub al-sunnâ al-sitta...), were lost when fire struck the Ottoman imperial library in 1558 (Djumâdâ II/April 1558). Ibn Ra'îk (978-1008) at as-Sâlih Khusraw restored the Nahrawan between 534/1139-40 and 536/1141-2, according to Yakût the Traveller, IHdm bi-â'lâm bayt lah Allah al-hardm, among saniyya ft 'l-rihla al-Madaniyya wa 'l-Rumiyya.
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irrigation system was ruined by fighting among the Seljuks. Reduced water flow and silting led to the general abandonment of the countryside by the general* abandonment of the countryside by the Arabs (al-Aswad al-Du-'ali Arab).
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and rival "schools", each having its own grammatical system (madhhab); subsequently, following a meeting of grammarians representing these two "schools" in Baghdād, in the 3rd/9th century, a third "school" came into being, its representatives operating a synthesis of the two former, through blending (khālāta) their systems.

While this traditional point of view was adopted by G. Flügel (Die grammatisch-stilistischen Schriften der Araber, Leipzig 1862), it was rejected by G. Well (Die grammatischen Streitfragen der Basrā and Kufer, Leiden 1913), who showed the artificial and belated nature of this division into three "schools". But it remains true that even if the systems of the grammarians of Basrā and of Kūfā were fundamentally the same, they nevertheless presented certain divergencies which should not be ignored.

These divergencies were first manifested in the area of terminology, the Kūfāns using a number of terms different to those of the Basrans, for example: madţi (masnârî); kalâmil (gâr); îmmad (fâsil); makâni (mu'dmar); nasâk (hashw). Differences also appeared in the context of general concepts, such as the nature of words, since, unlike the Basrans, the Kūfāns considered that the noun of the action belongs not to the category of the Basran method in Baghdad, introducing two methods; al-Zâdjâdjâdî (d. 338/949), who was one of the first works on the causes of grammatical phenomena, the K. al-Usûl wa 'l-takmilâ, and of a treatise on methodology, the K. al-Nahw al-adillâ.

In the 7th/13th century, the Egyptian Ibn al-Hâjîb (d. 647/1249) authored a copious commentary by a scholar of Aleppo, the K. al-‘Awwâmî al-mî‘â, which was to be one of the first studies of Arabic syntax to become known in the West, since it was translated into Latin by Erpenius at Leiden in 1617.

The 6th/12th century saw a resumption of grammatical production, after the proliferation of the preceding century; the only writer worthy of mention seems to be the Persian al-Djûdjândî (d. 471/1078), author of the K. al-‘Awâmî al-mî‘â, which was to be one of the first studies of Arabic syntax to become known in the West, since it was translated into Latin by Erpenius at Leiden in 1617.

The 5th/11th century is marked by a dearth of grammatical production, after the proliferation of the preceding century; the only writer worthy of mention seems to be the Persian al-Djûdjândî (d. 471/1078), author of the K. al-‘Awâmî al-mî‘â, which was to be one of the first studies of Arabic syntax to become known in the West, since it was translated into Latin by Erpenius at Leiden in 1617.
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examined successively, according to their inflexion (i^rdb) or their basic form (bind3):
(1) the ending of nouns inflected (mu^rabdt) in the
governing function (J-awdmil)‘.
(2) the ending of invariable nouns
(mushabbaha) or invariable
- nunn.
(3) the ending of nouns dependent
inflected nouns.
(4) the ending of inflected verbs in the governing
function:
 a. verbs raised (marfu^a) by the vowel /a/;
 b. verbs rectified (mansuba) by the vowel /a/;
 c. verbs with vowel cut off (maajrurda).
(5) the ending of invariable adjectives
(taksir).
(6) the ending of words modified by factors other than
inflexion.
This division comprises two parts in which the following are
described:
(1) morphological transformations which influence the
form of words: diminutiveness (tsaqiq, takbir),
breakness (takir) for the plural, annexation (id^afa, nasab),
derivation (igdagik) of verbs and nouns from the
verbal noun (masdar);
(2) phonetic transformations which influence the
phonemes of words: augmentation (ziyda), substitu-
tion (ibd), suppression (bad), conversion (tahvi) and insertion (ido).

It is this bipartite division, inherited from the
Kutab of Sibawayhi, which is to be found in all Arabic
grammatical works, even though, within these two major
divisions, the order of the constituent parts may vary slightly.

Bibliography: To the references indicated in the
course of the article, the following may be added:
F. Sezgin, GAS, ix, Grammatik, Leiden 1984, 1-27; G. Versteegh,
Arabische Sprachwissenschaft (Grammatik),
in Grundriss der arabischen Philologie, ii, Wiesbaden 1987, 148-76.
NAB (A.), literally: ‘substitute, delegate’ (nomen
agenti from n-a-b “to take the place of another”),
the term applied generally to any person appointed as
deputy of another in an official position
1. In pre-modern usage.
The term was used, more especially, in the Mamluk
and Dihl Sultanates, to designate (a) the deputy or
lieutenant of the sultan, and (b) the governors of the
chief provinces. In the Mamluk system the former,
entitled n^ib al-saltana al-mu^azzama wa-kafil al-mamlak
al-qabita al-nilmiyya, was the vice-sultan proper, who
administered all the territories and affairs of the em-
pire on behalf of the sultan. This was, however,
only an occasional office, and its holder is to be distin-
guished from the n^ib al-ghayba, the temporary gover-
nor of Cairo (or Egypt) during the absence of the
sultan, or of Damascus during the absence of the n^ib
al-saltana. The six n^ibas of Syria which replaced the
Ayyubid mamlakes—Damascus, Hamah, Tripoli,
Hama, Safad and al-Karak (their number was from
1. below)—were each administered by a n^ib
al-saltana (also entitled kafal al-
mamlaka), who was an “amir of a thousand”, the n^ib
of Damascus being superior to the others. At the end
of the 8th/14th century, Egypt also was divided into
three similar n^ibas: Alexandria (from 767/1365-6),
Upper Egypt (al-wadq al-barri or al-khbs) and Lower
Egypt (al-wadq al-bahri). The plain title of n^ib was
held by the commandants of the citadels of Cairo,
Damascus, Halab, etc., who were not under the
jurisdiction of their respective governors, and by vari-
ous amirs of lesser rank holding subordinate com-
mands. (For an instance of more recent use, see
Samit).

In the Dihl Sultanate, the n^ib was the powerful
minister who was the deputy of the king himself.
The earliest reference to the office seems to be the appoint-
ment of Ikhayr al-Din Aygiin as deputy on the ac-
session of Sultan Mu^izz al-Din Bahram Sh^ah in
637/1240 (Minhaj al-Din Dhuzdjani, Tabakat-i Naiiri, ed. Bibli.
Ind., i, 191). In fact, the support of the nobles was
conditioned upon the appointment of this person to the
deputyship. Although this was a separate office from
that of the wazir, nevertheless under powerful
n^ibs, like Malik Kafs in the reign of Ali’s al-Din
Khalidji and Husraw in the reign of Mubarak Sh^ah,
his existence was not conducive to the conduct of the
powers of the wazir.

In its most common acceptance, in Persian and in
Turkish, the term later Arabic n^ib signified a
judge-substitute, or delegate of the kaid in the
administration of law. In modern Arabic political usage,
it denotes a parliamentary deputy, so that maqdisi
al-nawwab means “chamber of deputies” [see MAQDISI
and below]. In modern legal usage, al-n^ib
al-tamani is the public prosecutor.
N^ib is further found in military usage as a term, with
nawwab, pl. of n^ib became much used in Indo-Muslim prac-
tice as the titles Nawwab or Nawab; for this, see
NAWWAB.

Bibliography: In addition to the standard
histories: E. Quatremere, Histoire des sulevs
mamelouks, Paris 1840, i/2, 95-9; M. van Bernhem,
Materiaux pour un corpus inscriptionum arabicurn, Paris
1903, i, 209-28 (analyses the epigraphic evidence):
M. Gaudefroy-Demombynes, La Syrie a l’époque des
Mamelouks, Paris 1923. (H.A.R. Giff*)
2. In modern politics.
Until the early 19th century, n^ib had carried only
the traditional meaning of official deputy, the lieute-
nant of a ruler, governor or judge. The term has re-
tained this import, and is still used in this sense in
Arabic, Turkish and Persian. Meanwhile, with the
Middle Eastern exposure to Western political ideas,
n^ib—in Arabic usage only—has acquired the addi-
tional meaning of people’s representatives in
government.

Like so many modern Arabic political expressions,
n^ib gained its new sense first through the discussing
of political phenomena abroad. Rifai’ al-Tahjawi
[q.v.] seems to have been the first to employ it with
such meaning in the 1830s, applying it to members of
the French Chambre des D6putes (Rifai’ Rifai’
al-Tahjawi, Tabklt iz-biz, 3rd ed. Cairo 1928, 141;
Iz, al-Kemz al-nawwab, Cairo 1834, 22, 57). Restor-
ing to calque, he chose the word n^ib to render the
French député, which carried the double meaning of
“appointed official” and “popular representative”.
Thereafter the term was occasionally used with this
new denotation, but it gained broad currency only
following the creation of the Egyptian maqdisi shar al-
nuwwab (Consultative Council of Deputies) by the Khedive Ismail in 1866. The membership of this institution, having been assembled through a combined procedure of appointment and election, clearly reflected a novel concept, and its designation as nuwwab lent the term a similarly novel, if somewhat ambiguous implication. Lasting until 1882, the Khedive's Council was the only official body in the region whose members were so formally designated prior to World War I.

Assemblies of deputies have emerged in the Middle East under different régimes since the disintegration of the Ottoman empire, their membership formed through various mechanisms. The name maglis al-nuwwāb has often been applied to such institutions, whether unicameral bodies or lower houses of bicameral ones. Thus were named institutions in monarchical Egypt (1923-52), Iraq (1924-58) and Libya (1951-69); mandatory, then independent Syria (1932-63); Sudan (1951-8); Trans-Jordan, then Jordan (since 1946), and Morocco (since 1962). Members of similar bodies with other names—maglis al-ahlā ('people's assembly'), maglis al-ulummā ('nation's assembly') etc.—have likewise been commonly known as nuwwāb. In their representational nature, political role and public standing these bodies have had in the Arab states, according to their respective political realities.

Bibliography: For the 19th century evolution of the term and concept of representation, see A. Ayalon, Language and change in the Arab Middle East, New York 1987, ch. V. For Ismā'il's maglis ǧītār al-nuwwāb, and the development of representative institutions in the 20th century, see maglis, 4, and the Bibliotheca treasuries (A. Ayalon).

Nāibli, properly Piri-Zāde (after his father Piri Khālīfe Muṣṭafā Čelebi, a celebrated Ottoman poet of the 17th century, d. in 1077/1666-7). To distinguish him from the 19th century poet and Mewlewi adherent Sāliḥ Nāibli of Montastir (who died in 1253/1837 in Cairo) he has since been called Nāibli-yi Kadim, 'old Nāibli', the later poet being referred to as Nāibli-yi Djeḏid, 'new Nāibli'.

Nāibli was born in Istanbul presumably about the beginning of the 17th century (as we are led to assume based on indications in his Diwān). He enjoyed a good education, upon the completion of which he entered the government office of finance called maṭā'īn kalēmi as clerk. This was to be his life-long job, and he ultimately became šakīr-khālīfe there (thus following in his father's footsteps, a clerk and ṭālīfe in the same office). Unable to secure a more important post, he had to content himself with the life of a civil servant of restricted means until towards the end of his life he was sent into exile by the grand vizier Köprülü-zāde Fāḍil Ahmed Paşa for unknown reasons. Allusions in some of his kasīdes to his having later been allowed to return to Istanbul, Nāibli died in 1077/1666-7; the location of his tomb cannot be ascertained.

Nāibli was a weak, delicate man of feeble constitution, inclining to hypersensitivity and pessimism. There are indications in his Diwān that he belonged to the Khālīfe order. Nevertheless, he was not only one of the greatest Ottoman poets of the post-classical period but one of the most interesting and important poets in the entire history of Turkish literature. He was an innovator, but mainly in the field of style and language, being the pre-eminent follower of the Ṣebk-i ḥindi [see SABK-I HINDI] style in Ottoman poetry. Nāibli's characteristics are a polished, elegant, individual style of great gracefulness, succinctness of expression and a language full of Persian words, constructions (often of considerable length, such as e.g.: diğhān-1 wṣāţirān-ī maškhab, 'the land of love with the horseshoes turned backwards'); horses used to be fitted with horseshoes turned backwards in order to confuse pursuers) and metaphors, many of which were new to Turkish usage. A good number of his verses contain so many foreign elements that they are unintelligible to a Turk who does not know Persian. An example from a ghazal: 'Zār-ī baṣī-yī niqšūḥ dest-bārdī-i ʿiğwacīd Čak rīz-ī qyū Españ dāmnā-l tahammūlār bāta "The force of your glance's arm is coquetry's victory; It is the tearing into pieces to collar of hem (my) endurance to me."

Furthermore, Nāibli's language is so compact and free from all redundancy that the meaning is often hard to decipher at first sight, and some of his verses become intelligible only when one has recourse to interpreting them in a Sufi sense. However, the use of tașawwuf ideas and allusions, at which Nāibli is a master, is only a matter of inspiration and style for him; he cannot be called a Sufi poet. His poetic imagination was not as powerful as his mastery of language and style, but he influenced both his contemporaries and later poets down to the 19th century.

Nāibli's literary work consists only of a Diwān, put together by the poet himself. It was printed in Bulaq in 1253/1837 (only about a third of his poems were printed, however). All of his work is included in the critical edition prepared by Haluk Ipekten (Istanbul 1970) (for the preparation of this critical edition, all known 31 mss. of the Diwān were studied). The complete Diwān consists of two mamluks, ten na'sīs, 29 medhīyeyes, a metrīye written in the form of a tajrīsī-i bend on the death of his brother who died young, four mūsāiḍed, one ṭerki-bī bend, one taḥkīm, 390 ghazels, one mūṣṭezad, 18 kūṭās, eight rubāʿīs, five ṣeṭūt, eleven ṣarkīs and six ṣārīgīs.

Most of Nāibli's religious poetry is in the kalīṣe form. Of the ten na'sīs, eight are in honour of the Prophet and one each in honour of 'All, Šīrāzī and Husayn; 27 of the 29 medhīyeyes are also kalīṣes (the other two being a kūṭā and a naẓm). Nāibli's medhīyeyes are dedicated to Murād IV and Mehmed IV [q.v.] to the grand viziers Kemānkēsh Kara Muṣṭafā Paşa, Şūltān-zāde Meḥmed Paşa [see MEHME D PASHA, SULTAN-ZADE], Sofu Meḥmed Paşa, Şālīḥ Paşa, Hezar-pāre Ahmed Paşa, Köprülü-zāde Fāḍil Ahmed Paşa [see Köprülü], to the ṣyūkā- rather than kalīṣe forms dedicated to the second viziers Zekeriyya-ābā Yāhya Efendi, Bahāyī Efendi [see BAḤĀYĪ MEHME D EFENDI], Meḥmed E mı'n-ı ʿazīd Efendi, to various defterdārs and others.

Nāibli's most important work is, however, his collection of 390 ghazels. These ghazels, the majority of which are of only five verses, have been considered samples of maḥṣūṣ, the art of expressing oneself in such a way that words and meaning are perfectly balanced. In some of them there is a lightness of tone that reminds one of Nefīm [q.v.], in others a pessimistic, and at times philosophizing, vein calling to mind Nābī [q.v.]. Thus first and foremost, Nāibli is considered a poet of ghazels. His ghazels have a special importance in that they are the first poems of this genre and in that he wrote them in a very simple language (with passages such as bızumle yar sūylehemes, "the beloved does not speak with us") that is totally different from the elaborate language of his other poems.

Bibliography: Rıđa, Teğkhere; 'Aṣım, Dhol-i Zabāt el-es-ṣār, Gütī, Teṣhrīfī el-shuʿarā', Muqīb, 916
NA'ILI — NA'IMA

The text is a historical account of Na'imi, an Ottoman historian, and his contributions to Ottoman history and culture. Na'imi was a composer and author of several significant works, including "Hadikatu'l-shuhedd," a work that he completed in 1157/1744. His career was marked by fluctuations, including assignments to high administrative posts and serving in various administrative positions.

Na'imi's life and career were shaped by his role in the history of Ottoman Turkey. He was a prominent figure in the 18th century, and his work continues to be studied and appreciated for its contribution to the understanding of Ottoman history.

In conclusion, Na'imi's work as an Ottoman historian is a testament to the richness and diversity of Ottoman culture and its enduring legacy.
government, bears similarities to the 17th-century reform memoranda, or *a3 that literature, but acknowledges particularly the influence of Kâbit Celâbi's *Dustûr al-*amîl, and Ibn Khalidân's theory of the rise and decline of states (Thomas, *A study of Naîma*, 68-83; C. Fleischer, *Royal authority, dynastic cyclism,* and *'Ibn Khalidân*" in sixteenth-century *Otoman letters*, in *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, xvi/3-4 [1983], 199-203).

Naîma's aim was to produce a reliable and accurate history, written in a graceful yet accessible prose style, which would be a source both of information and of instruction for Ottoman statesmen. A widely-read and highly-regarded history, the *Ta'nîh-i Naîma* was one of the first Ottoman printed works, being published in two volumes by Ibrâhim Mûteferrika [*q.v.*] in 1147/1733 (the first volume of which was reprinted in *Istanbul* in 1259/1843). Second and third editions, each in six volumes, were published in *Istanbul* in 1280/1863-4 and 1281-3/1864-6 (on the ms., editions, and partial translations, see Babinger, 246; *Istanbul kitâbahneleri tarikh-coğrafya yazmaları katalogu*, ii, *Istanbul* 1945, 200-7; M. Münir Aktepe, *Naîma Tarhi*nin yazma nihâhleri hakkında, in *TD*, 1/1 [1949], 35-52).

Naîma also collected material for a continuation of the history, to 1170/1758-9, but his manuscripts appear not to have survived. A daybook of contemporaneous events apparently kept by him during at least the Grand Vizierate of *Amâd-jâzâd Hasûyân Pâsha* (1109-14/1697-1702), and perhaps for almost a decade beforehand, served as a source for the historian Râşid (Râşîd-i Râşîd, *Istanbul* 1282/1865, 449 ff.). Naîma's only published writing on contemporary affairs was an account of the deposition of Mustawfl II [*q.v.*] in 1155/1743, which was printed as an appendix to the *Ta'nîh*.

Although Naîma is traditionally regarded as the first Ottoman official historian, or *wekâyî-nüvis* [*later wak'a-nüvis* [*q.v.*]], he does not refer to himself specifically as such, and it is doubtful whether either the title or the post were formally instituted until Râşîd was appointed, in 1126/1714, to continue the work of Mustawfl II [*q.v.*] in 1155/1743, which was printed as an appendix to the *Ta'nîh*.

Naîma's only published work on contemporary affairs was the title or the post were formally instituted until Râşîd was appointed, in 1126/1714, to continue the work of Mustawfl II [*q.v.*] in 1155/1743, which was printed as an appendix to the *Ta'nîh*.

Although Naîma is traditionally regarded as the first Ottoman official historian, or *wekâyî-nüvis* [*later wak'a-nüvis* [*q.v.*]], he does not refer to himself specifically as such, and it is doubtful whether either the title or the post were formally instituted until Râşîd was appointed, in 1126/1714, to continue the work of Mustawfl II [*q.v.*] in 1155/1743, which was printed as an appendix to the *Ta'nîh*.

Although Naîma is traditionally regarded as the first Ottoman official historian, or *wekâyî-nüvis* [*later wak'a-nüvis* [*q.v.*]], he does not refer to himself specifically as such, and it is doubtful whether either the title or the post were formally instituted until Râşîd was appointed, in 1126/1714, to continue the work of Mustawfl II [*q.v.*] in 1155/1743, which was printed as an appendix to the *Ta'nîh*.
régime. It was in reference to these developments that Nuri strongly supported the Shah as "the just King" and "the King of Islam", and thus prayed to God for him: "...do corroborate our king and his army; everlasting be his life; immortalise his kingship and rule". (Hairi, Shaykh Fadl 'Allah Nuri's refutation of the idea of constitutionalism, in MES, xiii [1977], 327-39).

In refuting the position of the anticonstitutionalists in general and that of Nuri in particular, Nā'īnī argued that in the absence of the Twelfth Imam whose rule, according to the 'Twelve Shīa, is just and perfect, the Persians may establish either a despotic or a constitutional form of government. Despotism imposes tyranny and oppression, and involves all types of evils and lawlessness, whereas constitutionalism brings law, benevolence, and justice. It goes, therefore, without saying that under the then circumstances one's obvious religious and national duty was to overthrow the despotic rule of the Kadjars which ruled: "...there shall at all times exist [in Parliament] a committee composed of not less than five mujtahids...so that they...reject and repudiate, wholly or in part, any such proposal which is at variance with the sacred law of Islam" (E.G. Browne, The Persian revolution of 1905-1909, Cambridge 1910, 372-3). Nā'īnī, however, dissociated himself from every constitutionalist activity because the Anglo-Russian meddling in Persia was overwhelming and the deviation of the Persian political system from constitutionalism was obvious, so that Nā'īnī is said to have collected copies of his book on constitutionalism and thrown them in the Tigris River (personal interview with Nā'īnī's son in 1970).

In 1339/1920, Nā'īnī and other Shīa 'ulamā' of 'Irāq participated in the 'Irāk uprising of that time and opposed British military rule in that dateary region. This resulted in their exile to Kum, where Shaykh 'Abd al-Karim Hā'iri [q.v.] had just founded the circle for religious studies (hawādżiy-i ʿilmiyā). Soon, however, Nā'īnī and other banished 'ulamā' returned to 'Irāk after signing statements in which they committed themselves not to interfere in 'Irākī political affairs ('Allī al-Wardī, Lamāḥāt i-khiddnā-yī ft i-rāk al-ʿIrāk al-hadīq, Baghdad 1976, vi, 261-2). From then on, no open political activities by Nā'īnī in the form of sedition against the rulers either of Persia or of 'Irāk are heard of. Rather, he had friendly relations with Rādā Shāh and the 'Irākī kings Faysal and Ghāzi (Hairi, Shīrīm, 149-9, Muhammad Muḥsin Shāykh Aḥḥā buzzurg, Tabrīz 1938, no. 19). Instead, he concentrated upon seeing Sāḥib al-ʿIrāk and wujūd al-fikhr for the rest of his life, through which he trained some of the subsequent Shī'ī madhhab-i taktīd such as Hādīḏī Sayyid Abu 'l-Kāsim Khūrī who until his death in 1992 lived in 'Irāk.

(S. Edwardes, Gazetteer of Bombay City and Island, Bombay 1909, ii, 23-4, 34-5). As the city grew from a settlement of rock and swamp to the proud position of the commercial metropolis of India under the British, the Naitias became the most influential Muslims in the city and retained that powerful position until the 19th century, when other Muslim trading communities started migrating into Bombay. They speak Bhojpur and Marathi, and have had a strong influence on the city's culture and commerce. They are also known for their contribution to the spread of Islam in the region.

In addition to the titles mentioned in the text, and the relevant titles in the articles on the poet and the genre, some other sources that provide further information include:

- I. Poonawala, NAKA (A.), a term connected with nakida, a generic noun denoting alkaline plants utilised for washing linen and whitening cloths. These are plants which grow stems without any leaves; as soon as they dry up, they become white. They give linen a dazzling white colour.

By analogy, the term denotes also a "rite of reconciliation" which was used in the Hijād and which was used for righting injuries. This was done in the following manner: The party causing the offense stops on the threshold of the aggrieved party, holding a knife in each hand, and says: nakida, nakada; the aggrieved person has then to appear at the door and the offender's face becomes white. The aggrieved person then has to come to the door and cover the supplicant's hand with a šimaṣṭā (a cloth used for covering the head underneath the turban). Then he would kill a sheep and celebrate the reconciliation (cf. W. Robertson Smith, in Jnl. of Philology, xiv [1886], 126).

**Bibliography:** Given in the article.

**NAKA’ID (A.)** "contradicting poems, flytings", pl. of nakida (from the verb nakada "to destroy, undo, rebuff, oppose"), synonymous with munakada (from the verbal form III nakadā): a form of poetic duelling in which tribal or personal insults are exchanged in poems, usually coming in pairs, employing the same metre and rhyme. It is thus part of inventive poetry or Hijād [q. v.]. Such duels were an established form in pre-Islamic times, and had their origin in the slanging-matches between members of different clans or tribes which took the place of, or formed the preliminaries for, a fracas or battle. Originally, the term may have referred to the "undoing" of the Nakada, a term of inventive verse.

The genre reached its apogee in the Umayyad period with the nakada'īd of al-Abghāl, Djarīr and al-Farazdaq [q. v.], which were popular with rulers and common people, and remained so with philologists and critics on account of their highly entertaining content and their poetic and linguistic skill. Sometimes the poems are short and monothematic, but very often they are long poems in fāṣīda form, with a peculiar juxtaposition of different themes: amatory, vaunting and invective verse. They are rich in historical, political and social allusions, but on the whole their political significance is second to their role as entertainment. This they provide by means of funny descriptions, powerful imagery, grotesque exaggerations and gross obscenities; expressed in a variety of dictons ranging from the high-flown and stately to the simple near-colloquial. The "rebutter" implied by the term nakida does not consist in a point-by-point refutation of the opponent's poem. Rather than defending himself against slander and abuse, the replying poet attacks in his turn. Often a number of the rhyme words of the first poem re-appear in the second, but this is not done systematically. The most famous series of Nakada'īds in Arabic literature, those of Djarīr and al-Farazdaq (both of the same tribe, Tamīm), were made in the course of some forty years. They show little development and reveal in the reiterated description of shameful incidents and characteristics. This static character has been called "perhaps the gravest artistic fault" of the genre (Salma Jang Bahadur, The Golden age of Islam, Amsterdam 1975, 221; Sarah Musia, The rise of Muslim power in Gujarat, London 1963, 193-5. Some of the information given is derived from personal interviews.

Among the examples from subsequent periods one could mention Nakada'īd Ibn al-Mas'āzī wa-Tamīm Ibn al-Ma'īzī (ed. Ahmad Sayyid Muhammad, 2nd ed. Cairo 1981). Sometimes the term nakida is used for what is more properly termed a mu'dara [q. v.], i.e., a poem with the same metre and rhyme as another, made by way of emulation or in order to surpass, without the inventive element (see e.g., the first volume of the Dhōnīn of Abū Nuwās [q. v.], ed. E. Wagner, Wiesbaden 1958, 24-105). The old tribal poetic duelling survived, with little changes, into modern times: Saad al-Abdulwah Hayyy, Nabati poetry: the oral poetry of Arabia (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1985), 142-4, describes the riddīyā in which two poets alternately improvise a few lines with the same metre and rhyme.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the titles mentioned in the text, and the relevant titles in the articles on the poet mentioned above and in the article Hijād [q. v.], see also Ahmad al-Shāyib, Ta'rikh al-Nakada'īd fi 'l-Qādī bi-'l-Tamīm, Cairo 1948; Mahmūd Chīnawī al-Zuhayrī, Nakada'īd al-Qādī wa-l-Farazdaq: dirāsa adābiyya, Baghdād 1954. For a list of ancient compilations and commentaries of nakada'īd, see Szegi, GÁS, ii, Leiden 1975, 62-3.
Be'er sheva' (Ar. Bīr al-Sabī[.g.v.]). The place-name Nagb is not found in Classical Arabic historical or geographical literature. After Israel adopted Negev in the modern designation for the southern desert of the country, the Bedouins resident there Arabised Negev to Nagb, which, meaning "a mountain pass" (Classical nakb), has popularly been thought to derive from the famous pass through which the former Mecca-bound Egyptian pilgrim caravan descended from the central Sinai heights to the head of the Gulf of Ašāba.

During the Mamlūk and Ottoman periods, Gama (Hazine [q.v.]) was the centre of administration, at the head of which was a kā'āmadšīm or sub-district governor. In 1901, the Ottomans built a mosque, which has been the administrative centre of the Negev ever since.

The earliest recorded Bedouin tribe in this area was the Balī, who aided the Byzantine emperor Heraclius to fight the invading Muslim forces (al-Tabarī, i, 2347, 2392). The Dhuḏām, who aided 'Amr b. al-As to invade Egypt, may also have lived there (al-Kalkashandi, Nīḥāya, 193). The present-day Dhuḏārāt were there by the 14th century A.D. (al-Kalkashandi, al-Bayān, 169) and the Wuhaydāt by the 16th century, when they expelled the Ayīd, which had dominated the southern sector for 300 years (al-Djazm, 461).

Throughout the ages, the Negev was a refuge for Bedouin groups from north-west Arabia fleeing from vengeance or drought, who apprended themselves to local tribes and confederations, some eventually growing and gaining tribal independence, such as the ʿUkba tribe and the Zullaṃa confederation.

The major contemporary Bedouin confederations in the Negev, the Tiyahā and the Tarabin, originally came there with the invading army of Bonaparte, in 1799, driving the dominant Wuhaydāt confederation north. They were subsequently joined by the ʿAzāzna. Throughout the 19th century, these confederations fought each other over territory and, internally, over leadership, the al-ʿAtawna and the Huzayyil contending to head the Tiyahā, and the al-Sūf and Abī Sitta vying within the Tarabin. These wars continued until 1890, when the final tribal borders were set.

During the Arab-Israeli War of 1948, most of the Bedouin population fled the Negev to neighbouring countries, only 13,000 out of 65,000 remaining; but by 1990, the Bedouin population was again put at 65,000, almost all of whom had become sedentary.


Nakb (A.), the portion of the dowry handed over at the conclusion of a marriage, see Maḥār. In modern Arabic, it has the sense of 'money', see Sīka.

Nakb al-Mīthak (A.), denotes the act of violating a religious covenant ('ahd or mīthak), occasionally used in Shi'i and, more commonly, Bahāʾī (q.v.), where the standard English term is 'covenant-breaking'. The terms 'ahd and mīthak are Kurʿānic (II, 27, 63, 83; III, 81; VIII, 56; XIII, 20, 25; XVI, 91, etc.), where they refer to God's general covenant with men or His prophets, or to specific covenants, such as that with the Banū Isrāʾīl [see Mīṭkā]. In Shi'i tradition, the Prophet entered into a specific mīthak concerning the succession of 'Alī. Each Imām in turn enters into a covenant concerning his successor, who must be appointed in his lifetime by means of an explicit declaration (naij). The imāmate itself is ' a known covenant ('ahd) on the part of God to named individuals' (al-Kulaynī, ii, 54,3).

In Bahāʾī, the terms are generally used of two covenants: that of God with men concerning His suc-
cessive prophets and that of each prophet or waṣī concerning his successor. In the latter sense, loyalty to the covenant and, more specifically, the individual appointed by it (the markaz al-mīthak) constitutes a cen-
tral motif in Bahāʾī doctrine.

The Bahāʾī covenant system closely resembles that of Shi'i. Mīrza Husayn 'Alī Bābā Allāh appointed his eldest son 'Abbās (ʿAbd al-Baḥāʾ) as his waṣī; 'Abbās in turn appointed a grandson, Shoghi Effendi, as the first of a succession of 'Guardians' (wādī-yī amr Allāh); Shoghi died childless, and authority passed six years later to an elected body, the baṣt al-ʿalāʾ al-ʿaṣam (Universal House of Justice).

The present-day boundaries of the country are based on the authority of the central figure or body, and are therefore settled by means of expert arbitration. Numerous individuals and small groups have been expelled from the country by the movement, but no important sects have yet developed. The absence of an explicit law of apostasy, the precise compass of nakb al-mīthak has yet to be determined. In Western Bahāʾī writing, the Shi'i origins of the covenant motif are generally ignored and the system treated as though it is unique.


Nakahī, Ibrahim b. Yāzīd, al-Kūfī, Abū ʿImrān, a Successor (Tābīʾī), Kūfī traditionist and lawyer, who enjoyed a certain fame, b. ca. 50/670, d. ca. 96/717. His informants were all ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd [q.v.] but also Anas b. Mālik and ʿĀisha [q.v.]. He seems to have been part of the latter's circle, and transmitted from her a fair number of items concerning in particular the behaviour of women and husband-and-wife relations, beginning ca. 65, 90; finally 204, 257. (R. Backwell, ed.), The Covenant of Bahāʾ Allāh: a compilation, London 1963; The power of the Covenant: Part Two. The problem of Covenant-breaking, Canada 1976; W. P. Collins, Bibliography of English-language works on the Bāb and Bahāʾī Faiths 1844-1985, Oxford 1990, chapter XII, "Works of Covenant-Breakers", 294-302; J. Björing, The Bāb's faith: a historical bibliography, New York and London 1985, chapter XI, "Independent and unaffiliated Bābists", 30-60. (D. MacEoin)
also those belonging to other law schools, such as Abu Yusuf, al-Shaybani, al-Shafi'i and even Sahmân [q.v.], who accord him quite a large place in their works.

Bibliography: Ibn Sa'd, vi, 188 ff.; Bukhârî, Ta'rîkh, ii, 333-4; Muhammad b. al-Husayn al-Âdîjûrî (d. 360/970), K. al-Šarî'a, Cairo 1369/1950, 223-3, 227 ff.; Abu Nu'aym, Hîya, iv, 219-40 (uses the information of Mânîbûr b. Mu'tamîr, d. 132/749, a direct disciple of al-Nakha'i's); Azafrî, Ta'dîkh, i, 177; Ablâ Iskhâq b. Sâhirzâ, Fudakâ, i, 125; Ibn Hâdi'âr, Ta'dîkh, i, 177-9; Ibn Kutayba, Ma'sirîf, Cairo 1960, 204; idem, K. Mâkhâfi'l al-bâ'dâhî, Cairo 1326, tr. G. Lecomte, Damascus 1962, index; Zirîkli, A'sâm, i, 76; cf. also J. van Ess, Zwischen Hadith and Theologie, Berlin-New York 1975, index. (G. Lecomte)

NAKHAWILA [see AL-MADINA, 3.]

NAHKÎÇIWAN, NAKHÇİWAN, the name of a town in Transcaucasia which is also the chief town of a region of the same name, until the early 19th century a largely independent khanate and in former Soviet Russian administrative geography part of the Azerbaijân SSR but an enclave within the Armenian Republic. Both town and region lie to the northwest of the great southern bend of the Araxes river, since 1834 also known (Armenian Djuta) with the ruins of the old bridge (Zqfar-ndîma, [q.v.]), dated 514/1120). The town numbered 8,946 and the district 121,365. After the Russian occupation was Karim Khan Kangarli. The last chief of Nakhciwan before the Russian occupation was Ihsan Khan and Shaykh 'Ali Beg. The mahalla of the khanate were: Nakhciwan, Alindja-cay (Armenian Erndjak), Mawazi-khatun, Khok. Daralagez, and those of Aza-Djiran: Ordubad, Akulis, Dasta, Bilaw and Çinânab. Among the dependencies of Nakhciwan, Alindja-cay (Armenian Erndjak) had 8,946 and the district 121,365. After the Russian occupation was Karin Khan Kangarli. The town was conquered under 'Uthman by Habib b. Maslama. It was rebuilt under Mu'awiya by 'Aziz b. Hátim. In 87/705 the Arabs hanged a large number of Armenian notables, and thereafter the town acquired a Muslim character. For a short time (about 900) the power was in the hands of the Bagratuni, but the town was reconquered by the Sâdjids [q.v.] and belonged henceforth to the domain of their vassal the amir of Goltam (Ordubad [q.v.]); cf. Markwart, Südarmenien, Vienna 1930, preface, 79, 93, 99-101, 115, text, 300, 362, 567. It figures in the war of the Daylam period (Ibn Miskawayh, ii, 148) and in the events of the Sâdjids period (cf. Ibn al-Athîr, under 514/1120).

The town was conquered under 'Uthman by Habib b. Maslama. It was rebuilt under Mu'awiya by 'Aziz b. Hátim. In 87/705 the Arabs hanged a large number of Armenian notables, and thereafter the town acquired a Muslim character. For a short time (about 900) the power was in the hands of the Bagratuni, but the town was reconquered by the Sâdjids [q.v.] and belonged henceforth to the domain of their vassal the amir of Goltam (Ordubad [q.v.]); cf. Markwart, Südarmenien, Vienna 1930, preface, 79, 93, 99-101, 115, text, 300, 362, 567. It figures in the war of the Daylam period (Ibn Miskawayh, ii, 148) and in the events of the Sâdjids period (cf. Ibn al-Athîr, under 514/1120).

Nakhciwan, lying on the Yerevan-Baku railway and now an industrial centre of some significance, had in 1970 a population of 33,000, whilst the republic of the same name depends largely on irrigated agriculture and stock-raising, with some mining, and in 1970 had a population of 202,000, mostly Muslim and Azeri Turkish-speaking.

The town Nakhciwan on the Don in the present-day Russian Federation is the settlement of Armenian colonists founded in 1780 on the Don and is at the present day a suburb of Rostov.

Bibliography: J. Morier, A second journey, 1818, 312; Ker Porter, Travels, 1821, i, 210; Ouseley, Travels, 1823, iv, 436 and pl. lxvi; Frœhner, Über zwei Inschriften von Nachtschewan, in Bull. scientifique de l'Acad. Imperiale, ii (1837), 14-16; Dubois, De Montperreux, Bull, scientifique de l'Acad. Imperiale, ii (1837), 14-16; Dubois, De Montperreux, Voyage au Caucase, 1840, iv, 7-20, and Atlas, 3rd series, pl. 20; E.A. Herrmann, Der ehemals zu Persien gehörende Theil Gross-Armeniens, 24; Engelhardt, Nakhciwan, Kaukaszi kalender 1882.
This attractive tree with dioecious flowers is probably one of the first to be known and exploited by mankind in the hot and arid zones of Africa and the Orient. The important role which has always been played by the date palms and their fruits [see TAMR] in the diet of sedentary and nomadic populations of these zones is attested, in Arabic, by the rich terminology devoted to them. Regarding the tree itself, each element of its structure is defined by one or several terms which, for the most part, have been retained in the local dialects.

After germination of the stone of the date (nawz) or tuber (akshab, pl. ikhbab) there emerges from the sand a turion (fasla, idli, wadaya; Tamabak, altem) which can be transplanted. The young cultivated plants (aght) are arranged in rows to form and orchard (sour, hášgh). When the stem of each (dghd) has a firm central stem known as k̄sid (Tam., tegeleft, teskent) and, above the height of a man, it is called nakhla, then ʿaydina. When, after five to six years, it has attained its final height, which can be between 15 and 20 m., it becomes the básika or ṣawwana if it is a single isolated tree. The date palm planted beside water is called k̄awra or mukra. If it leans excessively and is in danger of being uprooted, it needs propping up and, when supported, it becomes raghbāh. In old age, the tree to give birth to her child and the latter having arrived, she laments, driven to despair by her desolation and loneliness; but the God-child, placed at the foot of the tree, is immediately able to speak and advises his mother to shake the tree; succulent dates fall from it in profusion, while a spring of fresh and limpid water springs up from the trunk of the tree. Refreshed and nourished, the Virgin takes heart and, strengthened by divine support, she rejoins her kinsfolk with her child.

Besides dates, the date palm provides other useful products. In dietary terms, the pith of the young trunk or palmite (k̄awra, dádbab, sidhba, djummar) is white and of starchy consistency, resembles cheese and is a slender stuff much appreciated by gourmets. Similarly, when boiled, the outer bounds or "palm-cabbage" taste rather like artichoke. The sap rising in the trunk may be extracted, providing the drink known as "palm-wine" (dghmî); it is obtained either by pollarding the tree and surrounding the cut section with a receptacle which fills rapidly, or by slashing the stem vertically, and collecting the secretions in a manner similar to the procedure used for the extraction of rubber. This very sweet and refreshing liquid has the disadvantage of fermenting quite quickly, becoming charged with alcohol which renders it intoxicating; as such, Muslims must abstain from consuming it. In the field of craftsmanship, the dried folioles of the trunk may be extracted, providing the drink (sali, pl. siila, salu, afila) and small baskets for dates (dawdkhil) or dates for dates (dawdshal, pl. dawdsghal).

The ligneous fibres (k̄awlh, latif) of the trunk are very durable and provide the material for stout cables and ropes much used by fishing fleets and coastal trading vessel; after carding, this fibre provides excellent packing material (disar) for the caulking of ships and the stuffing (ḥâsī) of mattresses and cushions, especially those of pack-saddles and stools. Finally, for the carpeter ( Kı̄wī̄s), the large trunks, well dried and squared, constitute the base material for building work in the form of girders, rafters and pillars.

For the desert populations, the palmiers (hâs̄̄k al-nakhla) have always been centres of sedentarisation and...
NAKHL — NAKHLA
civilisation. In Biblical times the date palm was quite
abundant in Palestine, and Phoenicia or "land of
dams" owes to it its name, from the Greek φωξ.
Theophrastus and Pliny agree in attesting the abun-
dance of date palms in Judea, and this is confirmed
by other historians, Strabo, Pausanias, Tacitus and
Aulus Gallus. These testimonies explain the
representation of the date palm on the Roman and
Hebrew coinage struck in this country, as a symbol of
prosperity. It is thus that the city of Jericho was
known as the "city of palms", and Strabo described
its rich palmyra with admiration. Similar evidence is
to be found in accounts of pilgrimage to the Holy
Land, in various periods, until the 17th century. The
enclosed valley of the Jordan and the region of the
Dead Sea also enjoyed this source of nourishment, as
did the outskirts of Jerusalem, Samaria and Galilee.
According to the remants of Egyptian and Assyrian
monumental decorations, it may be asserted that the
date palm was to be found in abundance from the Nile
to the Euphrates. Solomon had built the city of Tadmur
(Palmyra) "city of palms" between Damascus and the
Euphrates; it was destroyed by the Emperor
Aurelian in 273 A.D. For their part, Muslim
geographers and travellers of the Middle Ages have
not neglected to account in their accounts the great
palmeries and oases [see WADI] from the Maghrib to
Irák and Persia. It is necessary only to follow Ibn
Battítar, who, in the 8th/14th century, travelled
throughout the Muslim world, from Morocco to the
Indies, to have, by means of his valuable Rihla, a vir-
tually exhaustive list of the great palmeries of the
period, most of which still exist today. In particular,
he notes the comparable excellence of the accounts of
Basra and that of Sidjílama and Iwalaten, in
southern Morocco. At the present, the renown of the
palmery of Nakhla, that of al-Ma'nsurí, and the Doum palm
(Phyphae coccifera or thebaica). On rare occasions, al-Mas'uí
used the expression nakhl al-ar 'zíjí for the Doum coconut
(Murajjiñ, §§ 269, 368, 872); the Doum palm is called dáh, khásíf, khazám, wakl.
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NAKHLA, the name of two valleys on the way
from Mecca to al-Tá'if, distinguished as Sha'á-miyyá
(Syrian, northern) and Yamáníya (Yemenite, southern).
The name is presumably due to an abun-
dance of palms (nakhí) in the valleys. On a height in
Syrian Nakhíla there was an idol of al-Uzáz which
was specially venerated by Quraych and Banu
Karásh. Some regarded the circumambulation of
al-Uzáz as an essential for the completion of the hajj,
to the Kaba. Three Samura trees were closely
associated with the deity. After the conquest of Mecca,
Muhammad sent Khá'id b. al-Wádí to cut down the
trees and destroy the idol. At another point in
Nakhíla there was an idol of Suwá'. On his way back
from al-Tá'if shortly before the Hijra, Muhammad
halted at Nakhíla, and the incident recorded in the
Kur'an (LXXII, 1, 2; XLV, 29-32), when djinn
came believers, is said to have occurred. Nakhíla
is best known as the goal of an expedition in 2 A.H. led
by 'Abd Allah b. Djabah. This was the first occasion
on which a Muslim killed a pagan and the Muslims
entered a Meccan caravan. The Muslims violated
the sacred month of Radjab, but this was condoned by
a revelation (II, 217). After the battle of Hunayn,
Muhammad passed through Nakhíla al-Yamáníya,
and a mosque was built there.
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Wellhausen, Reste arabischen Heidentums, Berlin 1897, 18, 34-45; W.M. Watt, Muhammad at Medina, Oxford 1956, 5-10, 69. (W. Montgomery Watt)

Nakhshabi, a town in the district of Bukharä, also called Nasaf by the Arab geographers (cf. the similar evolution of Naghawa from Nakhchivan). The town lay in the valley of the Khaška-Djar, cf. Ibn Hawkal, 460, tr. Kramer and Wieseler, 444; Khaša-rudh, which runs southwards parallel to the Zarafšan (river of Samarkand) and runs towards the Amu-Darya (q.v.) but before joining it disappears in the sands. Nakhshabi lay on the road joining Bukharä to Balkh four days’ journey from the former and eight from the latter (cf. al-Mukaddalst, 344). In the time of al-Isçašhi (325) the town consisted only of a suburb (rabub) and a ruined citadel (kuhandizi). The river ran through the centre of the town (Ibn Hawkal, 502, tr. 481).

The Mongols from the time of Chingiz-Khan (1220) used the region of Nakhshabi for their summer encampments. The Çaghatayids Kebek (1318-26) and Қазан (killed in 1347) had palaces built there, as a result of which the whole district was called Karšh ("park" = Pers.). Kadir Khan was an excellent poet (cf. above). All the works of Nakhshabi are embellished with kitâbs scattered through them, which show that he was also an excellent poet.

The river ran through the middle of the town (Ibn Hawkal, 502, tr. 481). The ruins of Kal-karšh were studied on the spot by L.A. Zimin, who formulated his conclusions as follows: 1. The ruins of the ancient Nakhshabi are around the hill of Shulluk-tepe (cf. Mahdi Khan, Ta’dhî-b-nadîr, on the events of 1149/1730-7) which marks the site of the old citadel, already in ruins in the 10th century. 2. As a result of the erection of the Mongol palaces somewhere to the south of the river, the town begins to shift southwards, and at the end of the 14th century, when Timur built a citadel there, it must have occupied in part the site of the modern Karšh. 3. The remains of this citadel (which Shâhvânî Khan and 4 Abd Allah Khan besieged in vain) should be sought near the ruins of Kala-yi Zahâk-i-Marân (about 2 miles southwest of Karšh).

The problem of identifying the ruins in the district of Karšh was studied on the spot by L. A. Zimin, who formulated his conclusions as follows: 1. The ruins of the ancient Nakhshabi are around the hill of Shulluk-tepe (cf. Mahdi Khan, Ta’dhî-b-nadîr, on the events of 1149/1730-7) which marks the site of the old citadel, already in ruins in the 10th century. 2. As a result of the erection of the Mongol palaces somewhere to the south of the river, the town begins to shift southwards, and at the end of the 14th century, when Timur built a citadel there, it must have occupied in part the site of the modern Karšh. 3. The remains of this citadel (which Shâhvânî Khan and 4 Abd Allah Khan besieged in vain) should be sought near the ruins of Kala-yi Zahâk-i-Marân (about 2 miles southwest of Karšh).

Bibliography: Le Strange, Lands, 470-1; Barthold, Turkestans down to the Mongol invasion, 134-42 (mentions about 60 villages dependent on Nakhshabi); idem, K istorii oronjên Timurâns, Turkestan, Petersburg 1912, 126 (valley of the Khaška); L. Zimin, Nakhshabi, Nasaf, Karshi, in Yed al-djumân (Festschrift for V. Barthold), Tashkent 1927, 197-214. On a pseudo-local history, see R. N. Frye, City chronicles of Central Asia and Khorasan: a history of Nasaf?, in 60. dogman yun maneshteye Fuad K披rîlis ar-îman, Bâgrad, 1953, 165-8. (V. Minorsky)

Nakhshabi, Šahyuk Dîyâ al-Dîn (d. 751/1350), a famous Persian author (not to be confounded with the famous Šufi Šahyuk Abû Turâsh Nakhshabi, d. 245/860). Very little is known of his career. His nishâ suggests that he came from Nakhshabi (q.v.), but he went to India where he became a murid of Šahyuk Farid, a descendant of the celebrated Šahyuk Hamid al-Dîn Nâşûri. The Äkḫer al-ṭâbiyir of Abd al-Hâkîm Dîlîwâlî (Dîlî 1309/1891-2, 104-7) says that he died in Bâdâ-în after a long and contemplative life and that his tomb is there. Nakhshabi was a prolific writer who used his knowledge of Indian languages to translate Indian books into Persian. His best known work is the Türi-nâmâ ("Book of the Parrot"), very popular in India and Central Asia, based on the Sanskrit Cakasaptati (partly translated into Greek by D. Galanos, Athens 1851). In the preface to this book, Nakhshabi tells us that one of his patrons was a descendant of the Emperor Akbar, Abu 'l-Fâdîl b. Mûbarâk rewrote the book in a simplified version (Rieu, 753b). This version, however, was completely supplanted by Muhammad Kâdîrî (11th/17th century) who reduced it to 35 chapters. A Teutonic version of this work of 1149/1736-7 was published by V. Zhukovski (St. Petersburg 1901). Nakhshabi’s work was known in Europe as early as 1792, when M. Gerrans published a free English translation of 12 nights. Kâdîrî’s version was translated into German by C. I. L. Iken (Stuttgart 1822), this edition contains an essay on Nakhshabi and specimens of his Türi-nâmâ by Koegarten. The Turkish version was translated into German by L. Rosen (Leipzig 1838). So far, no complete translation of the original work of Nakhshabi has been published, although there is a French translation in ms. in Munich. E. Berthels has translated the book into Russian, but this version is also still in manuscript. The eight night was published in original text and German translation by H. Brockhaus (Leipzig 1843, and in Blatter für literarische Unterhaltung, 1843, nos. 242, 243, pp. 969 ff.). Nakhshabi’s other works never attained anything like the popularity of the Türi-nâmâ but have almost all come down to us. Among them are: Gâbirî’s "Scattered roses", a tale dealing with the loves of Mašûm-shâh and Nâšûri (printed by Agha Muhammad Kâdîm Shâhri and K. F. Azoe, Calcutta 1892, in Bibl. Ind.). Dâvîya u kalîfîya ("Paradise and generals") also called Cîl nâmâs (Rieu, 740a), an allegory which deals with the descriptions of the various parts of the human body considered as the noblest work of God and as proof of His greatness; Lâdîhât al-niâd?, a Persian version of the Koka-sâtra, an Indian work on different temperaments and sexual intercourse; Sîk al-sulât, a collection of sayings of celebrated mystics (lith. Dîhî 1895), and Nasafî u mawârî, a brief treatise of a Sufi nature (Rieu, 738b). His treatise Äkhâra mubâkhâra is only known from its mention in the Äkḫer al-ṭâbiyir (see above). All the prose works of Nakhshabi are embelished with kifâs scattered through them, which show that he was also an excellent poet.
NAKIB AL-ASHRAF (A.), "the marshal of the nobility (i.e., the descendants of Muhammad's family, ah! al-bayr [q.v.])". Nakib is derived from the root n-b-b, meaning "to bore, to pierce", then also "to investigate, to verify, to examine". Thus nakib is the person who verifies something with regard to its correctness; following from this, nakib is an expert (n-air) in his business, acting as trustee (amin) and protector (kafil) (cf. L.A., s.v. n-b-b).

Although the term aghraf (one of the plurals of sharif [q.v.]) originates from pre-Islamic times when, among the Arab tribes, it meant those free men who could claim an eminent position (sharif) because of their pure descent (hasab) from Muhammad, it seems to have given superiority by either birth or acquired merit (hasab) to its possessors (see hasab wa-nasab), nakib al-aghrf is an Islamic creation. The historical development of the nakib and his office (miyab) has so far not found appropriate attention by scholars. There is no work exclusively focusing on nakib al-aghrf throughout the different regions and periods in Islamic history.

In the central Islamic lands thus became normative, for the historians (e.g. al-Tabarî, ii, 1358) speak of the 'Abbâsids, then living at al-Humayma [q.v.] in southern Jordan, in 100/718-19 nominating 12 nakabâ to further their interests in Khurâsân. This is dubious, but it does seem that the idea surfaced 30 years later when Abû Muslim [q.v.] was organising revolutionary propaganda in the Marw oasis. The Aabâsids (after the re-division of the 3rd/9th century) enumerate 12 nakabâ or representatives, 7 genuine Arabs and 5 mawdâl, and including figures who later were prominent in the wars of the Revolution or in early Aabâsid history, such as Ālîtâ b. Shâbib [q.v.], Tahtâ b. RuyaA and Sulaymân b. Kâthîr (ed. A.A. al-Duri and A.D. al-Mutâlî, Beirut 1971, 216). Outside this nucleus, the sources mention a further 18 regional nakabâ, equal in status to the Marw ones, and a wider body of up to 70 persons who operated also in other towns of Khurâsân (see M. Sharon, Black banners from the East. The establishment of the Aabâsid state—incubation of a revolt, Jerusalem 1983, 189, 192 ff.).
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the 4th/10th century, all members of the ashrāf, both Abbasid and Talibid-cAlid, were known, at least as far as they are stated in the law books by al-Mawardi and Abu Ya'la b. al-Farrāʾ (3rd/11th century). According to them, the duties of the nakib comprised genealogical, material and moral matters, the latter partly overlapping with the realm of the judge (kādiʾ [q.v.]). The nakib had to keep a register of nobility, to enter births and deaths in it and to exclude false claimants from intrusion into the corps of ashrāf. He had also to prevent the women of noble blood (sharjas) from marrying men not their equals in nobility. The nakib was enjoined to urge the faithful (al-muṣliḥīn) in particular, on the state financial claims of the state treasury concerning their pensions. Further to this, he had to watch over the proper administration of endowments (awṣaf) established for the ashrāf. With regard to morality, the nakib was liable to control the behaviour of the ashrāf, to restrain them from excess and to admonish them to avoid anything detrimental to their prestige.

For the jurists, there were two types of the post of nakib, the special position (al-nikba al-khusṣa) and the general one (al-nikba al-šimma). Perhaps this division was only theoretical, but it pointed to the different quality of functions attributed to the nakib. Within the general nikba fell considerable judicial powers, including the execution of Kurʾānic punishments (ḥudūd, pl. of hadd [q.v.] and the judgement of litigations between ashrāf (al-Mawardi, K. al-Ahkām al-sulṭaniyya, ed. M. Enger, Bonn 1883, ed. Cairo 1960, ch. 8; French tr. E. Fagnan, Algiers 1915, 199-207; Abu Yaʿla b. al-Farrāʾ, K. al-Ahkām al-sulṭaniyya, Cairo 1938, ch. 5 [both texts correspond with each other]; see also E. Tyan, Histoire de l’organisation judiciaire en pays d’Islam, 2nd ed., Leiden 1960, 554-8). The close relation between the (general) nikba and the judge became also apparent in terms of organisation: comparable to the chief judge there was a chief nikba (cf. L. Massignon, Cadis et nagibs bagdadis, in WZKM, li [1948], 106-15).

For the post-Abbasid periods, the history of the nikba is even worse investigated, with the exception of 16th century Aleppo and of Egypt under Ottoman rule. In Aleppo, by 1566, the ashrāf and the nakib of the Ottoman provincial government and the troops of the Janissaries (H.L. Bodman, Jr., op. cit. 86 ff., 103 ff.)

For the post-Abbasid period, the history of the nikba is even worse investigated, with the exception of 16th century Aleppo and of Egypt under Ottoman rule. In Aleppo, by 1566, the ashrāf and the nakib of the Ottoman provincial government and the troops of the Janissaries (H.L. Bodman, Jr., op. cit. 86 ff., 103 ff.)

In Egypt, the nakib al-ashrāf rose from a relatively low position at the end of Mamluk and the beginning of the Ottoman period to become an influential functionary in the 18th and early 19th centuries. Yet, from the time of Muhammad ʿAlī [q.v. onwards, the nakib was curtailed again, to become further reduced to a mere honorific in the present century (M. Winter, The Ashrāf and Niqāḥat al-Ashrāf in Egypt in Ottoman and modern times, in Asian and African Studies, xix [1965], 17-41; for the Ottoman period, see also H. R. Gibb and H. Bowen, Islamic society and the West, 2, London 1957, 95-4, 100 ff., and esp. for Damascus, see Linda Schatkowski Schilcher, Families in politics. Damascene families and estates of the 18th and 19th centuries, Stuttgart 1963, 124 ff., 194 ff.).

Bibliography: In addition to references in the article, see for other regions and periods: H. Horst, Die Staatsverwaltung der Grossfliegen und Hörnorrhäst (1038-1231), Wiesbaden 1964, 98; Camb. hist. Iran, v. ed. J. A. Boyle, Cambridge 1968, 276 (Saljūq period), 543 (Mongol period); H. Halm, op. cit., 75 (on the Saljūqīs), 83 (on the Mongols); R. Strothmann, Die Zuluf-Scha. Zwei religionsgeschichtliche Charakterbilder aus der Mongolezeit, Leipzig 1926, 88 ff.; B. Spuler, Die Mongolen in Iran, Berlin 1968, 224; H. R. Roemer, Staatsgeschichte der Tirmurdynasten, Wiesbaden 1952, 149; concerning Persia, where the oracle of al-ashrāf obviously disappeared during the Safawīs’ rule but emerged again under the later Qādis, alongside another functionary also called nakib in and charge of the guilds, the dervishes and other vaigrant groups, see M. Keyvani, Artisans and guild life in the later Safawī period, Berlin 1982, 67-8, 101 ff.; F. Meier and R. Gramlich, Drei moderne Texte zum persischen Wettorden, in ZDMG, cxiv (1964), esp. 312 ff., 319 ff., with a comment by W. M. Floor, in ZDMG, cxxiii (1973), 79-81; (A. Havemann)

2. In Muslim India. See hind. ii. Ethnography, and nakb. 2. In India. NAKIDA [see NAKIDP]. NAKIR [see MUNKAR WA-NAKIR]. NAKIR [see MUNKAR]. NAKKARA-KHANA, NAKARA-KHANA (p.), kind of military band. The origins of the nakkara-khana (q.v.), also called the nakkara or kettle-drum band, which was one of the instruments of the military band belonging to rulers and military leaders, are obscure. There are references to it from an early period when it appears to have been synonymous with the tabl-khana [q.v.]. Originally, its purpose was probably military and it retained this function in the Persian army until modern times. It also had ceremonial functions and these tended in the course of time to overshadow its military aspect. It was part of the ceremonial of the caliph and in the early centuries reserved for him alone. It was composed of various instruments, kettledrums, horns, trumpets and reed pipes, and played five times a day at the times of prayer at the caliph’s residence [see NAWBA], hence the expression nakkara-i sahari (or nakkara-i takbī, the nakkara played at the time of the dawn prayers, which is frequently found in later Persian texts. The nakkara-khana also played on special occasions such as when news was received of a military victory or at other times of public rejoicing, hence the expression nakkara-yi shāhāni and nakkara-yi shadjāni (shadjānyān), also met with in Persian texts. In 967/1559-60 Shāh Tahmāsp ordered the nakkara-yi shadjāni to be played for three days when Georgia was granted to Isā Khān, who had been converted to Islam (Kādī Ahmad Kumī, Khuldsat al-tawdrikh, ed. Isān Iṣrāʾīlī, Tehran AHS 1359/1980-I, i, 412). Sometimes the nakkara might be suspected as a sign of mourning [see TĀR-KĀNA].

When the caliphate began to fragment, governors and semi-independent rulers were granted, or arrogated to themselves, the right to the nakkara and had their own nakkara-khana. In 368/978-9 the caliph-ΤAFĪ gave the Buṭūd Aḥd al-Dawla the right to three nakhwas, to be played at the time of the morning, midday and evening prayers. The Ghaznavid historian Abu ʿl-Fadl Bayḥaki does not apparently mention the nakkara-khana, though musicians were...
associated with the royal court and played on special occasions such as receptions for envoys and friendly rulers (cf. Spuler, Iran, 270). The Saljuk sultans marked their sovereignty by exercising the privilege of the nakhoda and granted this also to subordinate rulers and governors, as had the caliphs. Both the caliph and the sultan might, and sometimes did, refuse the nakhoda to those to whom it was refused. The right to play drums was occasionally granted to officials of the bureaucracy, who, so far as they had private armies, presumably also had military bands. In 427/1035-6 the Ghaznavid Masi'd b. Mahmud gave various honors to his chamberlain Badih-i Shabhazi when he appointed him Badih-i buzurg, or chief minister, including the right to drums (tabl uwa dhul). (Abu '1-Fadl Bayhaqi, Tarih-i Mas'ud, ed. Ali Akbar Fayyad, Majhad, AHS 1350/1971, 427). In a draft document for the appointment of a nakhoda in the Dastur al-aman by Muhammad b. Hindushah Nakhdjiwani, (Bish'14th century) the recipient is granted various insignia, including the right to drums (tabl), a standard (alam) and the nakhoda (ed. A.A. Alizade, ii, Moscow 1976, 76).

The Ilghans and their followers, like preceding rulers, had military bands. Ibn Batutta, describing the ceremonial observed by the military forces of Abu Sa'id (d. 756/1355), states that each of his amirs had trumpets and standards. When Abu Sa'id mounted, drums, trumpets and pipes were sounded for his departure. His chief wife and the other amirs stationed on the north side of the citadel played from a balcony above the Kaysariyya, the town. It was also played on festivals and when a princess or in some high tower. Kadi Ahmad Kuml, op. cit., 90). The playing of military music whenever the ruler set out was probably normal practice. Muf'in al-Din ZamcT Isfizari states that "it had always been the custom that when Shahrukh Kazim Imam, Tehran AHS 1339/1960-1, ii, 85). A.V. Williams Jackson states that some ruins on a high ridge about two miles distant from Hamadan were called the nakhoda-khona (Persia past and present, New York 1906, 173).

Each provincial leader who aspired to independence or semi-independence probably had a nakhoda-khona in his residence. In this capacity of ruling by enemies signalled defeat. When Shah 'Abbás marched on Kazwin in 995/1587 to assert his sovereignty, the opposing army having scattered, the employees of the nakhoda-khona took their instruments into the city and sounded them in the name of Shahr 'Abbás. (Iskandar Beg, Tarih-i 'ulamadr-yi 'abbâs, Tehran AHS 1319/1956, i, 370). Provincial rulers under the Safawids received, as they had in former times, or arrogated to themselves, the right to the nakhoda. When the ruler of Diyar Bakr came with his followers to Ismâ'il in 910/1504-5, he had with him his standards and nakhoda (Kâdi Ahmad Kumi, op. cit., i, 90). Humâyün, the Great Mughal, when he took refuge with Shah Mas'ud in Kazwin, was given various gifts, including drums, standards and the equipment for a nakhoda-khona. Shah Mas'ud also gave a standard and a nakhoda to Bayram Khân, one of Humâyün's followers. (Iskandar Beg, op. cit., i, 99). It would appear that different contingents of the Safavid army each had, as in the Ilghânid army, a military band. When Shah Mas'ud reviewed the army in 936/1529-30, he ordered all the nakhoda-khonas which were at the royal camp to play and to lead the various contingents in the review (Kâdi Ahmad Kumi, op. cit., i, 198). Shortly after the accession of Shâh Safi in 1038/1629 there was an abortive rebellion in Gilân, headed by Kâlidjâr Sultân, whose followers gave him the tabâk 'Adî Shâh and played the nakhoda in his name. (Abd al-Fattâh Fûmîni Gilânî, Tarih-i Gilânî, ed. M. Sotoodeh, Tehran AHS 1349/1970, 262 ff.).

Chardin, describing the coronation of Shah Shâh Si (Sulaymân) in 1077/1668 states that the nakhoda was played from two balconies on the top of the Kaysariyya in Isfâhan. It sounded, he wrote, "more like the noise of war than musick" and lasted twenty days and nights without interruption (The coronation of Solymans III, 51, published with Travels of St. John Chardin into Persia and ye East Indies, London 1686). Thévenot, who was in Isfâhan in 1664-5, states that the nakhoda was played at sunset and midnight from balconies or galleries over the gate of the bazaar on the north side of the maydân (Travels of M. de Thévenot into the Levant, London 1687, ii, 79). Tavernier, who visited Persia several times between 1632 and 1668, states that the nakhoda-khona played at midnight, sunrise and sunset for a quarter of an hour in all towns where the ruler resided and in those which had khans as governors. It was played from an elevated place in the town so that the noise could be heard throughout the town. It was also played on festivals and when a new governor was appointed (Voyages en Perse, repr. Geneva 1970, 287-8). Both Tavernier and Du Mans allege that the nakhoda-khona would send one or two or more of their number, according to the status of the persons involved, to play at the door of a house where the birth of a boy had taken place and did not cease to play until they received their due (Estat de la Perse en 1660, Paris 1890, 123). Kaempfer, who was in Persia in the reign of Shâh Sulaymân, states that the nakhoda was played daily at sunset and two hours before sunrise. It was also played when the new moon appeared, on religious holidays and at royal banquets. There were in all some forty drummers, pipers and other musicians (Im Hufe des persischen Orients: 1684-1685, German tr. W. Hinz, Tübingen-Basel 1977, 157).
Although the nakkāra-khana was still one of the essential insignia of rule, it was by the 10th/16th century increasingly associated with less formal aspects of court life and with singers and dancers. This is indicated by a diploma for the nakkāraši Ustād Muhammed contained in the Ṣafarī-nāma of 'Abd Allāh Marvārdī, muḥāṣibī and later sād at the court of Husayn Baykara (d. 922/1516), who became keeper of the great seal in 1501 (text in facsimile with introduction, commentary and bibliography by H. Rostovtzeff, Wiesbaden 1952). The document states that Ustād Muhammed was to hold office as the head of the nakkāra-khana jointly with a certain ʿImād al-Dīn Maḥmūd, who was the leader (mukaddam) of the headmen (kaftānšāhī) of the naubātānīy of the court. The pipers, trumpeters and other musicians were to consider themselves his (kalāntār). Various groups or corporations were also placed under him, including story-tellers (kawwālān), bathkeepers (ham-māmāyīn), barbers (dalālān) and others (Doc. no. 15 and see Roemer’s commentary, 174-5).

According to the Tadhkīrāt al-mulūk, the nakkāra-khana seems to have been united with the maḥāl al-khāna, the palace lighting department. The accessories of the band were kept in that department (facs., text ed. V. Minorsky, London 1943, ff. 51b-52a). The Dastūr al-mulk-i Ṣafarī of Mirzā Raṭfī, half-nephew of Rida Shah, states that in Ramāḍān the chief astrologer (munaẓẓam-bābī) and other astrologers would go to the nakkāra-khana on those nights when the shah declared that the nakkāra-yi sahar should be sounded and at their indication the nakkāra-khāna would play (Dastūr al-mulūk-i Ṣafarī, ed. Muhammed Ṭakī Dānishpūghūrī, Tehran University, Révol de la faculte des lettres et des sciences humaines 1968, 310). There was also at the Šaafavī court a master of musicians (talīdīgī bāgī). He was in charge of musicians and dancing-girls attached to the court and was under the maḥāl al-khāna (Dāmans, op. cit., 24, Kaemper, op. cit., 87). Under Shāh Tahmāsp the role of the aḥ-ī tarāb was played down. He dismissed a number of them, retaining only a certain Ustād Ḫusayn Ṣūstārī and Ustād Asad, who was the head (kalāntār) of the royal nakkāra-khāna. Towards the end of his life, he also turned out some more musicians from the royal court, imprisoned Ustād Ḫusayn several times and finally made him swear that he would only play the surūn in the royal nakkāra-khāna (and not in musical assemblies) (Ṭūrīkh-i ʿalāmarā-yi ṣabbāsī, i, 190). However, the restrictions on the nakkāra-khāna and its associated musicians were temporary. The Dastūr al-mulūk states that the talīdīgī bāgī was head of the aḥ-ī tarāb. It was his duty to ensure that a number of musicians were always at the royal court whether the Shah was in residence at the capital or on an expedition (xvi/5 [1969], 559). Although special groups of singers and dancers were attached to the court, there were many other groups of entertainers who were attached only loosely, if at all, but who, on occasional occasions, joined in celebrations. This was also the case in the 19th century. Muḥammad Ibrāhīm Taḥwīldār, writing in 1877, includes among the various classes of the population of Isfāhān the aḥ-ī tarāb and the employees of the nakkāra-khāna (Ḍīvānīfāsī-yi Isfahān, ed. M. Sootodeh, Isfahān AHS 1342/1962-3, 126). The latter presumably received payment from the governor.

In the 19th century the nakkāra-khāna continued to have a ceremonial role. It was one of the royal offices (buṣūyūt-i salānaqī) (ʿAbd Allāh Mustawfī, Shahr-i zindgānī-i man, Tehran AHS 1324/1945-6, i, 39, 562). According to E. Aubin, the ihtishām-i ḫāṭeṭūt nominated the head of the nakkāra-khāna in the provin-cial towns. In Tehran the nakkāra-khāna consisted of about one hundred musicians and a dozen or so dancers. Their annual cost to the state was 6,000 tumāns. The head of the nakkāra-khāna in Tehran, Kāsīm Khān Bābī, whose father had held the office before him, also presided over the corporation of dancers and musicians (La Perse d’aujourd’hui, Paris 1908, 230-1).

After the grant of the constitution there was an attempt to stop the nakkāra-khāna on the grounds that it was old-fashioned or obsolete and the wages of the nakkāra-khāna were withheld. However, they were not underderted and continued their daily celebrations without pay, until some months later the payment of their wages was resumed (Mustawfī, op. cit. i, 563). When Rīdī Shāh seized power, he took possession of the nakkāra-khāna to mark his sovereignty and removed it from the gate of the citadel to the Māydān-i Maḥākh, where it remained (ibid., 563-4). The custom of playing the nakkāra-khāna survived in Tehran, Kāzwīn and Yazd until the late 1930s. In Maḥghād there had formerly been two nakkāra-khānas, one of which played in the name of the contemporary ruler and the other, attached to the shrine of the Imām Rīdī, played in the Imām’s name. The nakkāra-khāna of the shrine was abolished in AHS 1315/1936-7. In Tehran in 1937 the nakkāra-khāna still played daily in the name of the Imām. In 1955 at the south end of the Māydān-i Maḥākh and at sahar in Maḥ南昌 at some time after the grant of the constitution the nakkāra-khāna, which then numbered some one hundred people, broke away from the aḥ-ī tarāb. It had a strong hereditary tendency and a corporate organisation. It appointed its own ḫāṭeṭūt, to whom a small contribution was paid in return for which he settled disputes between the members of the corporation. Gradually the nakkāra-khāna dwindled in numbers. By AHS 1314/1935-6 it had only fourteen members. In the following year its numbers decreased to nine owing to the death of five persons. The government, wishing, no doubt, to bring what they regarded as an old-fashioned custom to an end, refused to allow them to increase their number. At that time each member of the nakkāra-khāna had to hold a government licence. Each received a small wage and two suits of clothes annually from the ihtishām-i ḫāṭeṭūt, who was no longer a member of the court but now belonged the Ministry of the Interior. The nakkāra-khāna in Kāzwīn consisted of only two persons in 1937 and came under the municipal authority. Formerly its members had received a small wage from the governor. The members of the nakkāra-khāna of the shrine of the Imām Rīdī in Maḥghād, prior to its dissolution, were paid a nominal wage in cash and kind by the shrine.

art. Nagdra, in The New Grove dictionary of musical instruments. See also MARASIM. 3. In ... of the Arabs, in Middle East Studies Association Bulletin, xvi/1 (July 1982), 12-13; M.A. al-Khozai, modern playwriting in Arabic. A Maronite, al-
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too, was almost exclusively male, as attested by David
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The five-act al-Bakilli was inspired by Mollière's
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Beirut and the names of the dramatis personae Arabicised—up to the inevitable concluding moral:

"Let every miser learn his lesson!" Most of this

comedy was written in literary Arabic, in verse and

sadif, except for the vernacular which better suited the roles of several characters. These features, too, served as models for many playwrights in Arabic. In the three-act al-Hasan al-mughaffal, perhaps the first original full-length play in Arabic, al-Nakksh was inspired by one of the tales in Alfi layla wa-leyla which recounts the story of a caliph-for-a-day. He developed the plot more intricately, in sadig and prose, pre-
senting the naive character as a full-fledged one (see H. Ben Halima, in Arabica, xi [1964], 73-9). Finally, the three-act al-Salih al-hasad described the deeds and sentiments of an excessively jealous suitor whose beloved had been promised to someone else by her father. The play, in prose and verse, displays some inspiration from Mollière (chiefly from Le Misanthrope and Le bourgeois gentilhomme), but the plot, locale and characters again maintain a Syrian-Lebanese flavour. Al-Nakkash's methods and style have since certainly been imitated and possibly surpassed, yet he remains renowned for having introduced new patterns into the Arabic theatre.

Bibliography: Märun al-Nakkash's three plays and some verses of his were first printed as Arzat Lubnân, Beirut 1869, 496 pp., with an introduction by his father al-Nâtik N. Ilyas Nakkash (see Bibl., below). They were reprinted almost a century later as Märun al-


NANKAŞ HASAN (PAŞA), Ottoman painter (d. 1031/1622).

Raised and educated in the Topkapı Sarayı, he is one of the few court painters whose names have been successfully attributed to specific manuscripts in 16th and early 17th century Ottoman ateliers. At the same time, his official political career is well documented. The first record of his career appears in a document from 989/1581, where he is identified as assigned to the kethüda of the Treasurer, ʻOTHMÂN AĞHA, in the Topkapı Sarayı. He appears in palace pay-ment records as NAKKÂŞ HASAN in 996/1588, 998/1590 and 1003/1594. By at least 1006/1597, Nakkâş Hasan is listed as ağha and again in 1012/1603 he is cited in gift and payment records as ikiyânı kapılışı başlı Nakkâş Hasan Ağha and again as Yeni Cerril Ağhası Nakkâş Hasan Ağha (Meriç, 56-7). He is said to have been made a ağha (Uzunçaşrılı, 569, and Tannd, Sıyer-i Nehr, 42). His death is recorded as 1031/1622 (Uzunçaşrılı, 569).

This record indicates that he was a product of the daşğirmen [q.e.], since an education as a palace page was a common route to such positions (see C.G. Fisher and A. Fisher for more detailed description). He may be one of the rare cases where a student of the Calligrapher Talât Efendi, as indicated by his extensive analysis of the palace organisation, Uzunçaşrılı noted that such cultural activities as poetry, calligraphy, and music went on in the palace, but fails to mention any painting ateliers. Bobovi made no mention of such an atelier in his detailed description of the Topkapı Saraylı, although this former palace page provides much detail on virtually all rooms in the palace itself in the first three palace courtyards. Because of his exacting detail, the existence of the ateliers within the walls of the palace proper is doubt-ful (Fisher and Fisher, 1987, 118-20). Gülri Necipoğlu notes that to the left of the first courtyard were extensive artisan shops which seem to have been used by artists involved in the extensive palace repairs (Necipoğlu, 251-3). Finally, Ewliya Celebi describes the proliferation of guild workshops outside the palace walls that are used both by the palace officials and by the bourgeoisie of the town (Seyahat-nâme, i, 607-12).

The disbursement of the workshops has led several scholars to investigate or document the connections of painting ateliers with outlying Şifî teyêşer (Fisher, diss., 95-7) where manuscripts were commissioned by Murâd III and later transported to Topkapı Saraylı, or with provincial centres such as Bagdad, where manuscripts were made for such patrons as Şokollu Mehemed Paşa (Mistleite, 1984, 130-1, and Milstein, 1990) that may have supplemented the city guild ateliers.

NAKKASH-KHANA — NAKL


(CAROL G. FISHER)

NAKL (a.), transport.

1. In the central Islamic lands and North Africa.

See for this 'āraba; barīd; qāmūs in Suppl.; faras; fil; ilāt; kārwān; khan; mawāki; Milo; safina; tijāra.

2. In India.

Travel on foot is obviously such an everyday occurrence between village and village that it receives scant mention in the texts; pilgrimage might be made on foot entirely, for pietistic reasons, such as Akbar's to the tomb of Mu‘āhin al-Dīn Čiştī from Āgra to Adīmār, but generally foot-journeys are the accompaniment to a baggage-train. Ibn Baṭūta, on his journey into India, writes of selling the horses which drew the wagons, replacing them by camels; and his journey cannot have been without comfort, for 'everybody eats and sleeps in his waggon while it is actually on the move, and I had in my waggon three slayegis' (Ribāh, iii, 1, tr. Gibb, iii, 539).

Transport depending on foot includes the various litters, dōlt, miyānā and palki. The dōlt is a simple rectangular frame or bedstead, usually suspended by the four corners from a bamboo pole and carried by two or four men; when used by women there are usually curtains hanging from the bamboo. They were much used for the transport of sick persons, and in war to carry casualties off the battlefield. A form where the frame is supported on two poles is used as the bier (qāmūs) to transport a corpse to the burial-ground, and an upright chair may similarly be carried by four men to carry someone up a steep hillside. Simpler than the dōlt but equally portable, for 'everybody eats and sleeps in his waggon while it is actually on the move, and I had in my waggon three slayegis' (Ribāh, iii, 1, tr. Gibb, iii, 539) refers to dōlt-bearers plying for hire outside the gates of royal and other houses, and to the possibility of longer journeys being carried out by relays of dōlt-bearers. The palki 'palanquin', is an enclosed variety of litter, its central pole having an upward curve to afford more head-room for the passenger. In its common form it was in use for considerable journeys, relays of palanquin-bearers being provided at dāk-stations [see barītd]; Colonel Yule, one of the authors of Hobson-Jobson, undertook 'hardly less than 8,000 or 9,000 miles of travelling in going considerable distances' by such vehicles (Hobson-Jobson, 659b). A more elaborate form, with its carriage and pole covered with plates of silver, was in use in royal processions [see mawāki]. In Muslim India, and specimens of such are to be seen in Indian museums. A smaller form of palki, called simply miyānā 'middle-sized', was provided with side-curtains rather than the box enclosure. Runners of the postal service (dāk) carried not only the post but could also be used for the rapid transport of luscious fruit from Khurāsān, or to carry water from the Gangetic near the Indus to the sultan at Daulā바ād (Ibn Baṭūta, ii, 3-4).

The Indian armies and hunting camps were regularly supplied by the bandjānas, dealers rather than mere commissariat carriers, who travelled all over the country with large droves of laden cattle, who could of course move over rough country where carts were impracticable. All kinds of animal were used for pack-transport: horses, donkeys, mules, camels, cows, elephants, and even sheep. Donkeys regularly carried laundry for dhobās, earthenware goods for potters, and were slung with panniers of earth or gravel for the gangs of road-builders; pack-horses and mules carried equipment for the armies in the field (many illustrations in Mughal painting, e.g. in the Akbar-nāma), and were regularly used for transporting goods on packpaths. Merchandise from the north-west was brought to northern and even eastern India by the camel kāfīla, the northern two-humped camel being substituted by the one-humped at Peshāwar or Lahore. Cattle being driven over long distances were often required to carry panniers of goods (as by the bandjānas referred to above), and even sheep being driven into India from Tibet or Nepal might carry panniers of rock-salt or borax. Elephants, besides their use as carriers of heavy pieces of artillery, were continually employed to transport logs in forests or timber-yards. For the use of animals in the Indian armies, see ʿarrābī vi.

Riding animals were especially common and in use by all classes. Enormous numbers of horses were required by the army, for the cavalry was its backbone; horses were imported from the Arabian peninsula and from the north-west, besides being bred in the royal pāvyāns, under the care of an akārār-bek (see I.H. Qureshi, The administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, Karachi 1938, 70, with refs. especially to Diya al-Dīn Barānī and Şāhans al-Siīratā 'Aftī). Besides the regular cavalry, foot-soldiers were accompanied by led horses. The importance of horses in the court was signalled by the royal saddle-cover being recognised as one of the insignia of royalty [see qāshīya]. For the use of horses in processions, see mawāki. Special riding-camels were also known, employed especially in campaigns in the west in semi-desert territories. Elephants were also used in the armies for the transport of equipment, and were employed in India in the field by the Mughals. For instance, 'they build wooden castles on the elephants' backs which will hold three or four men with bows, arrows, arquebuses and other weapons...', the elephants were armoured with steel plates, examples of elephant armour being not uncommon in Indian museums. See also ʿīrt. Working and processional elephants carried men on a litter on the animals back, either a long platform from which the passengers' legs hang over each side, or a more elaborate boxed-in structure with flat cushions which afforded more protection during tiger and lion hunts, as exemplified in Mughal painting; both these types are known as hauāda. The seat on processional elephants has the hauāda covered by a canopy, often jewelled, and is known as ʿamārī.

The commonest Indian mode of transport of goods has always been the two-wheeled cart drawn by a pair of bullocks, whose design varies subtly between one region and the next but in any region is remarkably conservative (R.E. Mortimer Wheeler, Civilisations of the Indus Valley and beyond, London 1966, shows on pp. 46-7 illustrations of a terracotta model of a cart, 1300-1000 B.C., and its modern Sind counterpart, with little change); long convoys of bullock-carts, often moving at night, were a familiar features of Indian roads before the coming of motor transport. The bullock-cart provided with a domed canopy is the ratha, used
particularly by women on journeys—whose escorts may walk on foot beside them, cf. Kipling's description of the Sahiba's pilgrimage in *Kim*. The ratha may also be used in formal processions (see *MAWAKIB*, 5). Flat wheeled carts are also be drawn by horses, bullocks, buffaloes, camels and even by elephants (Firuz Shah's banners were so heavy that they had to be carried on elephant-carts). For light transport, specially within towns, small horse cartages (ekkā, tanga) were in general use (Tavernier's *Travels* describes such cartriages, although he does not use either word); they might also be used for longer journeys, when the horses could be changed in relays on the dāk-system. More elaborate carriages after European models were introduced at the end of the Mughal period, and in provincial courts such as Lucknow. Mention should also be made of the hand-cart, commonly used to transport goods in towns.

There was also the possibility of transport by water on the great rivers; the canals (see *NAHR*, 2. India) were for irrigation purposes, and were not navigable. The common river-boat was the bāagrā (see *Hobson-Jobson*, s.v. Budgerow), a sort of barge without a keel, sometimes of a great length and capacity. A sort of raft was used by Firuz Shah to transport his banners, which were for irrigation purposes, and were not navigable. There were also, of course, smaller craft without number on the rivers. Sea transport across the Arabian Sea, which flourished among Turkic speakers, and the Persian-speaking Khālid Ata, for a full twelve years.

The ethnic and linguistic differentiation between Turk and Tadjik was reflected, in 8th/14th century Transoxanian Sufism, in a dichotomy between the Yasawi order (a disciple of al-Din's immediate predecessors in the *silsila*), beginning with Khālid Ata, and the Khwājah order (founded by Khālid Ata), a successor of Hamadani. Its origins lie in the Tao of Sufism, which flourished almost everywhere. It seems certain that Khālid Ata is identical with Kutham Shaykh, a Yasawi master resident in Hindustan, before joining the following of a second Yasawi shaykh, Khwājal Ata, for a full twelve years. The chronological problems posed by the sources (works of hagiography, the Timurid chronicles, and the *Rīhā* of Ibn Baṭṭūta) are impossible to resolve, but it seems certain that Khwājal Ata is identical with Kudān/Ghazān Khān, a singularly ferocious individual who ruled over the Caghatayid khanate for roughly a decade. It is tempting to see in Khwājal Ata the origin of the subsequent several later Nakshbandis for establishing ascendancy over rulers, but such an interpretation is excluded by a careful reading of the sources.

After the overthrow of Khwājal Ata, Bahā al-Din retired to his birthplace to begin training his own disciples, most of whom came from Bukhārā and its environs. He left the region himself only three times, contemporary and near-contemporary sources make no mention of sayyid ancestry. They stress rather the position of Bahā al-Din, as the seventh in a series of Central Asian masters (kaḏvā-šahān) of Sufism, which was inaugurated by Abū Yusuf Hamadānī (d. 534/1140 in Marw). Soon after his birth in Muharram 718/1318 in the Buḥrān hamlet of Kašr-i Hinduwān (later renamed Kašr-i Ārīfān, out of deference to him), Bahā al-Din was adopted as the spiritual son (farānd) of Khwāja Muhammad Sāmān, the fifth descendant of Hamadānī. Samān immediately assigned the infant's future spiritual training to his own principal murādī, Khwāja Amir Kulāl. Kulāl counts as Bahā al-Din's immediate predecessor in the *silsila*, for it was he who transmitted to him the essentials of the Path: the link of companionship (nisbat-i ṣubḥār), instruction in the customs of the Path (ʿalām-i ṣubḥāt-i tarkā), and the incultation of dhikr (talkīn-i ḍikr) (Abd al-Rahmān Dāmī, *Nafshāt al-um*, 381).

Nonetheless, as befitted the founder of a new order, Bahā al-Din kept the company of a wide variety of spiritual instructors. Early during his association with Amir Kulāl, Bahā al-Din continued to comply with this command, but Amir Kulāl continued to hold him in high esteem. He ultimately pronounced five preceptors to be at an end and freed Bahā al-Din to seek out other shaykhīs, "both Turk and Tadjik".

The ethnic and linguistic differentiation between Turk and Tadjik was reflected, in 8th/14th century Transoxanian Sufism, in a dichotomy between the Yasawi order (founded by Khwāja Ahmad Yasawi (d. 652/1212), another disciple of Hamadānī), which flourished among Turkic speakers, and the Persian-speaking khvājahī and their adherents. Since the Nakshbandiyya was destined to spread across almost every region of the Turkish world in the space of a few generations, it was appropriate that Bahā al-Din should spend part of his apprenticeship with the Yasawi masters who were known to their contemporaries as the "Turkish shaykhs" (mahdawīj-i turk). First, however, Bahā al-Din spent seven months in the company of another Tadjik shaykh, Mwālnāwī Ṣarīf Dīkargarānī, perfecting under his guidance the practice of the silent dhikr. He next spent two or three months with Kudān Shāykh, a Yasawi master resident in Nakshāb, before joining the following of a second Yasawi shaykh, Khwājal Ata, for a full twelve years.

The chronological problems posed by the sources (works of hagiography, the Timurid chronicles, and the *Rīhā* of Ibn Baṭṭūta) are impossible to resolve, but it seems certain that Khwājal Ata is identical with Kudān/Ghazān Khān, a singularly ferocious individual who ruled over the Caghatayid khanate for roughly a decade. It is tempting to see in Bahā al-Din's association with Khwājal Ata the origin of the subsequent several later Nakshbandis for establishing ascendancy over rulers, but such an interpretation is excluded by a careful reading of the sources.

After the overthrow of Khwājal Ata, Bahā al-Din retired to his birthplace to begin training his own disciples, most of whom came from Bukhārā and its environs. He left the region himself only three times,
twice to perform the hajjdj and once to visit Herat. There he met with the ruler, Mucizz-ud-Dln Monzah, which he is a part, instead of, for example, the physical heart in order to make it participate in the teaching are, then, hard to discern, not because of the exiguous and some-
other recurrent features of the Nakshbandi path, particularly difficult to establish why he should have become an eponymous figure, the central link in the silsila of which he is a part, instead of, for example, Ghidjduwanl have, after all, been reiterated in the Muslims world.

Baha° al-Dln left behind no writings (with the possible exception of the litany named after him, Avn444-i Baha°yya), and he even discouraged his disciples from

Other recurrent features of the Nakshbandi path, such as fidelity to the

The rise of the Nakshbandiyya to supremacy in Transoxiana appears to have begun already in the time of Kh°dja Bah°-al-Din Nakshband [q. v.] himself, although the nascent order did not yet exercise political influence and in the Kubrawiya [q. v.] it faced a still formidable competitor.

NAKSHBANDIYYA, an important mystical tarikd order, in

In Persia

It is a paradox of Nakshbandi history that although this Sufi order first arose among Persian-speakers and virtually all its classical texts are written in the Persian language, its impact on Persia has been relatively slight. This statement requires qualification only for the period of the genesis of the Nakshbandiya when, it might be argued, Transoxiana and the eastern reaches of Khurasan still counted as parts of the Persian world.

3. Gentlemen of the third generation and their ships as well as in devotional life, and a marked hostility to Shi'I Islam, were established in later periods; they cannot be traced directly to Bah°-al-Din, or Alai, among the ulema of Bukharâ, had to endure the hostility of his colleagues for a number of reasons, not least being his enthusiasm for the works and concepts of Ibn 'Arabi. However, it was also in connection with Pârsâ that the Timurids established their links with the Nakshbandi order, when Mîrzâ Shahrûkh secured the return of Pârsâ to Bukharâ after a period of banishment. Those links, important for
the ascendancy of the order, were consolidated in the
time of Khwadja cUbayd Allah Ahrar (d. 896/1490
decisively in the political sphere (according both to the chronicles and to the hagiographic sources) and through his numerous disciples made the Nakshbandiya supreme in most regions of Transoxiana.

The influence of the Nakshbandiya spread during the same period southward to Harat, partly through the ardor and energy of a number of Shaykhs and Talish, who were the leaders of the region. This influence ultimately reached as far as the Caspian, where its impact was felt in the social and political life of the region. The Nakshbandiya dominated the religious and cultural life of late Timurid Harat. The principal initiate of Khausgari was the great poet and mystic cAbd al-Rahman Djami (d. 898/1492 [q. v.]), who brought to Kazwin by a

As many references to the order and its personalities during the late 9th/15th century were recorded in the literature of the time, the Nakshbandiya continued to thrive and flourish. The presence of the Nakshbandiya in Transoxiana and Harat has proved permanent. By contrast, the implantation of the Nakshbandiya in north-western Persia that took place in the late 9th/15th century was relatively shortlived. The Nakshbandiya was brought to Kazwin by a murid of Ahrar, Shaykh 'Ali Kurdi. Originally from Amadiya, he spent a number of years serving Ahrar as tutor to his children before settling in Kazwin. He was put to death by the Safawids in 925/1519. At least one of his six khalifas suffered the same fate, while several others fled before the Safawid onslaught. However, Nakshbandi influence remained strong in Kazwin for several decades and has been one of the major factors in the relatively long resistance put up by the people of the city against the imposition of Shiiism. Tabriz, the first Safawid capital, was also a centre of Nakshbandi activity, stemming from the presence there of Sun'cAllah Kusuzanuni (d. 929/1523), a disciple of 'Abd al-Din Maktadbair (d. 892/1486), one of the khalifas of Sa'd al-Din Khausgari in Harat. He enjoyed some influence at the Ak Koyunlu court and evidently managed to survive the Safawid conquest. His son, known as Abu Sa'id-i Thani, was imprisoned and tortured by the Safawids, but was able to escape and ultimately to migrate to Istanbul, where he found favour with Sultan Sulayman. Another successor of Kusuzanuni, 'Ali-din Badamyari, established himself in the village of Badamyar near Tabriz, where his initiative line continued for two more generations.

There are also traces of the Nakshbandiya in Sawa and Hamadan in the immediate pre-Safavid and early Safavid period. In general, however, the rise of the Safavid state sounded the knell for the Nakshbandi order in northern and western Persia, for with their strong loyalty to Sunnism the Nakshbandis came to be the special target of persecution. Mirzâ Kâ-
and he withdrew to Urak. Despite this removal of Shaykh Uthman, the Nakshbandi order remains strong among the Kurds of Peria (particularly in the region of Mahabad [q.v.]) and in Tâlish (especially Hashtpar and its surroundings). By contrast, it is now moribund among the Turkumans.


2. In Turkey

The first implantation of the Nakshbandiyya among the western Turks took place in the 9th/15th century, less than a hundred years after the death of its eponym. This was an important part of the general expansion of the Nakshbandiyya outside its Transoxanian homeland, for the order was well placed to gain the loyalty of the Ottoman Turks with its emphatically Sunni identity and insistence on sober respect for the shari'a.

The first Ottoman Nakshbandi was Möllâ 'Abd Allah İllâhî of Simav, who travelled to Samarkand where he became a disciple of Khâtâmânî 'Abd Allah Uthmanî [q.v. in Suppl.]. After his training was complete, he returned to his birthplace for a number of years before reluctantly accepting an invitation to settle in Istanbul. There, at the Zeyrek mosque, he established the first Nakshbandi centre in Turkey and found himself surrounded by a large number of devotees. Preferring, however, a life of seclusion and scholarship, he left Istanbul for Vardar Yenice in Thrace, where he became a disciple of Khâzînî of Simav, who travelled to Samarkand. Under the patronage of the Khalidiyya in the Ottoman capital was greeted with suspicion. Mawlana Khalid's first representative there, Muhammad Salih, made matters worse by his advocacy of triple Nakshbandî, Yasawi and Kubrawî.

The first Ottoman Nakshbandi was Möllâ 'Abd Allah İllâhî of Simav, who travelled to Samarkand where he became a disciple of Khâtâmânî 'Abd Allah Uthmanî [q.v. in Suppl.]. After his training was complete, he returned to his birthplace for a number of years before reluctantly accepting an invitation to settle in Istanbul. There, at the Zeyrek mosque, he established the first Nakshbandi centre in Turkey and found himself surrounded by a large number of devotees. Preferring, however, a life of seclusion and scholarship, he left Istanbul for Vardar Yenice in Thrace, where he became a disciple of Khâzînî of Simav, who travelled to Samarkand. Under the patronage of the Khalidiyya in the Ottoman capital was greeted with suspicion. Mawlana Khalid's first representative there, Muhammad Salih, made matters worse by his advocacy of triple Nakshbandî, Yasawi and Kubrawî.

More widely, the fortunes of the Nakshbandiyya in Turkey began to change in the 9th/15th century, with the emergence of the Khalidiyya. Among the most prominent of the early Turkish Mudjaddidis were certainly prominent and respected, both in Istanbul and elsewhere, but they never came close to enjoying the near-monopoly on Şûfi activity that they exercised in Central Asia. The Khalidiyya, however, made the Nakshbandiyya the paramount order in Turkey, a position it has retained even after the official dissolution of the orders.

Mawlâna Khalîlî Baghdadî (d. 1242/1827) was a poet from Shahrzur who obtained initiation into the Nakshbandiyya in Dhibî at the hands of Dâvlâmî 'Ali Dîlawî (d. 1240/1824), a shaykh of the Mudjaddidi line. Although Mawlâna Khalîlî was hostile to the local authority in Kurdistan and acted there as an advocate of Ottoman power, the first appearance of the Khalidiyya in the Ottoman capital was greeted with suspicion. Mawlâna Khalîlî's first representative there, Muhammad Salîbî, made matters worse by his advocacy of triple Nakshbandî, Yasawi and Kubrawî.
attempting to exclude non-initiates from public mosques during the performance of Khalidi rituals. The next representative, Abd al-Wahhab al-Susi, was, however, able to make inroads among the Ottoman elite. Like other key figures in the history of the order, he recruited numerous ‘ulama’, bureaucrats and men of letters; mention may be made of Mekki-zade Mustafa ‘Aṣım, several times Shaikh al-Islām; Gürdü Nefzi Pağha and Mâsa Şafveti Pağha, and Kechég-zade ‘Izzet Mollâ, kâdî of Istanbul. It was suggested to Sultan Mahmûd II by Hâyet Efendi, the Mudjaddidî-Mewlewî, that this swift expansion of the Khâlidîyya posed a danger to the state, and in 1828 all prominent Khâlidîs were in fact banned from the city. This period of disfavour was temporary, for in 1833 Mekki-zade was reappointed Shaikh al-Islâm.

Much of the impetus behind the early propagation of the Khâlidîyya in the Ottoman lands had been political; it was the wish of Mawdânâ Khâlid to reinforce the allegiance of the Ottoman state to the şairîa and thus to make of it a viable focus for Muslim strength and unity. This aim gradually slipped beyond reach, and even in the period of Sultan ‘Abd al-Hamîd II, the shaikhî orders were more intimately associated with the sovereign than were the Nakshbandîs.

Nonetheless, the Khâlidî branch of the Nakshbandîyya possessed a wide popular appeal; it struck root throughout Anatolia, and even in Konya, the hallowed ground of the Mewlewî order, the Khâlidîs were supreme. By the close of the 19th century, they had more tekkês in Istanbul than any other order.

Among the shaikhs of the second half of the century, Shaikh Divârî al-Dîn Gümûşhâhnî (d. 1904) may be singled out for mention both because of the size of his tekke in the city, being visited not only by members of the Ottoman elite but also by many Muslims from abroad. In addition, Gümûşhâhnî wrote extensively, in both Arabic and Turkish, and by compiling a collection of hadîth, Râmûz al-ahdîth, he inaugurated a tradition of hadîth study still continued by his initiatic descendants in present-day Turkey.

Gümûşhâhnî further distinguished himself by fighting, together with his followers, in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877. This example of military engagement was followed by several other Nakshbandî shaikhs who fought on various fronts during the First World War and the Turkish War of Independence. Nonetheless, the Nakshbandîs found themselves denied all legitimacy under the dispensation brought in by the Turkish Republic when all the Şûfi orders were proscribed in September 1925. The immediate pretext for the ban was furnished by the uprising led in the same year by Shaikh Safi al-Din al-‘Askârî, a Khâlidî shaikh of eastern Anatolia. However, the rebellion was more an expression of Kurdish grievances and aspirations then it was of fidelity to the traditional political ideals of the Khâlidîyya. Frequently cited as another exemplar of militant Nakshbandî opposition to the Turkish Republic is Shaikh Muhammad ‘Asîd (Meşhed Esad, d. 1931). Originally from Lahol, a physiognomist as well as spiritual descendant of Mawdânâ Khâlid, he too sought residence at the Kelâmî tekkê in Istanbul in 1888 before being banished to his native city by Sultan ‘Abd al-Hamid. He returned in 1908 to take his place among the leading shaikhs of the Ottoman capital. In 1931, he was arrested on charges of complicity with those responsible for the notorious Menemen incident. Although the evidence of his involvement was exceedingly slight, his son was executed and he himself died in prison hospital.

Initiatic descendants of Meşhed Esad as well as other Khâlidî shaikhs continue to be active in Turkey; among those who have died in recent times we may mention Samî Ramazanoğlu (d. 1984) and Meşhed Zahid Koçku (d. 1980). Arrests of Nakshbandîs and other forms of harassment have remained common, but the subversive potential and aspirations often ascribed to the Nakshbandîs in contemporary Turkey are, at best, grossly exaggerated. It can even be said that certain Nakshbandîs have integrated themselves into the political structure of Turkey by their involvement in ventures such as the National Salvation Party (Millî Selâvet Partisi) and its successor, the Prosperity Party (Refah Partisi). The present-day significance of the Nakshbandîs in Turkey is too big to omit so much in their political activity as in the support they provide for traditional religiosity, a support greatly weakened by the debilitating trends of more than half a century.

two centuries it was the principal spiritual order in India. Though some saints of the silsila had visited India during the time of Bâbur (Bâbur-nâma, tr. Beveridge, ii, 631) and Humâyûn (Shâhâtî, Qulâr-i ahrân, ms.), the credit of establishing the first Nakshbandî khânkâh in India goes to Khâdja Bâkî Bîl-lah who came to Dîlîh from Kabûl and, in his own words, “planted the silsilah in India”. The Khâdja died at the age of only forty, but he made deep impact on the lives of the people by his unassuming ways and deep humanitarian spirit. He attracted both religious and political figures to his fold. A believer in pantheism, he gave expression to his cosmic emotions in spiritual verses (fîrûnîyât-i Bâkî, Dîlîh 1970). Among his disciples, two persons were pre-eminent: (i) Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindî (d. 1624 [q.v.]), generally known as Mudjaddidi-i alf-i thâmî (“Reformer of the second millennium”), who expanded the order so successfully that, according to Dîhângîrî, his disciples reached every town and city of India (Tuzuk, ed. Sir Syed, 272-3). (ii) Shaykh ʿAbî al-Hâkî of Dîlîh (d. 1642), who came to be known as muhaddith on account of his contribution to the popularisation of Hadîth studies in India. Shaykh Ahmad gave to the Nakshbandî silsilah a distinct ideology, a motive power and an effective organisation. He broke away from the earlier mystic tradition in India by rejecting pantheism (wahdat-ul-wujûd) and propounded his theory of wahdat-ul-ghuţâd (unity of the phenomenal world). He raised his voice against the innovations (bidâ’â) introduced by the Sufis, the Emperor Akbar [see Dîn-i ilâm] and the ‘ulamâ-i islâmî (the worldly ulamâ). He opposed Akbar’s experiments to work out a synthesis of Hindu and Muslim religious attitudes, and desired a link with the traditions of both religions and non-Muslims their ways, as the Kurâân enjoins “for you yours and for me my religion” (Maţkâhâh). As Ibn ʿArâbi’s approach had sustained these religious trends, Shaykh Ahmad criticised his views trenchantly. He did not believe in keeping away from the state and the ruler. He struggled hard to bring about a change in the outlook of the ruling classes and carried on a brisk correspondence with Mughal nobles like ʿAbî al-Râhîm Khân-i Khânân [q.v.] Mirzâ ʿAzîz Kôkâ [q.v.], Farîd Bughlî and others, and won them to his point of view. When Dîhângîrî ascended the throne, Farîd Bughlî obtained a promise from him that he would not do anything against the khânâra (Akbar and the Jesuits, 204; Jahangir and the Jesuits, 3). However, in 1619, acting on the mischievous reports of his opponents (Dârâ Shûkhâh, Safnât-ul-aqelâbâ, 197-8), Dîhângîrî imprisoned him in the Gwâlîâr fortress. He was set free after a year but remained with the Emperor for some time. He spoke in the court on themes like prophethood, the Day of Judgement and the instability of reason. Shaykh Ahmad’s work was zealously carried forward by his sons and descendants. Awrangzîb came under the influence of Nakshbandî saints and showed deep respect to Khâdja Maşûm (whose collections of letters contain several letters addressed to him) and Khâdja Sayf al-Dîn, Khâdja Muhammad Nakshband and others. In the ideological shift of the Mughal state as typified in the differing approaches of Akbar and Awrangzîb, the Nakshbandî saints played an important role.

The Nakshbandî mystic ideology differed from other mystic silsilas in several respects: (a) It developed a dynamic, active and assertive outlook as opposed to the quiet, unobtrusive and cosmic approach of the Cîghtâhs. Even their litanies and practices were coloured by this approach. (b) It closed the channels of ideological contact with other religions by rejecting Ibn ʿArâbi’s thinking. Bernier found the country in the grip of a bitter controversy between the supporters and the opponents of the pantheistic approach. The Maţrîdî al-walîyât gives the text of a fatwâ issued against Sirhindî’s views. (c) Its belief in the need for providing guidance to the state created a new situation which bridged the gulf between the Sufis and the state on one side but gave birth to new problems on the other. (d) While other silsilas had propagated their teachings through mafâsit (q.v. in Suppl.), the Nakshbandî saints communicated their views through maktâbât (letters). The Nakshbandî mystical thought may, therefore, be studied in the compilations of letters left by Shaykh Ahmad, Khâdja Maţrî, Khâdja Nakshband, Shâh Ghulâm ʿAli and others. (e) While the earlier saints had propounded the idea of walîyât (spiritual territories assigned by the mystic master), the Nakshbandîs propounded the concept of Kayâmâtîyât (a type of spiritual axis on whom the world depended for its functioning). This concept, instead of strengthening the silsilah, homœnised its structure and diffused its activities. The Rawdat al-bayyâm mâlîn reveals the anarchy of thought caused by this concept. In the 12th/19th century two Nakshbandî saints made significant contribution to the silsilah by stating some of its basic ideological postures. Shâh Wâlî Allâh (d. 1762 [q.v.] ) sought to bring about a reconciliation between the conflicting approaches of Ibn ʿArâbi and Shaykh Ahmad and declared that difference between their approaches was one of simile and metaphor. Mirzâ Maţzâr Dîjân-i Dîjânân (d. 1782 [see MAZHAR]) adopted a broad and catholic attitude towards the religious ideas of the Mu’tazilah and the Mu’tazilah as well as al-Fawdî al-didbita fi ithbât al-râbîta (Author of the declaration of religious thought in Islam). He played a significant role in the political developments of the period. His political letters addressed to Ahmad Shâh Abdâlî, Muhammad Shâh, Nizâm al-Mulk and others reveal a clear understanding of the contemporary political situation (Shâh Wâlî Allâh kay siyâsî muhâdith, ed. Nizâmî, ‘Delhi 1969). Kâdî Thânâ Allâh Pânîpâti (d. 1810), a disciple of Mirzâ Maţzâr, made significant contribution to religious literature. His book on fîtûk, Mâ là badd min (“Alawi Press, Shâhpûr 1270 A.H.”) and his exegetical study of the Kur’aân (Tafsîr-i Mazhârî, Nadawat al-Mu’asannîn, Dîlîh 1962-70) came to be widely appreciated. His treatise Irfân al-shûkhîn (Mudjâba’î Press, Dîlîh, 1915) contains an exposition of Nakshbandî mystic principles. Other spiritual descendents of Mirzâ Dîjân-i Dîjânân, like Shâh Ghulâm ʿAli, Shâh Abû Sa’îd (author of Hidayat al-shûikhîn, Mudjâba’î Press, Dîlîh n.d.), and Shâh Ahmad Sa’îd (author of al-Fawdî al-didbita fi ithbût al-râbîta, Meerut 1331 A.H.), played an important part in propagating the Nakshbandî ideology. The descendants of Shâh Ghulâm ʿAli resented British occupation of the country and supported anti-British tendencies and activities.

Of the mystic order that have appeared so far in India, the Nakshbandî-Mudjaddiddî silsilah alone attracted the attention of the people of Afghanistan, Turkey and Syria. The khânkâh of Shâh Ghulâm ʿAli (d. 1824) had, according to Sir Syed, thousands of visitors from

Kha'ida Mir Nisir (d. 1758), though associated with the Mudjaddidi-Nakshbandi silsila, founded a new order called Taraka-yi-Muhammad. His son Khwaida Mir Dard (d. 1776) wrote 'ilm al-Kiaah (Amzi Press, Delhi n.d.), a work marked by deep insight in mystical thought, and gave a new orientation to the Nakshbandiya discipline. Sayyid Ahmad Shahib of Raa Bareli (d. 1831 [see Ahmad i-kawt]) also originally belonged to the Mudjaddidi order, but set up a new method, the Taraka-yi-Nabhaaswat, broadly within the framework of the Nakshbandiya. An important aspect of the Nakshbandiya order was its virility of thought and capacity to differ from its elders. Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi differed from his mentor on the question of pantheism; Mirza Maqar Djin-i Djinan disagreed with his elders on their approach to Hinduism, and Shah Ghu'lam Ali differed from him on this point. Sayyid Ahmad Shahid disagreed with Shah Aba'z Veg (d. 1823) on the concept of fi. Thus the main characteristic of the Nakshbandiya silsila in India has been its rejection of innovations (bid'at) and its involvement in political struggles.
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Naksha (Gr. NaXOS/Axia), Turkish name of the largest Aegean Cycladic island (1981 pop.: 14,037), east of Para [q.v.] and north-west of Amorgos, celebrated since antiquity and the Middle Ages for its products (wine, olive oil, dairies: cf. Vakalopoulos, ii, 492-3; iv, 473-4; in mid-12th century, al-Idrisi refers to its extensive cattle raising (Opus topographiae, ed. Burhan Ahmad Faruki, 5.7., east of Petra 12-9, Paris 1988, 216 ff. and s.v.; further refs in A. Savvides, Notes on NaXos and Para—Antiparos in Byzantine times [in Gk.], in Pariana, xllii [1991] 227-37), with its capital at the southern castle of "Arpalies", Nakshe suffered from Arab raids, mostly from the Cretan amirate [see Ktita], since it lay in a crucial spot of the major south-eastern Mediterranean trade routes (Constantinopolis-Aegean-Crete-Syria-Egypt); the raid of 904 carried off Naxiot captives to Crete, while Nakshe paid tribute to the amir (see V. Christides, Conquest of Crete, Athens 1984, 6, 128, 131, 165-6, 167), though by 910 it was in Byzantine hands (Malumat, 62, 82). Clear traces of Muslim influences on Naxiot frescoes are recorded in that period (Christides, 128 ff.) and, apart from the surviving Byzantine coinage (Malumat, 210, n.10), of particular importance is a rare Saldjuk coin, probably of Kay Khusraw I [q.v.], discovered on Nakshe (mid-1950s) and associated with Christian refugees from Antalya and Alanya [q.v.], who settled on the island (early 13th century) in view of the Saladin advance in south-western Anatolia (refs. in Savvides, in Byzantinos Domos, iii [1989] 159-60).

Turcoman raids, mostly associated with the Aydin, Ogulhali [q.v.], commenced in the early 1300s, almost a century after the foundation of the Latin Archipelago Duchy with Nakshe as capital (1207-1566). In 1304 and 1309-10 the Sanudo Duke assisted the Genoese to capture Chios [see SK] and the
Hospitallers to seize Rhodes [see rodos], driving the Turcosmans off those islands; yet raids on Nakshe are recorded in 1324 and 1326, which were intensified after 1340, since the Duke had participated in the planned 1343 crusade against Aydin; in 1341 8mur Beg abducted 6,000 Naxians and obtained tribute (refs. in M-L, ii, 352-3, 357, n. 1, 358-9; Melas [see para], 9-10; Frazee, 90-1), but the amir's menace ceased following the 1343 sack of Izmir [q.v. in Suppl.]. The Genoese dynasty faced new raids (late 14th century onwards) and Buondelmonti ca. 1420 sadly records the island's depopulation to the effect that there were no husbands for Naxiot women (ed. Legrand, ch. xvii, 56, 58; M-L, ii, 371; Melas, 18-19; Vakalopoulos, 132, 133). The first Ottoman raid under the kapudan paşa Çall Bey occurred in 1416 [see para], but Venetian control over the Duchy was recognised by Mehmed I, Murad II and Mehemed II [q.v.] in the treaties of 1419, 1426, 1446, 1451 and 1454 in return for a tribute (M-L, ii, 377-8, 383, 388; D. Pitcher, Hist. geogr. of the Ottoman Empire, Leiden 1972, 67, 84). In the Turco-Venetian war of 1463-79, extensive raids hit the island (particularly in 1477) and, according to some western sources, Nakshe and Para were Turkish in 1479 (cf, Setton, ii, 237-9, 239; 1479 pact of which record the previous status quo; soon, however, Bayezid II [q.v.] protested to the Venetian Senate that the Duke harboured western pirates (the Genoese Spinola had briefly captured it in 1431) (M-L, ii, 378, 389 ff., 394; Pitcher, 85). In the 1499-1503 war there was another raid on Nakshe, which is mentioned in the 1503 pact (refs. in M-L, ii, 399; KrantoneUe, 91), yet in 1517, despite a recent treaty renewal, the Genoese Duke was abducted by Turkish corsairs and later released to appeals to Venice (1521, 1523, 1532), while in 1552 money and gifts convinced the pirate Kur-
toglu not to sack the island (M-L, ii, 402, 405; Kran-
toneUe, 62, 69-70, 79, 102, 111, 121, 399). In the extensive raids of Khayr al-Din Paşa [q.v.] in the Cyclades (1537-8) the Duke was spared, through Nakshe was looted for 3 days (HadjdjT Khalifa, Eng. tr. Mitchell, 58; Byzant. Kleinchroniken, ed. Schreiner, nos. i, iv, 15, 16/2, 50/7; ii, 575-6; I.H. Uzuncaçılı, Osmanlı tarihi, ii, 1988, 375, 459), though some Greek sources record that upon its capitulation (11 Nov. 1537) the island agreed to pay khargiş and was thus spared the fate of Para [q.v.] (Ethnica Chronica, 80; Chronicle of 1603, ed. Amanouts, Hellenika, i, 1928, 49; idem, Relations between Greeks and Turks [in Gk.], i, 167). Khayr al-Din actually collected his tribute (1538), while the Turco-Venetian treaty of 1540 established Ottoman suzerainty over the Duchy (M-L, ii, 412 ff.). Although the last Crispo secured a favourable 'auth-name (29 Aug. 1565) from Süleyman II [q.v.], the definitive annexation occurred in 1566, when Yiayla Paşa [q.v.] seized Keos and Andros (M-L, ii, 420, n. 2, 424; Vakalopoulos, iii, 215-20, 228 ff.; D. Polemis, Hist. of Andros [in Gk.], 1981, 70). Selim II [q.v.] then ceded the Duchy to his favourite, the Jewish adventurer "Duke" Joseph Nasi, who ruled through an administrator until 1579 (C. Roth, The house of Nasi, Duke of Naxos, Philadelphia 1948; M-L, ii, 422 ff.; Vakalopoulos, ii, 43, 347, iii, 233 ff., 238 ff., 274 ff.; Slot, Archipelagio, 88 ff.), a period that witnessed the devastating raid of Uthman Beg in 1572 on Nakshe and Para (Vakalopoulos, iii, 259, 274). A new era for the Cyclades commenced with the 'auth-names of 1580 and 1646 [see para]; Nakshe became the seat of the first sanjak beg, "Soleiman bei de ducat di Naxia, signor di Andro" (1579-80 or 82) (cf. Vakalopoulos, iii, 296-7; Slot, 98 ff.), from now onwards the Sultanate leased the island to Turkish sandjak beg or to Greek-Ionian notables (as "dukes"), like Constantine Cantacuzenos (1582), John Choniates, "Duke of Axia, Paros and Andros and voivode of all the Aegean" (1598), Otural Bey, whose taxing exertions resulted in his dismissal by the Porte (1606), and Gasparo Gratiani (1617-18), an ambassador of the Ottomans to Vienna (cf. Vakalopoulos, iii, 287 ff.). On the other hand, from the 1640s, several Jesuits and Capuchin friars, driven away from Istanbul by Murad IV, arrived on the island, where a period of thriving Catholic monasticism began [see para]. In mid-1651 or 1652 the Venetians defeated between Para and Nakshe an Ottoman fleet bringing supplies to the besiegers of Crete during the Turco-Venetian war of 1645-69 (details in para), yet Ottoman rule in Nakshe had in fact been loose since the 1646 'auth-name, regulating local government through a vottivo and 6 annual local notables; a series of raids by French pirates between 1675-8 resulted in the abduction of many Christian and Muslim settlers from Nakshe, wherefrom additional refugees began to emigrate to Smyrna, as recorded early in the 17th century by Coronteli [see para].

The Passarowitz Treaty (1718 [see PASAROFCA]) ended the Latin presence in the Cyclades, with the Venetians forced out of Tenos (Slot, 250 ff.), it was in 1770, during the Turco-Russian war of 1668-74, that the Russians seized the island, with Para and Antiparos, until expelled by the Ottomans in 1774. In the 1821 Greek War for Liberation, the Naxiots, contrary to the Parians, did not participate fervently, probably on account of the influence of the local Latin element, yet Nakshe, which suffered heavily from Cretan and Kassian pirates (1823-4, 1825-7), received many refugees from Chios, Psara and other islands. Finally, several Naxiots distinguished themselves elsewhere in Greek uprisings until the incorporation of their island to the Kingdom of Greece in 1830 (see Vakalopoulos, iv, 717, 736, 895; ii, 112, 118, 513, 516, 940, 954, n. 211; vii, 383, 392, 805, 811 ff.).

tion latine et occupation ottomane, c. 1500-1718, i-ii, Leiden 1982 (based on important archival material). On the Turkish era see also [in Gk.]: D. Paschales, The Cyclades during the Turco-Venetian wars of 1644-69, in In memory S. Lampros, Athens 1935, 132-9; idem, Privilegios y administración en Cyclades during Turkish domination, in Andriaka Chronika, i (1948), 120-50; The conquest of Cyclades by the Turks, in Epetiris Etairias Kykladikon Meleton (= EKKM), i (1960), 215-33; J. Della-Rocca, Nax-
ian law during Turkish domination, in EKKM, vii
NAKUR (Nukur) was the name of a town in northern Morocco ( Rif) situated approximately 140 km./90 miles (by road) to the west of Melilla [q.v.], in a plain which extends between two small coastal rivers, joining at a place called Agdal [on this term, see AGDAL], then separating before flowing into the Mediterranean, the Nakur and the Ghavs/Ghias; a ribat [q.v.] had been constructed on an elevation. The town itself was built some 10 km./7 miles from the Mediterranean coast among inlets which sheltered a number of small harbours. The best known, al-Mazimma, was situated at the rear of a bay protected by several small islands. The town had a name of Alhuremas [see ED q.v.] the French, that of Albouzeme/Albouzemes and modern Moroccans call it al-Husayma [q.v. in Suppl.]; this locality has become a popular seaside resort, having in the past been devastated three times, as noted by Leo Africanus (tr. Épaulard, 277-8).

Nakur was surrounded by a wall of coarse brick and possessed a large mosque, of which the roof was supported by pillars of thuya (abundant in the region, as was cedar), prosperous markets, gardens and orchards of pears and pomegranates. The history of the town is inseparable from the somewhat turbulent history of a principality of which it was the capital and which was governed for several centuries by the descendants of a companion of the conqueror of the Idrissid principality of Sahil b. Mansur al-Himyarl—although this South Arabian origin for him is disputed by al-Yakubí (K. Al-Buldán, 357, tr. Wiet, 222), who associates him rather with the Berber tribe of the Nafza [q.v.]. According to tradition, this ancestor of the Salihids established himself at Tamsaman, on the coast, and succeeded in converting the population of the region which belonged to the Berber groups of the Ghamara and the Shanjada [q.v.]; but these new converts were not slow to apostasise and to expel Salih from the principality which he had founded in 90/709, under the caliphate of al-Walid b. Abd al-Malik (88-98/705-15 [q.v.]), taking as their leader a certain Dávid al-Rundl (who probably was not a native of Ronda). Salih, who had found refuge in Spain, separately purchased in order to constitute a kind of praetorian guard, demanded their freedom and civil rights. Their movement was suppressed, and they were forced to take refuge in their cantonment, the Karyat al-Salihids, while awaiting their punishment. Some cousins of Salih, who had been usability important in the rebellion, were condemned to death, thus provoking one of the conspiracies which are a feature of the history of the Salihids.

Although a sister of Salih, Umm al-Sa'd, had married, in Nakur, a descendant of Fátima, related in fact to the Idrissids who were under threat from Kayrawání, a certain Ahmad b. Abdu al-Hamid b. Abdu al-Malik b. Umm al-Sa'd, had founded a small principality before embarking for Spain in 138/755. Salih—who had found refuge in Spain, separately purchased in order to constitute a kind of praetorian guard, demanded their freedom and civil rights. Their movement was suppressed, and they were forced to take refuge in their cantonment, the Karyat al-Salihids, while awaiting their punishment. Some cousins of Salih, who had been usability important in the rebellion, were condemned to death, thus provoking one of the conspiracies which are a feature of the history of the Salihids.

NAKUR — NAKUR 941
(1968), 426-81 (on Turkish administration and taxation); A. Katsouros, Naxiot notarial documents of the 17th c., in EEEK, vii (1968), 24-537; The Turks of Naxos, in EEEK, ix (1971-3), 153-90; General references in A. Vakalopoulos, Hist, of mod. Hellenism [in Gk.], i-vii, Thessalonica 1961-86 (period 1204-1828); K. Setton, Papacy and Levant, 1204-1571, i, Philadelphia 1976 (13th-14th centuries); ii, 1978 (15th century); iii-iv, 1984 (16th century); cf. C. Sathas, Kykladika, i-xxxiii. Further references in PARA. (A. SAVVIDES)
Nakur; they captured Dalul and his supporters and hanged them. Abd al-Rahman III, informed of this success, congratulated Sahil and promulgated throughout Spain the news of the recovery of the principality and of its capital, which in fact seem henceforward to have been placed under the sovereignty of the Umayyads who, as mentioned previously, had a long-standing relationship with the Sahilids.

However, in 308/920-1, Masula recaptured Nakur, which he held for a short time. Sahil died and was succeeded by his grandson, al-Mu’ayyad b. ‘Abd al-Badi’ b. Sahil, who was attacked in 316/928 by a vassal of the Fatimids, the lieutenant and successor of Masula, Musa b. Abi ‘l-Afiya (d. 327/938 [q.v.]), then governor of a province of which the capital was Guercif [see GARSIF], and Nakur was razed the following year. Abu ‘Ayyub Isma’il b. ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Abd al-Rahman b. Sa’d b. Idris b. Sahil, a grandson of the hero of the ghida’ against Ibn Hafsun, regained power and rebuilt the town. Since the Fatimids had no intention of allowing the Umayyads to retain a bridgehead on the coast of the Maghrib, al-Ka‘im (322-34/934-46 [q.v.]) entrusted to a Slav named Sandal the task of recapturing Nakur; after an exchange of letters and envoys—some of whom were executed by Isma’il—the Fatimid officer arrived to lay siege to the capital in Shawwal 323/September 935 and captured it after eight days of fierce fighting. Isma’il and almost all of his supporters lost their lives, and the women and children were taken away in captivity.

Once more, the inhabitants of the town, who had been expelled from it, succeeded in returning, executed the governor appointed by Sandal and sent his head to ‘Abd al-Rahman III (324/936). After the defection of Musa b. Abi ‘l-Afiya, who went over to the Umayyads in 320/932, the loss of Nakur was strongly resented by the Fatimids. The citizens had taken as their leader a member of the ruling family, Musa, known as Ibn Rum, but he was expelled by one of his kinsmen, ‘Abd al-Salim, and went into exile at Pechina with his supporters. In 336/948-9, another Sahilid was to be called to power, Djurtum (?), but Ahmad, who reigned until Dhu l-Ka‘da 360/September-October 971. It was during his reign or that of his predecessor that Ibn Hawkal visited the region; he says (Surat al-ard, tr. Kramers-Wiet, 75) that Nakur had lost some of its importance, but retained reasonable proportions, and he speaks of its port, al-Mazimma. Two centuries later, al-Idrisi [q.v.] locates 20 miles from the town of Badas (Opus geographicum, v, Naples-Rome 1975, 353) the port of Du Dhukur, “an ancient town, today (540/1154) in ruins, called Nakur in the history books”, which is rather surprising.

After 360/971, information regarding the town becomes rather obscure. It seems that the last Idrisid amir [see IDRISIDS], al-Hasan b. al-Kasim Gannun (343-63/954-74 and 375/985), established himself at Nakur, before yielding to the Umayyads in 362/973. The town must subsequently have passed into the hands of the Zirids [q.v.], since historians relate that in 388/998, al-Mansur Ibn Abi ‘Amir (d. 392/1002 [q.v.]), in the course of his campaign against Zir (‘Atiya (see H.R. Iris, Zirides, index), sent his general, the Slav Wadhi, to Morocco, and the latter occupied a number of towns including Nakur (Majbakir al-Barbar, 29). It is probable that the descendants of the last Sahilid to be cited by name were able to recover their throne and to retain it until 410/1019-20, at which date they were obliged to go into exile in Malaga. They returned, however, to Mazimma, whence they were expelled by Ya’la b. al-Futuh al-Azadajji of Orania. The descendants of the latter were still in residence there at the time when al-Bakri was writing his Description (460/1068). In 477/1084, the Almoravid Yusuf b. Tashfim (453-500/1061-1107 [q.v.]) captured and definitively destroyed Nakur, the site of which is today only of archaeological interest (see A. Makinasi, Reconocimientos arqueologicos en el Rif, in Tamuda, vii/1-2 [1959], 156-8).

Information is lacking regarding the social, economic and intellectual life of the town, but it may be supposed that it was not greatly distinguished from the rest of Morocco. It is known only that a few dirhams were struck there between 372 and 397/902-1007 (see G.C. Miles, The coinage of the Umayyads of Spain, New York 1950, 52-3) and that close commercial relations had been established with Spain, and in particular with Malaga, which was the nearest port. From a cultural point of view, Berber was certainly the language of the people, but Arabic was not unknown, and it may be supposed that poets frequented the court; proof of this is constituted by a fragment attributed, in 305/917, to a certain Ahmad b. al-Marwazi, whose patronym could also (if this reading is correct) be an indication of the prestige enjoyed by the little principality of Nakur.

Bibliography: The principal sources are Bakri,

Approximative genealogical table of those Sahilids who reigned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manṣūr</th>
<th>I. ṢĀḤĪH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idris</td>
<td>II. AL-MU’ṬASIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. ṢA‘ĪD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idris</td>
<td>IV. ṢĀḤĪH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Abd al-Rahmān</td>
<td>V. ṢĀḤĪH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫuwajj</td>
<td>VI. ṢĀḤĪH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djurtum</td>
<td>VII. AL-MU’AYYAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Abd al-Malik</td>
<td>VIII. ISMĀ‘ĪL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Abd al-Badī’</td>
<td>IX. MŪṢĀ-IBN RŪMĪ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahil</td>
<td>XI. DJURTUM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Approximative genealogical table of those Sahilids who reigned]
 Already in Middle Persian the form \textit{ndmag} can be derived as an adjective from the common Iranian root \textit{ndman}-, "name".

Naldrug, which appears to be of the late Adil Shahi period only, for the final disposition of the latter tr. S.K. Basu, \textit{AlI Tabataba}, \textit{Burhdn-i ma^dthir}, passim; \textit{Adil Shahi} period only, Hashim Beg Astarabadl, from Muhammad Kasim "Firishta", \textit{Adil Shah of Bldjapur} c.

The above is mostly extracted from Muhammad b. Tughluk, and so probably came into Bahmani possession after the imperial forces had withdrawn, in the late 8th/14th century; its stone fortifications, which appear to be of Bahmani work although elaborated later under the \textit{Adil Shahi} of Bidjapur, may have replaced an earlier Hindu (\textit{Chalmeta}) mud fort. Thereafter, Naldrug incurred frequent mention in the dense squabbles of the Deccan, lying as it does on the border of the old BahmanI kingdom, when Naldrug became a bone of contention between the rival sultanates, there were several mosque buildings in the vicinity of Naldrug, disfigured with mean squatters' buildings. An interesting addition to its fortifications is a multi-layered, square mandir, possibly the one at Golkonda fort. The water-supply system of the latter was not sufficiently described or published, but there are illustrations of the PanI mahall and the single gateway, "fort".

It does not figure in the Deccan campaign of Muhammad b. Tughluk, and so probably came into Bahmani possession after the imperial forces had withdrawn, in the late 8th/14th century; its stone fortifications, which appear to be of Bahmani work although elaborated later under the \textit{Adil Shahi} of Bidjapur, may have replaced an earlier Hindu (\textit{Chalmeta}) mud fort. Thereafter, Naldrug incurred frequent mention in the dense squabbles of the Deccan, lying as it does on the border of the \textit{Adil Shahi} and \textit{Kutb Shahi} territories of Bidjapur and Ahmadnagar respectively, having later even attracted the attention of the Kutb Shahis of Golkonda. Thus Muhammad Khan, the brother of \textit{AlI} at-Din Ahmad II Bahmani, in rebellion in 840/1436, is reported to have occupied Naldrug as well as Mudgul, Kalyan and Raycur, and carried out some rebuilding, including a dam across the river Bori, to improve the water supply to the garrison. In 898/1851, after the death of \textit{AlI} at-Shah, Murd
dš
dš\textit{Nizam Shah} attempted to recover Sholapur and Naldrug, now with the help of Ibrahim Kuth Shah of Golkonda; but the allied forces, on seeing Naldrug's great strength, moved rather to Bidjapur itself; the siege of Naldrug, however, was prolonged under the next Kuth Shahi sultan, Muhammad Kuli Kuth Shah, the following year.

In 1003/1595 Ibrahim \textit{AlI} Shahl of Bidjapur invaded the \textit{Nizam Shahi} kingdom; in an ensuing battle at Naldrug Ibrahim \textit{Nizam Shah} was killed. But there were several other battles which is borne with a rod. The name, which comes from the Syriac \textit{nakht}, is not infrequently found with the verbs \textit{dara
dša} or \textit{sa
dška} in the old Arabic poets, especially when early morning is to be indicated, e.g. \textit{Antara}, app.; \textit{Labi

found also as a substantive referring to an inscription, a letter or a book. In the orthography of Pahlavi, the word could be written either phonemically, as *n*m*ḵ*, or by means of any of two heterographs: SHM-k', which was based on the Semitic word for "name", and MGLT, i.e. the Aramaic mgilta, "scroll" (cf. L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti libros*, Leiden 1953, 1091). It occurs also in compounds, especially in the titles of books. Some of these denote certain genres of writings, e.g. kār-nāmā ("book of deeds"), andarz-nāmā ("book of admonition"); others specify the subject-matter of a particular text, such as Khuδuses-nāmā ("The Book of Kings"), or contain the name of the main protagonist of a story, like the title of the eschatological Arādā Wirāz-nāmā ("The Book of Arda Wiraz").

These usages of the word lived on in Islamic times when nāmā became in many ways the equivalent of the Arabic kūdāq [q.v.], especially in the titles of books. The straightforward Persian titles often contrast with the much more extensive and flowery style of titles in Arabic. Sometimes the former came into use as an alternative title to an Arabic one, as in the case of Nizām al-Mulk's Siyāyat-nāmā which is also known as Siyār al-mulūk; the title Sa'dī's-nāmā occurs next to the more traditional name of Būstān.

As an independent word nāmā continued to have the generic meaning of a letter, frequently occurring in the Shīh-nāma of Firdawsī. A specific connotation is that of a royal edict or diploma, as in the expressions nāmā-yi khāšqāni or nāmā-yi hamāyunī. In the sense of a "dictionary".

In the traditional lexicography of Persian, a number of other meanings are given which need not be discussed here. In present-day Persian, nāmā continues to be a very productive morpheme. It helped to form neologisms (e.g. ašā-nāmā "statute", ḥarīnānā "identity card", guwāhi-nāmā "certificate"), but also to give contemporary meanings to words already existing in the classical language (e.g. dāndūh-nāmā "encyclopaedia", ṭiza-nāmā "journal, daily newspaper", lughat-nāmā "dictionary").


**NAMĀRA**, the name of several places in the Near East.

According to the *LA*, the root n-m-r-h has, amongst its meanings, that of sweet, drinkable, abundant water, suitable for beasts and for irrigating crops. This explains why a certain number of settlements, provided with a hawd [q.v.] and which have developed around a source of water, a well or a natural reservoir of water (birkah), are called Namāra, Namīr, Namr or Nimrā. R. Dussaud and F. Macler noted that during Antiquity, there were in Syria a good number of sites in the traditional lexicography of Persian, a number of other meanings are given which need not be discussed here. In present-day Persian, nāmā continues to be a very productive morpheme. It helped to form neologisms (e.g. ašā-nāmā "statute", ḥarīnānā "identity card", guwāhi-nāmā "certificate"), but also to give contemporary meanings to words already existing in the classical language (e.g. dāndūh-nāmā "encyclopaedia", ṭiza-nāmā "journal, daily newspaper", lughat-nāmā "dictionary").


**NAMĀRA**, the name of several places in the Near East.

According to the *LA*, the root n-m-r-h has, amongst its meanings, that of sweet, drinkable, abundant water, suitable for beasts and for irrigating crops. This explains why a certain number of settlements, provided with a hawd [q.v.] and which have developed around a source of water, a well or a natural reservoir of water (birkah), are called Namāra, Namīr, Namr or Nimrā. R. Dussaud and F. Macler noted that during Antiquity, there were in Syria a good number of sites bearing this name. The best known are four places localised in the Kībīliya, the southern fringe of the province of Dimāq [q.v.] or Damascus, forming part of the vast rural region (nūdā) of the Ḥawrān [q.v.]. The relief of the Ḍjabal al-Durūz [q.v.] is characterised by numerous volcanic cones which are also landmarks visible a long distance away.

Links between the villages are by roads or by tracks marked out by low walls of stones in order to prevent people from losing their way in the zones of lava flows, and in order to facilitate the passage of camels, which find difficulty in picking their way through terrain scattered with the blocks of volcanic rocks. Since Roman times there have been roads with paving or stone surfacing, important parts of which were used during the centuries before the appearance of the motor car.

1. The Namāra in southern Syria which is situated, like Khirbat al-Baydā [q.v.], Kaʿīf al-ʿAraq and Djabal Says [q.v. in Suppl.] on the fringe of Roman Arabia (Provincia Arabia) in the *hara* [q.v.] of al-Ṣafā, a strenuous day's march to the east of the oasis of Taymā [q.v.] and of Tarba. According to N. Pigulevskaya, Namāra is a little distance from the ancient route transformed by Diocletian into the *Strata romana diocletiana*.

Namāra is situated at the extreme edge of the steppe, in an oasis of the Wādī l-Ṣām, a wide and long valley which begins in the region of Muḥammadān to the northeast of the Djabal al-Durūz and crosses a plain covered with blackish stones coming from the lava flows of volcanoes long since extinct, before losing itself in the fertile Rubba depression. The basalt region of the Hawrān benefits in winter and spring from abundant rains, which bring floods into the valley, this latter being dry the rest of the year, and filling the reservoirs (al-ḥawd) in the plain, which, since early Antiquity, have helped to conserve the water. Namāra, whose ṣawq had, according to al-ʿIṣṭāḵkhī, one of the best supplies of water in the region, lasting practically for the whole year through, was probably, like the post of Djabal Says, one of the stages on the road followed by the caravans starting from Taẓīrāt or Panāk, and heading for Boṣrā [q.v.] or for Filastīn [q.v.]. The alluvial soils which soaked up water allowed the cultivation of high-yielding cereal crops without irrigation, and these excised the greed of nearby nomads.

Built on a height in the middle of the valley at the Wādī l-Ṣawt confluent, the post of Namāra protected the road coming from the northeast and leading to Boṣrā, whilst Kaʿīf al-ʿAraq [q.v. in Suppl.] guarded the east and Kaʿīf Azrāk controlled access from the south. Namāra's function was to protect the security of caravans and the flocks of pastoral nomads in the Rubba. Its strategic role is marked by a small Roman fort and a rectangular Roman-Byzantine guard tower built on the model of those which guarded the main routes converging on Syria. In Antiquity, this type of tower assured the rapid transmission of information by means of signals visible from other posts. Namāra's importance is further confirmed by the title of Nāmērāh ha-Sulāṭīn which appears in Safaitic texts, as noted by G. Ryckmans.

From the 2nd century A.D., the Romans took control of the Bāḥnāmiyya [q.v.], whose Arabo-Nabataean population became their tributaries before becoming liable to the *harār* of the incoming Muslims. Its defence was the responsibility of the Third Cyrenaican Legion stationed at Boṣrā, whose garrison included units of camel riders (dromedarii) recruited locally, thereby explaining the presence of Nabataean soldiers at Namāra, attested by numerous Safaitic graffitti rudely traced by them on neighbouring pieces of rock. Although Namāra was abandoned by the Romans at the beginning of the 4th century, as the *laurel* near the site of the tomb of Imam al-Bays [q.v.] indicates, the military system established there by them was not changed and actually benefited in the following century by the incorporation of Arab nomads into the army.
After the victory of Adjnadayn [q.v.] over the Byzantines in the summer of 13/634, the Muslims occupied the Hawran region. Two years later, after the success of the commander Khalid b. al-Walid [q.v.] at the battle of 'Yarmuk, Namara was integrated within the diqān [q.v.] of Dimashq from the time of the Umayyads' advent to power.


2. Namara (Waddington, nos. 2172-85), now called today Nimrâ, in one of the six rural districts (rûstân) of the Hawran in the middle of a region covered with lava flows to the east of the Djibal Durûz. This Druze village is situated to the east of Ta'ba and Shabba (the ancient Philippopolis), to the south of Shâkkâ, to the west of the oasis of Taymâ and to the northwest of Mshhannaf. The large number of prehistoric sites in this region bears witness to a very old occupation of sites favoured by the basaltic nature of the soil which, thanks to a thick layer of rain annually, gives a good cereal yields.

The actual village, with a population in 1945 of 824, is built like an eagle's nest at ca. 1,400 m.
altitude, at the top of a tell which dominates the high valley of the Wadi Namrā which, from this spot onwards, assumes the name of the Wadi Liwā and which forms the downstream of the Laqādji (q.v.), the ancient Traconitories. A Roman road made use of this valley, marked out by Taβa, Shaβba, Umμ al-Zaytūn, Kāhilalā and Burāk, from where the Roman road continues northwards to Damascus, whilst the flow of the wādi eventually forms, further to the east, the Bahriyāt Burāk, a fine natural reservoir of water, situated to the south of Shawkān. A track came from the north via Shawkān to Namrā, from where another one led towards Taymā, Tarba and Mughannaf, where it took a southward direction to join Shakhir by means of Sala (ancient Salamamistica), whilst there branched off towards the east a track which eventually joined Namrā (1) via the Wadi al-Šām, where the terrain covered with lava chips made painful going, during the dry season, for the camels of caravans and mounted troops.

At the crossing point of the Wadi Liwā there developed a lower quarter of Namrā; at the foot of the lava streams there are still remains of a fortified tower from the Roman period, which had the function of protecting this obligatory crossing place.

A short distance downstream, on the right bank of the wādi, which have been found, an unornamented building, like the greater part of the Christian buildings of the Hawrān of the early period. This church is reminiscent of the basilica of Taβa a little further away to the west. Moreover, below the fording place, there is on the left bank a large, ruined building called Dayr al-Šāhib which, a long time ago, was transformed by the local inhabitants into a rudimentary marking the frontier between the territory of the biblical city of the land of Canaan. Cited in the Bible under the name of Al-Hadajdji and the Damascus-Hidjaz railway.


3. Modern Namrā (Namr, Namir) al-Hawā

This lies at an altitude of 580 m. to the south of Izrā, southeast of Shaykā, Maskin, north of Khibrāt al-Qhashā, northwest of Harāk and northeast of Adhriāt (q.v.). Like Namrā (1), Namrā is situated in a region where the nature of the soil and the amount of rainfall have furnished, since Antiquity, an appreciable agricultural richness and have provided its based with a respectable amount of water. In Hellenistic times, this place was called Eūρη. In 4th century A.D., Eusebius of Caesarea called it XCOJLT (JLeyiowr) ivTfj in his Onomasticon (138, 114). At the opening of the 5th century, St. Jerome cites it as an important settlement (sicav grandio). It was at that time a centre for the Nabataeans, nomads with their long tents, to gather together. In mediaeval times, under the Mamluks (q.v.), Namrā was included administratively in the wilāya of Adhriāt (the chief town of the Bālāniyya). In 1925, at the time of the rebellion in the Jabal al-Duruz, Nāmrah (Namrā) was found itself on the no. 3 road which linked the Jabal with the port of Saydā via Izrā. At the present time, this place is situated 3 km/2 miles to the north of the Darb al-Hadajdji and the Damascus-Hidjaz railway.


4. The name Namāra (Namr, Nam(a)ra, Namrē) appears on an ancient military boundary marking the frontier between the territory of Dāsam (Gasīmeh) and its own one. Namrā is situated in the large, undulating plain of the Nukrā, the veritable granary of Syria. It is probably the ancient city of the land of Canaan. Cited in the Bible under the name of Namrē (Numbers, xxxii, 3, and Samuel, v, vi) or of Beth Nimreh (Numbers, xxxii, 34, 36), it appears there as a strong urban centre, with grazing grounds for sheep, surrounded by meadows suitable for herds. Over the centuries, it experienced various fortunes; in the 13th century B.C., notably, it suffered a violent conflagration and was reconstructed in 1230 B.C. by one of Jacob’s grandsons.

Namrā lies to the south of Akhrāb (q.v.), the ancient residence of the Ghassānīd princes and at the foot of the Jabal al-Hārā (1,217 m in altitude) which dominates the plain of the village of al-Hārā (Eūρη) which is on the southern side, at the foot of this height, to the east of the Nahā Alān, an affluent of the Yarmūk, to the north of Nawā and to the west of the Laqādji (q.v.). According to Dussaud, Namrā, which was a place of some importance in a region dominated by
the Monophysites, subjects of the Ghassanids, would be a more fitting place to be qualified than Namara (2), situated to the northwest of Mughanâf. The confusion seems to arise from an indication given by Eusebius of Caesarea, which Waddington (no. 2176), Thomsen and Noldeke followed.

Al-Mas'ûdî places Nam some miles to the north of Dâbiya [q.v.] and Nawâ in the district of the Dâjiwân [q.v.]. The troops of Nûr al-Dîn [q.v.], setting off to campaign in Egypt, encamped on several occasions in this vicinity, notably in 563/1168 and 565/1170.

Bibliography: Wetzstein, op. cit., 90; Noldeke, Zur topographie und Geschichte der Damascenischen Gebiete und des Haurangegend, in ZDMG, xxix (1875), 419 ff.; Le Strange, Palestine, iii, 38; Chauvet and Isambert, Topographique histoirique, 333, 341; N. Elissèeff, Nûr al-Dîn, i, 262, 265, 327; Sartre, Trois études, 1982, 186, map; G. Höscher, op. cit., col. 1611.

(N. Elissèeff)

NAMAZ [see SALAT].

NAMAZGâh (h.), 'place of prayer', in India an alternative name for 'idgâh, the open structure built usually to the west of a town, consisting solely of what is in Persia a Minbar, a central minbar which should be capable of accommodating the entire adult male Muslim population; the wall-structure may stand at the western end of a large paved area (sahn), but there is usually no hawd for ablutions. The structure is used only for the celebration of the two 'id festivals ('id al-âdha and 'id al-fitr [q. v.]), and no special sanctity attaches to it; this may account for the fact that such structures have been built in many places in India.

The namazgâh in Muslim settlements in India is often a substantial building of some artistic merit, e.g. the Bahmani 'idgâh at Bijâpur [q.v.]; the splendid 'idgâh at Chandîri (not described s.v.) in Malvâ with its mihrâb wall, canopied minbar in typical Malvâ style (e.g. Mându, Chandîri style), and tapering end buttresses with domes; the early Tughlukid Khârîrâ' 'idgâh, near the old Dinhl of many old 'idgâhs.
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The namazgâh in Muslim settlements in India is often a substantial building of some artistic merit, e.g. the Bahmani 'idgâh at Bijâpur [q.v.]; the splendid 'idgâh at Chandîri (not described s.v.) in Malvâ with its mihrâb wall, canopied minbar in typical Malvâ style (e.g. Mându, Chandîri style), and tapering end buttresses with domes; the early Tughlukid Khârîrâ' 'idgâh, near the old Dinhl of many old 'idgâhs.
the cheetah. From Aristotle is also borrowed the statement that the panther gives off an agreeable odour to which the cheetah may be the result of crossing the lioness and the male panther (Abrigé, 107). The polygraph poet Kughadzîm (4th/10th century), in his treatise on hunting (Msāyid, 211-12) states that there are two breeds of panthers, one of a large build with a short tail, the other of a small build with a long tail; this theory was repeated word-for-word by al-Kalkashandi (8th/14th century) in his Subh al-a'āqī fi sinā'at al-insâq (Paris 1942, ii, 37). However, wipe the slate clean of all these erroneous interpretations, a single author, in the 6th/12th century, the famous knight Usâma b. Munkîdhib (d. 584/188) (q. v.), who was personally as fully familiar with the cheetah, which he owned, as with the panther that he encountered on several occasions, was able to make a clear distinction between these two carnivores (l'Indeb, 110-11) and to outline the anatomical differences which make the two species quite distinct: the structure of the skull, elongated in the panther, short and rounded in the cheetah; eyes very different in shape and colour; dissimilar coat, flecked with plain black spots in the cheetah; eyes canカー recognising that, unlike the lion who, once satiated, runs off and is very little on the offensive, the panther, and the Mamluk Ibn Mangli, in his abridgement of Antiquity, such as the idea, among the Greeks, that the panther, intoxicated by absorbing leopard’s bane or “panther strangler”, sought a remedy for it by swallowing human excrement; so the hunters hung some up for it in a container very high in a tree and the beast strove to jump in vain to seize its antipathetic flesh. With the efforts of the hunters, quickly led to total exhaustion, if we are to believe Aristotle. The geographer al-Idrisî (6th/12th century), speaking of the towns of Malindi and Mombasa on the coast of Kenya (Opus, i, 59-60), mentions that the natives (al-Zandî) hunt the panther, which is very abundant in this country, with red-haired mastiffs and that, as a precaution, they get the sorcerer who is called makankd, a sorcerer who is endowed with the power to bewitch the ferocious beasts, a procedure which, they claim, removes much of the danger.

In the whole of Africa, the main concern of panther hunters was to obtain intact skins of the animal of a kind that would be saleable; also, the best method of capture was and still is the trap-box snare (rughba, bidgîn, agywan, mighwd, mughawwa), built of solid wooden planks, crossed with strings tied to the triggers of guns levelled at the bait. When the beast returned to its prey, it was literally shot to bits and fell down, face to the ground and use the dagger to stab its belly and flanks of the beast who clung to his back. Indeed, such a method required, apart from muscular power, a rare courage and composure. The author does not say if there were many bold men to risk themselves in this dangerous exercise. Less hazardous was the method of encircling the beast with archers letting fly at it volleyes of arrows. A popular belief held that in order to put a panther to flight it was sufficient to show it a human skull. Here we meet again the fictions of Antiquity, such as the idea, among the Greeks, that the panther, intoxicated by absorbing leopard’s bane or “panther strangler”, sought a remedy for it by swallowing human excrement; so the hunters hung some up for it in a container very high in a tree and the beast strove to jump in vain to seize its antipathetic flesh. With the efforts of the hunters, quickly led to total exhaustion, if we are to believe Aristotle. The geographer al-Idrisî (6th/12th century), speaking of the towns of Malindi and Mombasa on the coast of Kenya (Opus, i, 59-60), mentions that the natives (al-Zandî) hunt the panther, which is very abundant in this country, with red-haired mastiffs and that, as a precaution, they get the sorcerer who is called makankd, a sorcerer who is endowed with the power to bewitch the ferocious beasts, a procedure which, they claim, removes much of the danger.

In the whole of Africa, the main concern of panther hunters was to obtain intact skins of the animal of a kind that would be saleable; also, the best method of capture was and still is the trap-box snare (rughba, bidgîn, agywan, mighwd, mughawwa), built of solid wooden planks, crossed with strings tied to the triggers of guns levelled at the bait. When the beast returned to its prey, it was literally shot to bits and fell down, face to the ground and use the dagger to stab its belly and flanks of the beast who clung to his back. Indeed, such a method required, apart from muscular power, a rare courage and composure. The author does not say if there were many bold men to risk themselves in this dangerous exercise. Less hazardous was the method of encircling the beast with archers letting fly at it volleyes of arrows. A popular belief held that in order to put a panther to flight it was sufficient to show it a human skull. Here we meet again the fictions of Antiquity, such as the idea, among the Greeks, that the panther, intoxicated by absorbing
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74 f.). In Kabylia, in the last century, when the natives (al-Zandî) hunt the panther, which is very abundant in this country, with red-haired mastiffs and that, as a precaution, they get the sorcerer who is called makankd, a sorcerer who is endowed with the power to bewitch the ferocious beasts, a procedure which, they claim, removes much of the danger.

In the whole of Africa, the main concern of panther hunters was to obtain intact skins of the animal of a kind that would be saleable; also, the best method of capture was and still is the trap-box snare (rughba, bidgîn, agywan, mighwd, mughawwa), built of solid wooden planks, crossed with strings tied to the triggers of guns levelled at the bait. When the beast returned to its prey, it was literally shot to bits and fell down, face to the ground and use the dagger to stab its belly and flanks of the beast who clung to his back. Indeed, such a method required, apart from muscular power, a rare courage and composure. The author does not say if there were many bold men to risk themselves in this dangerous exercise. Less hazardous was the method of encircling the beast with archers letting fly at it volleyes of arrows. A popular belief held that in order to put a panther to flight it was sufficient to show it a human skull. Here we meet again the fictions of Antiquity, such as the idea, among the Greeks, that the panther, intoxicated by absorbing leopard’s bane or “panther strangler”, sought a remedy for it by swallowing human excrement; so the hunters hung some up for it in a container very high in a tree and the beast strove to jump in vain to seize its antipathetic flesh.

Asadi gives details as to the manner of tackling the leopard’s bane or “panther strangler”, sought a remedy for it by swallowing human excrement; so the hunters hung some up for it in a container very high in a tree and the beast strove to jump in vain to seize its antipathetic flesh. With the efforts of the hunters, quickly led to total exhaustion, if we are to believe Aristotle. The geographer al-Idrisî (6th/12th century), speaking of the towns of Malindi and Mombasa on the coast of Kenya (Opus, i, 59-60), mentions that the natives (al-Zandî) hunt the panther, which is very abundant in this country, with red-haired mastiffs and that, as a precaution, they get the sorcerer who is called makankd, a sorcerer who is endowed with the power to bewitch the ferocious beasts, a procedure which, they claim, removes much of the danger.

In the whole of Africa, the main concern of panther hunters was to obtain intact skins of the animal of a kind that would be saleable; also, the best method of capture was and still is the trap-box snare (rughba, bidgîn, agywan, mighwd, mughawwa), built of solid wooden planks, crossed with strings tied to the triggers of guns levelled at the bait. When the beast returned to its prey, it was literally shot to bits and fell down, face to the ground and use the dagger to stab its belly and flanks of the beast who clung to his back. Indeed, such a method required, apart from muscular power, a rare courage and composure. The author does not say if there were many bold men to risk themselves in this dangerous exercise. Less hazardous was the method of encircling the beast with archers letting fly at it volleyes of arrows. A popular belief held that in order to put a panther to flight it was sufficient to show it a human skull. Here we meet again the fictions of Antiquity, such as the idea, among the Greeks, that the panther, intoxicated by absorbing leopard’s bane or “panther strangler”, sought a remedy for it by swallowing human excrement; so the hunters hung some up for it in a container very high in a tree and the beast strove to jump in vain to seize its antipathetic flesh. With the efforts of the hunters, quickly led to total exhaustion, if we are to believe Aristotle. The geographer al-Idrisî (6th/12th century), speaking of the towns of Malindi and Mombasa on the coast of Kenya (Opus, i, 59-60), mentions that the natives (al-Zandî) hunt the panther, which is very abundant in this country, with red-haired mastiffs and that, as a precaution, they get the sorcerer who is called makankd, a sorcerer who is endowed with the power to bewitch the ferocious beasts, a procedure which, they claim, removes much of the danger.

In the whole of Africa, the main concern of panther hunters was to obtain intact skins of the animal of a kind that would be saleable; also, the best method of capture was and still is the trap-box snare (rughba, bidgîn, agywan, mighwd, mughawwa), built of solid wooden planks, crossed with strings tied to the triggers of guns levelled at the bait. When the beast returned to its prey, it was literally shot to bits and fell down, face to the ground and use the dagger to stab its belly and flanks of the beast who clung to his back. Indeed, such a method required, apart from muscular power, a rare courage and composure. The author does not say if there were many bold men to risk themselves in this dangerous exercise. Less hazardous was the method of encircling the beast with archers letting fly at it volleyes of arrows. A popular belief held that in order to put a panther to flight it was sufficient to show it a human skull. Here we meet again the fictions of Antiquity, such as the idea, among the Greeks, that the panther, intoxicated by absorbing leopard’s bane or “panther strangler”, sought a remedy for it by swallowing human excrement; so the hunters hung some up for it in a container very high in a tree and the beast strove to jump in vain to seize its antipathetic flesh.
The name of the panther is connected with the
noun numra, pl. numra “small spot”, synonym of
nukta, on account of its hide, which is dotted with spots
of trade and export to the lands of Europe and Central
Asia. Al-Mas'ūdī mentions furthermore the more impor-
tant import into the Near East and Turkey of leopard
skins for the saddlebag of cavalry. Al-Idrīsī notes (Opus
iii, 311) the tanneries treating these skins in Barka
[q.v.], a port from which they were exported; they
reached there from East Africa (the land of Sofāla) by
transit caravans through the Libyan oasis of Awjilīa
[q.v.]. In the Maghrib, Kayrawān and Gafsa were for,
tanning, two reputed centres, which is confirmed, in
the 10th/16th century, by Leo Africanus (ed. Scheler,
tii, 80, 163-9); all these tannery skins went to the
Turks of Central Asia, Byzantium and as far as the
peoples of the Danube and southern Russia (see M.
Lombard, La chasse et les produits de la chasse, 578).
For the Near East, Aden was the centre of trade in the
skin of the leopard called barbari (sc. of Berbera), from
its place of origin; via the Arabo-Persian Gulf, the skins
reached Baghdād and Cairo, where they were given a
final dressing. Pseudo-Dāhīz provides interesting
comments on the choice of these skins from Berbera
(Tabassur, tr. Pellat, 158) in these words: "(12) The best
skins of panthers (numūr) are those of Berbera
(barbari), with spots on the flanks (muwanṣabāhak),
the clear parts being very spotted, the black parts very
dark, with long spots recalling the plumage of a start-
ing (1') (ābānī). The most sought-after skins are those
which combine a small black streak in the middle of the
hide with an evident, black point. If the black spots are joined by
a light black streak (gazīyya), it is even more beautiful.
A skin containing red with shiny (yādak) white and very dark black is more beautiful and more
expensive. The panther skins of Berbera are small and
one of them is hardly sufficient to cover a saddle; the
maximum price of a skin is 50 dinār. The skins of the Maghrib are larger and larger but they
not fetch a high price and are not of superior quality.
The most beautiful skins are those with designs." It
is also known that skins came from India and, even,
live animals, as the author later confirms: "(14) Imports from India are: tigers (bab), panthers (nimr),
elephant, panthers skins -...", and "(15) Imports from
Barbary and the borders of Maghrib include pan-
thers." These skins were certainly transported to
menageries of some great rulers. In the 6th/10th
century, the caliph al-Muktadir (295-320/908-32)
was particularly interested in wild animals, creating, near
his "Palace of the Pleiades" (Dār al-Thurayya), a
zoological and hunting park (hayr al-wuhādī), of which
the menagerie numbered a hundred animals; it was
thus a reminiscence of the famous parks of the
emperors of Persia. Al-Makrizī (9th/15th century)
forms us (Khitat, ii, 587) that the live captured
panther served, in Nubia, as tribute (bakt [q.v.] in kind; also,
after the suppression of the revolt of the Nubian
king Dāwūd by the sultan Baybars al-Bundukdār
[q.v.] in 674/1276, the annual tribute was three
elephants, three giraffes, five female panthers, a hun-
dred redhaired camels and four hundred cattle. As for
modern times, the inconsiderate tapping practised for
one or two centuries of the natural stock of panthers in
order to satisfy tastes for luxury (saddlery, military
uniforms, decoration of living rooms, feminine
fashion) and the curiosity of the public (amusement
parks, menageries, circuses) has led to a limiting and
severe control of captures, indeed, to a total protec-
tion of the species in the East as well as in the states of
the Maghrib and in the great natural reserves of
Africa and Asia.
The name of the panther is connected with the
noun nūmra, pl. nūmrā "small spot", synonym of
nukta, on account of its hide, which is dotted with spots
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and, after the external appearance of the animal, namir was applied to a "dappled" cloud, just as the derived adjective namar describes the dappled grey coat of the horse; namira also designates the black and white variegated cloak, as well as the black ink of the writing contrasting with the white of the page. Apart from analogies with the typical coat of the panther, its irascible and vicious character is at the origin of the following metaphor fulân labisa li-fulân jûdl al-namir "So-and-so wore the panther's skin in regard to so-and-so", to define a break in relations between two individuals who have become hostile to one another, hence the meaning of the verbs namira, nammarra, tanannarra, synonyms of ghâdira "to be irritated, angry".

Among the nomads are to be found the tribes of Namir, Numayr, Numâra and Anmâr, the latter being a section of the Khuzâ'â; all these tribal groups derive their names from patronyms such as Namir, Namîrûn, Namûrûn, quite current in the pre-Islamic period. Toponomy also supplies mentions of places where the panther was once present. Thus in Palestine, in the land of Moab, are to be found Tell Nimrin and the wâdi of the same name, a tributary of the left bank of the Jordan, 15 km/10 miles to the north of the Dead Sea. This valley sheltered, in Antiquity, panthers and other carnivores. Two such names are also given to a rock in its jungle. In embossing techniques, these same "panther strangler" and "panther killer" designate the Panther strangler, Leopard's bane (Doronicum pardaniches, compositeae); the same two names are also given to two ranunculuses, the roots of which were once used in the making of poisoned bait to kill harmful carnivores. These two names are also found on the Black majeleen (Cardopatium corymbosum, compositeae). The expressions shufjanyâr al-namir (in the Yemen) "panther tree" and hammiyât al-namir "panther arch" describe the African asparagus (Asparagus africanus, liliaceae). Finally, the Ochna (Ochna inermis and O. parvifolia, ochnaceae) shrubs of tropical countries, are called syân al-namir "panther eyes" because of their flowers.

In the field of art, the motif of the panther seems to have been slightly eclipsed by those of the lion and cheetah; confusion between panther and cheetah reigned, most often, in the mind of the artists. In miniatures, carpentwork and ceramics, one recognises, however, the panther in the representations of the wild Persian-style parks and in the scenes of hunting such as was practised by the Sâslânid rulers. Some very realistic animal "designs" of the Timurid-Persian school (9th/15th century) show us the animal in its jungle. In embossing techniques, these same hunting scenes, more or less stylised, are found with several plants. As mentioned above, khânîn al-namir "panther strangler" and kâtil al-namir "panther-killer" designate the Panther strangler, Leopard's bane (Doronicum pardalianches, compositeae); the same two names are also given to two ranunculuses, the Wolf's bane (Aconitum leucomum) and the Monk's head (Aconitum napellus). The roots of these three plants were once used in the making of poisoned bait to kill harmful carnivores. These two names are also given to a rock in its jungle. In embossing techniques, these same "panther strangler" and "panther killer" designate the Panther strangler, Leopard's bane (Doronicum pardalianches, compositeae); the same two names are also given to two ranunculuses, the roots of which were once used in the making of poisoned bait to kill harmful carnivores. These two names are also found applied to the Black majeleen (Cardopatium corymbosum, compositeae). The expressions shufjanyâr al-namir (in the Yemen) "panther tree" and hammiyât al-namir "panther arch" describe the African asparagus (Asparagus africanus, liliaceae). Finally, the Ochna (Ochna inermis and O. parvifolia, ochnaceae) shrubs of tropical countries, are called syân al-namir "panther eyes" because of their flowers.

In the field of art, the motif of the panther seems to have been slightly eclipsed by those of the lion and cheetah; confusion between panther and cheetah reigned, most often, in the mind of the artists. In miniatures, carpentwork and ceramics, one recognises, however, the panther in the representations of the wild Persian-style parks and in the scenes of hunting such as was practised by the Sâslânid rulers. Some very realistic animal "designs" of the Timurid-Persian school (9th/15th century) show us the animal in its jungle. In embossing techniques, these same hunting scenes, more or less stylised, are found with several plants. As mentioned above, khânîn al-namir "panther strangler" and kâtil al-namir "panther-killer" designate the Panther strangler, Leopard's bane (Doronicum pardalianches, compositeae); the same two names are also given to two ranunculuses, the roots of which were once used in the making of poisoned bait to kill harmful carnivores. These two names are also found applied to the Black majeleen (Cardopatium corymbosum, compositeae). The expressions shufjanyâr al-namir (in the Yemen) "panther tree" and hammiyât al-namir "panther arch" describe the African asparagus (Asparagus africanus, liliaceae). Finally, the Ochna (Ochna inermis and O. parvifolia, ochnaceae) shrubs of tropical countries, are called syân al-namir "panther eyes" because of their flowers.

In the field of art, the motif of the panther seems to have been slightly eclipsed by those of the lion and cheetah; confusion between panther and cheetah reigned, most often, in the mind of the artists. In miniatures, carpentwork and ceramics, one recognises, however, the panther in the representations of the wild Persian-style parks and in the scenes of hunting such as was practised by the Sâslânid rulers. Some very realistic animal "designs" of the Timurid-Persian school (9th/15th century) show us the animal in its jungle. In embossing techniques, these same hunting scenes, more or less stylised, are found with several plants. As mentioned above, khânîn al-namir "panther strangler" and kâtil al-namir "panther-killer" designate the Panther strangler, Leopard's bane (Doronicum pardalianches, compositeae); the same two names are also given to two ranunculuses, the roots of which were once used in the making of poisoned bait to kill harmful carnivores. These two names are also found applied to the Black majeleen (Cardopatium corymbosum, compositeae). The expressions shufjanyâr al-namir (in the Yemen) "panther tree" and hammiyât al-namir "panther arch" describe the African asparagus (Asparagus africanus, liliaceae). Finally, the Ochna (Ochna inermis and O. parvifolia, ochnaceae) shrubs of tropical countries, are called syân al-namir "panther eyes" because of their flowers.
poet settled at Basra, where he seems to have spent the last years of his life.

Al-Namir (according to Abū Hātim al-Sindjāstānī, apud al-Mubarrad, Kāmil, 185, and Ibn Durayd, Iṣbīli, 153, one should read al-Nāmil) was nevertheless the most prolific poet of the Middle Ages such as al-Kazwīnī [q.v.], al-Dājīhī and al-Dāmīrī, reproducing the statements of Aristotle, Pliny the Elder and Aelianus, added nothing to these forms of distinction. Their only contribution was to supply the nicknames (kaṣya) given to ants in local dialects including, for the male, ḍūḥā majshād and, for the female, ūmū ṭawba and ūmū mazān.

Since early Antiquity, ants have been an object of admiration on account of their prescience, the feverish and noisy activity with which they provide for their sustenance and the perfect organisation of their societies. The Bible refers to them as an example (Proverbs, vi. 6-8, xxx. 24-5). With the arrival of Islam, Muslims were obliged to consider them a privileged “race” (umma), since the Kurān, in the sûra al-Nāmil (XXVIII, 18), recalls the legend attributed to Solomon who, arriving with his army in the “Valley of the Ants” (Wādī l-umnām) in Syria, is supposed to have heard the sentinel of the local population calling to his companions to return with all possible speed to the ant-hill (karaṭ al-umnām, ḍūḥāmajshāma, mānmla) to avoid being trapped underfoot by the soldiers. Solomon smiled, seeing here a direct message from the Most High who had granted him the supernatural gift of understanding the language of animal and, in particular, that of the birds. However, according to Abu Ḥātim al-Sindjāstānī, who, held captive among the Asad, had been offered as a present to the Elder and Aelianus, added nothing to these forms of distinction and the perfect organisation of their societies.

Bibliography (in addition to references given in the article): Ibn Sallām, Taḥdīb, 1347-7; Dājīhī, Bayān, index; idem, Hayawān, index; idem, Bukkālī,5 ed. Ḥāḍirī, 150, 210, 346-7 (biography); Ibn Kutasbīy, Ṣhir, 173-4; Buḥtārī, Ḥamās, index; Kurāštī, Dājmār, 1091; Mubarrad, Kāmil, index; Ḥāṣani, Dάjmār, xvi, 199-103 = ed. Beitr., xxxviii, 287-302; Baghdaḍī, Khizinā, Cairo 1299, i, 153-6, iv, 435-42; Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Ṣaḥāḥ, in margins of the Išāba, s.v., 759-81; ʿAškalanī, Išāba, no. 8802; Abkārūs, Raswat al-adab, 281-2; O. Rescher, Abrisi, i, 115; Ḥaẓ al-Dīn Ṣālāḥ, in RAAD, xxxviii (1962), 367-8; Blachère, HLA, 266-7; Ziriklī, Aḥlām, xii, 22; Sezgin, OĀS, i, 222-3, iv, 271 (with fuller bibl.) (CM. PEIT) (NAAL, A.), substantive of a collective nature (unitary noun namlī, pl. nimālī, namalī, numalī) denoting ants (Persian namal, mīr, Turkish karıncı, Tamahāk anellūq; pl. anellūqān, Hebrew nemalāh, pl. namalīm. These hymenopters living in organised societies comprise more than 1,600 species worldwide, and are divided into two groups: “formicines” (genera formica, camponotus, lastius) which do not possess an aggressive sting, and “myrmicines” (genera myrmica, tetramorium, aphenogaster) which are thus equipped. These classifications being of interest only to specialist entomologists, the majority of laymen, in the Arabic and Berber world as elsewhere, differentiate between the numerous species of ant only according to the external criteria of size, colour and behaviour. For the city-dweller as for the nomad, there are only large or small ants (ḏijīr, ḍabāb) or, in addition, those which sting or bite and the harmless ones, although certain of the latter are capable of spitting a corrosive liquid, formic acid (hand namalī) causing severe burns. Similarly, attention is often paid only to the colour, with black ants on the one hand and yellow-red ants on the other. Arabophone naturalists of the Middle Ages such as al-Kazwīnī [q.v.], al-Dājīhī and al-Dāmīrī, reproducing the statements of Aristotle, Pliny the Elder and Aelianus, added nothing to these forms of distinction. Their only contribution was to supply the nicknames (kaṣya) given to ants in local dialects including, for the male, ḍūḥā majshād and, for the female, ūmū ṭawba and ūmū mazān.

The “specific qualities” (ṭhawāṣ) attributed to ants tend to be negative. Thus the cocoons, if ground to a powder and applied to the skin, prevent any growth of hair. In order to disperse and put to flight a group of persons, it is enough to throw at them a few of these ants; these include smothering the ant-hill with ground carraway (karāwyā) or cumin (kammīn) or to spray with rue-water (ṣabāh) or tar-water (kīrūn) or to grind sulphur (kībīr) in the vicinity. Finally, ants will not approach an object on which the stained linen of a menstruating woman has been placed.

According to Kurānīc law, the consumption of ants is absolutely forbidden, as is the consumption of the cocoons or false “eggs” (ḥayāl, maʿżūn, mazān, ḍūḥā; ḍūḥā āṣa; kāsirīya, ḍīhām) and of the foodstuffs (ẓāḥil, ẓubūl) which the workers transport with their mandibles and their feet.

The “specific qualities” (ṭhawāṣ) attributed to ants tend to be negative. Thus the cocoons, if ground to a powder and applied to the skin, prevent any growth of hair. In order to disperse and put to flight a group of persons, it is enough to throw at them a few of these cocoons; a concoction of these taken in the dose of a dirham entails severe intestinal disorders. Finally, an ointment composed of seven large ants soaked for a day and a night in a solution of calomel (dūhn al-ziʿbāk) and smeared on the sexual organs is reckoned to be a powerful aphrodisiac. In oneiro-
NAML — NAMRUD

NAMRUD, also Namrud, is a Namrud of the Bible, is associated in Muslim legend, as in Haggada, with the story of the childhood of Abraham. The Kur'an, it is true, does not mention him but probably, as in many other cases, only from dislike of mentioning names. That the legend of Namrud was known is evident from the following verses. “Do you not see how he disputed with Ibrahim about the Lord who had granted him dominion? When Ibrahim said: It is my Lord who gives life and death. Namrud replied: I give life and I slay. When Ibrahim said: God makes the sun rise in the east; do you make it rise in the west; then the liar was humbled’” (II, 260/258).

The Kur'an exegists are probably right when they see Namrud here disputing with Ibrahim and also when they refer to Namrud the verse: “What did Ibrahim’s people answer? The only said: Kill him, burn him; but God saved him from fire.” (XXIX, 22/24).

The legend is already richly developed in al-Tabari, but it is at the beginning of the romance of ‘Antar in the Abraham midrash that we find its most luxurious development.

Al-Tabari already numbers Namrud among the three or (with Nebuchadnezzar) four kings who, like Sulaymân b. Dawîd and Dhu ‘l-Karnain, ruled the whole world. His astrologers told him that a child would be born who would overthrow his kingdom and destroy his idols. Ibrahim thus becomes one of those heroes of legend who are persecuted from the moment of birth by a tyrant, to whom they are destined to prove fatal, like Moses, Gilgamish, Semiramis, Sargon, KaroA (in the Mahâkhâtate), Trakhân (King of Gilgit), Cyrus, Perseus, Telephus, Aegisthus, Oedipus, Romulus and Remus, Jesus (see Frazer, Folklore in the Old Testament, ii, 437-55). Usha, the wife of Azar of Târikh (Terakh), is able to deceive Namrud and his searchers. Ibrahim is born in concealment; maturing rapidly, he engages in a religious disputation with Namrud; Namrud cannot be God, for God gives life and death. Namrud replies that he can do this also, for he can raise the dead and also when he is at the beginning of the romance of ‘Antar in the Abraham midrash that we find its most luxurious development.

Finally, ants encounter some formidable enemies among birds, with the Woodpecker family and in particular with the Wryneck (Jynx torquilla) which is called ka’dedekkum, ahu lidaway, malawwa according to Arabic dialects and which is not much larger than a sparrow.

A Namrud is a popular character in Islamic literature and folklore. This character has many similarities to the Romulus and Remus story (Jean de l'Ours) and culminates in the Oedipus story for Namrud, brought up unknown, kills his father and marries his mother. Al-Kisâhî has preserved this version and it is given at greater length in the introduction to the romance of Antar.

Namrud's father Kana'an b. Kûh has a dream which troubles him; it is interpreted to mean that his son will kill him. The child is born, a snake enters his nose, which is an omen sign. Kana'an wants to kill the child, but his mother Suhâbâ' entrusts him secretly to a herdsman; the latter flees scatter at the sight of the black flat-nosed infant. The shepherd's wife throws the child into the water; the waves wash him to the bank where he is suckled by a female panther. Already dangerous when quite a boy, as a young man he becomes a robber leader, attacks Kana'an with his band, kills him (without knowing that he is killing his father), marries his own mother and becomes king of the country and later lord of the world. Azar (already in the Kur'ân the father of Ibrâhîm) builds him a marvellous palace flowing with milk, oil and honey, with mechanical singing birds—in the mediaeval epic, the wonderful feature of the Chrysoctricinum in Byzantium. The lore of astrology, the inheritance of Idrîs and Hermes, he acquires by force from the pupils of Idrîs. Iblîs teaches him magic. He was himself worshipped as a god. Then dreams, voices and omens frighten him. In spite of all Namrud's cruel orders, Ibrâhîm is born, brought up and soon shatters the belief in Namrud. Namrud throws those who believe in God to the wild animals, but they do not touch them. He denies them food; the sand of the desert becomes corn for them; on every grain of it is written "gift of God". Namrud throws Ibrâhîm into the fire but he is unharmed. Namrud builds up a pile of fuel, the flames of which burn the birds for miles round—it is impossible to approach it. Iblîs then designs a ballista which hurls Ibrâhîm on to the flaming pile. Ibrâhîm spends the finest time of his life there under blooming trees and amid rippling brooks. Namrud then decides to attack the God of Ibrâhîm in heaven. Starved eagles fly up with his litter, until he hears a voice saying that the first creature to be slain was Adam, 500 years in width, it is 500 years between heaven and heaven, then comes infinity. Namrud shoots an arrow against God; the arrow comes back stained with blood. Namrud suddenly becomes grey and old and falls to the ground. But he prides himself on having slain God. Then a gnat puts an end to his life.

The history of the Namrud legend. Very little can have been taken from the Bible. Kur'ân expositors and collectors of legends call Namrud Djâbbâr (tyrant) no doubt after the gibbor applied to Namrud in the Bible (Gen. x. 6); Geiger also sees in Djâbbâr 'antîl (xi, 62) an allusion to Namrud. Al-Tabari (i, 217) also describes Namrud as a mutâdâbbîr. Muslim legend and Haggada (Targ. Stem on Ezaheir 1, i; Midr. Hagadot, ed. Schechter, 180-1; Gaster, Exempla of the Rabbis, N. 1) make Namrud ruler of the world. From Haggada comes the association of Namrud with the Tower of Babel and, in particular, with the childhood of Abraham, and with the latter's rescue from the fire (Gen. Rabbâ, xli, 1.). The death of Namrud caused by the gnat is also based on Haggada, which makes Titus, the destroyer of the Temple, die in this way. Nebuchadnezzar comes to a similar end (see Grün- baum, Neue Beiträge, 97-9). The flight to heaven, especially, in the romance of Antar, with the intervals of 500 years, recalls the ascent of Nebuchadnezzar in the Talmud (Chagiga, p. 13a). But the flight has far more resemblance to that of Shâh Kay-Kâwûs as described by Firdawsi (ed. Mohl, ii, 31-4).

The Namrud legend borrows from many directions. Al-Tabari (1, 253) mentions that Namrud had been identified as the Persian Daâbâk [see ZAHAH], but he refrains from giving a definite date. In 97-9 he is called Haggado, Haggadot, Sifer ha-yâjîbâr, Şèhet Mâsîr of R. Eliaj Hajjakhon from Smyrna, is influenced in the section of Abraham and Nimrod by Muslim literature.

true Arabic word *namūs* (root n-m-s), which exists alongside of the Greek loanword, and meanings like "the trusted one, confidant of a secret" seem rather to come from the Greek loanword already known in its reference to Dījbrīl (against Dozy, *Supplement*, s.v.), it was natural to look for a specific use of the word ḥāūs which admitted of a personal interpretation and could at the same time have been known to the Arabs. Nyberg was reminded by the *namūs* doctrine of the Ikhwān al-Ṣafāʾ (see below) of the pseudo-Clementine writings, and Tor Anandar described the *namūs* of the Waraka tradition from the sense *al-dār al-nāmūs* of the pseudo-Clementines, which according to the book *Kūgūya Ḥīrūn* was revealed to Adam, and afterwards again appeared to all prophets worthy of such an honour, lastly, to Moses and to Jesus. However startling the agreement of the conception of ḥāūs of the later forms of the Waraka tradition, the question still remains open, by what way a personal conception of ḥāūs could have entered Islam. Baumstark quoted a passage from the liturgy of St. James of Jerusalem, *kalīlīs aṭ-ṭūn bīn dīnāmā (*q. v. *), which, as with the natural forces (ii, 102) and (iii, 39) with the nature of origin and decay. Above the third in humble prostration before the Creator, conception of the spiritual kingdom is the place of God. But in several passages of the *al-Qudūs* are defined as "mosquito net" and "buzzing insect" as *nominis agentis* from n-m-s to "buzz" (for this sense, see section 2. below). On the other hand, not only the meaning "cunning" and its derivatives must be secondary, but also the already-mentioned meanings referred to persons, the latter especially because the word, so far as we know, is used also in the later literature predominantly in the material sense and the person connected with the idea is called *jāhīl al-nāmūs*, etc. (counter-example: Dozy, s.v.). Just as the material meanings predominate generally, so also does the meaning of the Greek loanword predominate, apart of course from the old poetry, from which the meaning "midge" and particularly the word *nāmūsyya* "mosquito net" have survived into the modern vernacular. Below we shall therefore deal only with the development of meaning of the Greek loanword.

The favourite meaning is divine law, with or without the addition of ḥāūs. This law is revealed through the prophets, and only men of prophetic spirit can be *waḏīl al-nawwām* in this sense. The double character, political and religious, of the Muslim constitution naturally very much favoured this conception. Thus, for example, al-Kalkaghāndi, *wāḏīl al-athon*, i, Cairo 1903, 280, gives as the first among the *al-Qudūs* "tīm al-nawwām al-muṣallākh bi l-nubuwwa. Ibn Sīna expressly observes in his *al-Qudūs* (r. a.s., Cairo, 230-1) in treating of politics that the pertinent works of Plato and Aristotle understand by ḥāūs not "cunning" and "deceit", corresponding to the usage of the vernacular, but *sunna*, revelation, etc., for the laws of the community are dependent on prophecy and the divine law; similarly Sprenger, *Dct. of technical terms*, i, 40, Abu l-Hayyān al-Tawḥīdī devotes the fourth of his *Mukhāsāt* to the *nāmūs* ḥāūs (ed. Cairo 1929).

Here we may mention Miskawayh's definition which is also of literary interest. In connection with his discussion of the function of the *dīn* as a measure of the equivalence (*sadīd*) of service and reward (*Tahdhib al-ϊbāh, makāla iv, Cairo, Khayriyya, 1932, 38; Fr. tr. M. Arkoun, *Traité d'éthique*, Damascus 1969, 181-2), he quotes an alleged saying of Aristotle according to which the *dīn* is a just *nāmūs*. *Nāmūs*, he adds, in striking contrast to Ibn Sīna, means in Greek, *sēdai* and *tadīr*; Aristotle says in the *Eth. Nic.* that the greatest *nāmūs* proceeds from God, the second is the judge, the third the *dīn*; the first, as a condition for just settlement between the claims of men, is the example which the two others follow. As a result of these expositions, the *al-Qudūs* in the economic part of his book (ii, 2, 254), calls gold briefly the smallest *nāmūs* (tr. in Plessner, *Der oudoorszeks* des Neupthagoreers *Bryson*, 1928, 63); and Kinnâlīzâde also follows him (ii, 7).

The *namūs* doctrine of the Ikhwān al-Ṣafāʾ can only be briefly outlined here. In part i, 56 (Bombay ed.), the first *al-Qudūs* is defined as "the place of God. But in several passages of the encyclopaedia he is represented as giving names. Thus he calls the *al-Qudūs* by the ancient Greeks on the first, middle, and last day of the month. The night of the first day was divided into three parts. The first was spent in worship of *nāmūs*, the second in meditation on the malakūs, the third in humble prostration before the Creator, confession of sins and repetition of prayers by Plato, Idrīs and Aristotle until the break of day (iv, 273 ff.). Nevertheless, the *nāmūs* here has not exactly taken the place of God. But in several passages of the encyclopaedia he is represented as giving names. Thus he calls the spirits of the planets angels (ii, 97, cf. iv, 244); he does the same with the natural forces (ii, 102) and (iii, 10) with the nature of light and decay. Above the three spheres (*dawr*) of the three kingdoms of nature and of man is the sphere of the divine *nāmūs*, whose members deal with the affairs of the *nawwām* and the divine revelations and which corresponds to the "sur-
rounding") (ninth) sphere of the astronomers (iv, 251). As the namūs and the ability to become creative in him involves a special organisation of man, he has found an allegoric place in the physiology and psychology of the škhwn al-Šafāʾ, here indeed the conception changes from page to page. Thus in the first part of the work (second half, 48), five kinds of soul are described, two above and two below that of man. The former two are the soul of the angels and the divine (kadrīya) soul, one of which is the stage of the soul of wisdom, the other the namūs-like angel soul. On p. 54, we find the following gradation: nature, soul, intellect, namūs. Nature receives through the soul free will, through the intellect the power of thought and through the namūs commands and prohibitions. The parts of the soul are as follows: vegetable, animal, logical (human), intellectual (wise), namūsiyya, angelic, which latter serves the namūs. Here again there is the tendency to personification. It is in keeping with this when in iv, 119 (cf. also iv, 146), the story of Socrates in prison (in agreement with the Greek tradition and mentioning the Phaedo), it is related that Socrates will not escape from prison for fear of the namūs; he justifies his attitude with the words "He who does not respect the namūs is slain by it" (iv, 133). The name seems to have been identified with the sharīʿa, it is difficult to say whether this is serious or only done out of caution. It is nevertheless remarkable that the sixth essay of the fourth part which treats of the nature of divine namūs, of the qualifications for prophethood and the qualities of a prophet, does not contain the word namūs at all, but instead of it always has sharīʿa. The škhwn have spiritual powers of their own; these form a series of four stages, the third of which is the kwusu namūsiyya; man attains it at 40 and it is the special characteristic of kings and rulers. Possessors of this power are called the distinguished and noble (fudalaʾ, kīrām) brethren. Above it is only the kwusu malakīyya (iv, 134-5).

The origin of the meaning "cunning" cannot be given with certainty; it possibly comes from the Arabic gnūŪbas or gnūūba, "to conceal". That it was particularly common in the spoken language is evident from the quotation given above from Ibn Sina. In any case, this meaning has undergone a remarkable amalgamation with the Greek "law" in the literature of magic, for the word is there used for magical formulae, particularly those which are based on illusions of the senses. The pupil of al-Anṭākī [as] in his Ḍhayl on the latter's Tadhkira, s.v. šimāʾa (iii, Cairo 1924, 56), gives the namūsī as the first section of the science known by this name. But the meaning of the word is not limited to this kind of magic formulae.

Through translations from the Arabic, the word entered the Hebrew literature of the Middle Ages with the meaning "law, religious law (of other peoples), morality, propriety"; in the latter meaning it has survived in the modern Hebrew vernacular. It is interesting to note that in the modern dialect of Mecca, a similar change of meaning is found; according to Snouck Hurgronje, Mekkanische Sprichwörter, no. 10, namūs means the "spotless, honorable name", which one has among men; its opposite is ār, "shame".

The word namūs also occurs as the title of a book; cf. Ivanow, Catalogue, i, 335-6. 


2. In zoology. Here, namūs is a masculine noun used in the collective sense (unity, namūsa) denoting the totality of dipterous, nematocerous insects or mosquitoes and embracing the family of Culicidae, which includes Gnat (Culex pipiens), Anopheles, Stegomyia (= Anopheles coronalis) and Malaria (Stegomyia fasciaca), Aedes (Aedes cantans, A. aegypti) and Phlebotomi (Phlebotomus papatasii). In all these species, only the females bite humans and animals to feed on their blood.

The root n-m-s evokes either the notion of being hidden, of concealing oneself, since mosquitoes emerge only at night and spend the day immobile in dark and damp places, or the notion of the colour dark, the adjective armad being a synonym of armad and akdar. Besides the sense of mosquitoes, namūs is the "hide" or the ditch in which the hunter squats to watch for game; it has the same sense as karmūs, zarb, zariba, kutra. In fact, with reference to mosquitoes, namūsa (less often namūs) is a term exclusive to Egypt and to the Maghrib; it seems to have been unknown in the Near East and it has gradually superseded baṭdaʿ which, with ḥarba and ḥamūs, was the only term known in the time of the Prophet Muhammad to denote harmful insects. Thus it is said in the Qurʾān (II, 4/26): "Allāh does not disdain to give a parable about a gnat (baʿādaʿ) or that which is greater." In the Arabic, mosquitoes are called bekā, a collective term which in the Maghrib denotes bed-bugs (Cimex lectularius), while in Syria Culicidae and Phlebotomi are known as djirīsi or kīrīsī.

The life of the mosquito is linked to an aquatic environment, and its larva (daʿāmūs, pl. daʿāmūti) can develop only in stagnant water; thus the places infested with mosquitoes (maḥdaʿil) in the lands of Islam are the marshy zones of the deltas of the Nile and of the Tigris-Euphrates, the baṭīḥ, the domain of the buffalo (dāmūs [s.v. in Suppl.]). This creature protects itself from the attacks of the mosquito by keeping itself immersed or by covering itself in mud, as is also the practice of elephants, bovines and the wild boars of Africa and Asia. Al-Damiri relates (Ḥaṣā, i, 121 ff., ii, 339) that in ancient times the tyrants of Mesopotamia used to leave to the mosquitoes the task of executing, with their bites, those whom they had condemned to death, leaving them, with hands and feet tied, in the marshes. Describing the marshy zones of the deltas of the Nile and of the Tigris-Euphrates, the baṭīḥ, the domain of the buffalo (daʿāmūs [s.v. in Suppl.]), al-Dhajjāb recounts (Ḥayawān, v, 399-400) the quick death of a sailor who, following an argument, was thrown into the marsh by
his drunken ship-mates and suffered the same fate. He also mentions that, according to legend, the city of 

Nanak's followers were distinguished by the title of (namus), referring to the Day of Judgment and the wealth accumulated by the powerful of this world. On the other hand, seeking to show that this present, lower world has some importance for Allāh, the Prophet also said: "If for Allāh, this world weighed no more than the wing of a mosquito. He would not grant an infidel one mouthful of water." Finally, to express a cheated hope, the Moroccans have the following saying, complete with assurance: "I thought I saw a fig-tree bearing figs (karmūs) and now I see it was only a ruin infested with mosquitoes (namūs)."


Nānak, commonly called Guru Nānak, Hindū religious reformed born in the village of Talwandī some 50 km/50 miles south-west of Lāhawr, in 874/1469, some half a century after Kābir [q.v.] and died in 945/1538; there is much in common between the two teachers, both in the rejection of formal Hinduism and in the acceptance of ideas derived from Islam, especially an uncompromising monotheism. The Talwandi district was well forested, and the young Nānak is said to have resorted often to the religious recluses who had settled there, Hindū and Muslim. He is said to have learnt Persian, in order to assist his father in accountancy, and also to have rejected investiture with the Hindū sacred thread, and to have spent many years in wanderings and meditation; he attracted followers, and the poems used in their worship have been preserved in his Īdī Granth, including many by other religious reformers, but especially Kābir.

Nānak cannot be said to have influenced Islam in India directly, although an indirect influence is tangible through his effect on the intellectual climate of his age; for this saw the growth of the bhakti movement in Hinduism, a movement directed to individual and direct devotion to, and the personal experience of, a relationship between God and Man, to the displacement of priestly authority and dependency on formalised and ritualised expressions of worship. There was much contact between Hindūs and Muslims who had settled there, Hindu and Muslim, including many by other religious reformers, but especially Kābir.

In literature, mosquitoes have given little inspiration to poets, which is understandable. However, al-Dājāgh has been able to collect (Ḥayawān, v, 402-9) a few scattered verses, most of them in rajīg metre and by anonymous writers, evoking the rustlings of these insects (makhlūkāt) and mosquitoes (muḥdūd) as the time of their flight, and swats (sunūn) and swifts (sharrūt) who chase and devour mosquitoes that have perched on the walls; but he does not forget the equally important role played in this respect, by spiders (iii, 336, iv, 295, v, 411, 415).

In contemporary usage the mosquito, by its tiny and fragile constitution, has given rise to metaphors such as (aḏḡīb min ba’āda "more puny than a mosquito" and, to define something practically impossible to obtain, the saying is a’azz min makhlūk al-ba’āda "more rare than the marrow of a mosquito". Still with the notion of insignificance, a ḫadīq of the Prophet states (īdī yāxīn ʿind Allāh dīnāb ba’āda "(this) will not weigh, for Allāh, even as much as (the weight of) a wing of a mosquito", referring to the Day of Judgment and the wealth accumulated by the powerful of this world. On the other hand, seeking to show that this present, lower world has some importance for Allāh, the Prophet also said: "If for Allāh, this world weighed no more than the wing of a mosquito. He would not grant an infidel one mouthful of water." Finally, to express a cheated hope, the Moroccans have the following saying, complete with assurance: "I thought I saw a fig-tree bearing figs (karmūs) and now I see it was only a ruin infested with mosquitoes (namūs)."

Bibliography: The fullest account is in M.A. Macauliffe, The Sikh religion, 6 vols., Oxford 1909. Useful shorter accounts are in N. MacNicol, Indian
NANDÉR, a town situated in 19°9'N., 77°-20'E., a former district headquarters in Haydarabád State, now in Maháráhrá, on the north bank of the River Godávarí. Once a fort of the Káaktu dynasty, it was conquered early in the 8th/14th century by 'Alá' al-Din Kháldjí [see dhilí sultánát], passing through Tughrúk hands to the Bahmanís; on the disintegration of the Bahmani state it passed to the Khúth Khán of GoIánd, forming a defence on their north-east front with the Nížám Sháhís of Ahmadnagar, and apparently was later in the possession of the latter since a mosque at Nándér was built by Malik 'ánár [q.v.]. In 1009 Iláhí/1601 the Mughal forces engaged Malik 'ánár in battle at Nándér, putting him to flight (Abú 'l-Fadl, Akhár-námá, iii, 791 f.; tr. iii, 1185-6); it seems that Nándér finally fell to the Mughals after Sháhjáhi's arrival in the Deccan in 1046/1636. Hereafter its history is vague, until a Maráthá clan captured it about 1100/1698. The last Sikh gúrú, Govind Singh, pursued by Mughal forces, eventually made his way from the Pandjáb and settled in Nándér, where he was stabbed by an Aqfání in the Mughal service in 1120/1708. There appears to be no reliable description of Nándér, which is said to have a Kúb Sháhí mosque as well as that of Malik 'ánár, the shrines of several Muslim saints, and the gurudwára of Gurú Govind Singh, a pilgrimage centre for Sikhs from all over India. The town is noted for very fine gold-edged muslin.

Bibliography: Imperial gazetteer of India, xviii, 349-55. (J. BURTON-PAGE)

NANDURBAR, an ancient town of India in west Khándehsh [q.v.; Map], situated in lat. 21°22'N., long. 74°14'E., in the valley of the River Tápétí and formerly an important trade centre. As Nándigrá it is said to have been founded by Nanda Gawlí, a local tribal chief, and it is asserted that it remained in his family "until conquered by the Muhammadans under Mún-ud-dín Chishtí" [JGP, xvii, s.v. 362-3, Nándér]; this source is unreliable, and perhaps refers to an early Súfí settlement. Its possession seems to have changed at various times between Gudjarat and Khándehsh [q.v.; see HINDUSHAHIYYA and GHAZNAWIDS]. The last two dynasties of the Sháhis, of Gudjarat, were good with the Mughal powers while Radja Rádja of Khándehsh, and a Khándehshí general was chased from Khándehsh by the Mughal advance on Malwá and the depredations of the Nížám Sháhís [q.v.] of Ahmadnagar. Relations were good with the Mughal Nawír Khan Khán was alive, but after his death in 1005/1597 fighting for the Mughals against a Deccan confederacy, relations worsened until in 1009/1601 Khándehsh was annexed and became a súba of the Mughal empire.

West Khándehsh and the Nándürbár region appear to have been less disturbed than the east, and the district was so well-known for its fertility (grapes, melons) and its strategic position on trade-routes that an English factory was established, English factors moving here from Ahmadábád in 1080/1670. But all Khándehsh declined under the Maráthás [q.v.], and Nándürbár was half-deserted by the time it was occupied by the British in 1816. Bibliography: Nándürbár is mentioned sporadically, though not at any great length, in the chronicles dealing with Gudjarat, Malwá, and Khándehsh; for these see the Bibl. to FÁRÍKÍDS.

NANGRAHAR, NINGRAHAR, the name of the province of modern Afghanístan (post-1964 administrative organisation) which covers essentially the basin of the middle Kábíl River from the Pakistan frontier near Landá Khal to a short distance to the west of the province's administrative centre, Djalalábád [q.v. in Suppl.] and the mountain regions on each bank. Before Lánghmán and Kunaf provinces were carved out from it in 1964, Nangráhar province extended northwards to include Núristán (L. Dupree, Afghanistan, Princeton 1973, 156-7).

The name itself goes back to the pre-Islamic period and to Buddhist Gandhara, when it had the form Nagararáhá, whence the Chinese form Na-kì-lo-ha in the travel account of the early 7th century Buddhist pilgrim Hiuen-Tsang (Marquart, Évén.-hru., 284; Abdur Rahman, The last two dynasties of the Sháhi, Islamabad 1979, 14). In early Islamic times the region formed part of the kingdom of the Hindúsháhí before being conquered by Sebúktígin and his son Máhmúd of Ghazná [see HINDUSHAHIYYA and GHAZNAWIDS]. The name appears only sporadically in the Islamic geographers, in particular, in the Hudúl al-álam (end of the 4th/10th century), tr. Minoroky, §§ 6.13 and 10.50, tr. 72, 91, comm. 252-3, which describes Nínhár as a district whose ruler made a show of Islam but whose population were largely idol worshippers. Hence the use of this toponym in modern Afghaní administrative geography is a revival. The present population of the province is largely composed of Pashto-speaking Pushtús, but there are also Páshtú-speaking speakers [see AFGHÁN, i, ii, and DARDIC and KAFIR LANGUAGES].

Bibliography: Given in the article. See also KAFIRISTÁN and LÁMGHANÁT. (C.E. BOSWORTH)
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the fire of Sinai (XX, 10, XXVII, 7-8, XXVIII, 29), three to fire as punishment (II, 266, XXI, 69, XXIX, 24), one to celestial fire as proof of the prophetic mission (III, 183), one to fire as a sign of divine omnipotence (LV, 35).

Al-Djahiz (d. 255/868-9) devotes a lengthy section of his K. al-Hayawdn to fire (ed. Hārūn, Beirut 1388/1969 v, iv, 461-92, and v, 4-148, with numerous digressions). This section, intitled "Fires and their varieties" is located at the end of a chapter dealing with the male ostrich, and the connection is established as follows: "The fire of the stomach (of flying creatures) is unlike the fire (obtained) from flint and stone". This statement emerges from an anecdote describing how a precious stone swallowed by a male ostrich diminished in size by a half during the time that elapsed between the swallowing and the discovery of the fact. However, what this stone lost in weight it gained in colour and as a result its value was increased.

In this section al-Djahiz proposes to study "the full range of knowledge concerning fires and their varieties, concerning the role of each of them, concerning those attributed to non-Arabs and those attributed to Arabs". Furthermore, he declares his intention to speak of fires of religious and non-religious nature, of those who have venerated them also called the nār al-hawla, of those who have elevated their veneration of fire into the status of a cult. There will also be mention of the places where the cult of fire has been implanted (iv, 461). There follows a list of different types of fire, a list interspersed with long digressions and frequent repetitions.

The present article will proceed to examine material relating to fire in the Kurān and in ancient Arabic writings, a subject tackled by T. Fahd in Le panthéon de l'Arabie Centrale à la veille de l'hégire, Paris 1968, 9-18, and in Le feu dans le Proche-Orient antique, Leiden 1973, 43-61. Fires will be discussed in the following order: those of religious nature, those of tribal nature, and others.

1. Nār al-Kurān ("the fire of the sacrificial offering"), also called nār al-rūd (the fire of acceptance), a fire established by God to test the sincerity of the Children of Israel and the purity of their intentions. This fire recalls Kurān, III, 183, but also Genesis, iv, 3-5 (the offerings of Cain and Abel) and I Kings, xviii, 21 ff. (Elijah on Mount Carmel). Ibn al-Aṭṭūr (Kāmil, i, 40) establishes a link between this fire and the account in Genesis. He writes: "After Kābīl (Cain) had killed Hābīl (Abel) and fled before his father to the Yemen, Hīlās came to him and said: "If the offering of Hābīl was accepted and consumed by the fire, it is because he served the fire and worshipped it; you too should set up a fire which will be for you and for your posterity". He then erected a pyre (bāyāt nār) and was also the first to build (a sanctuary for) the fire and to worship it".

2. Nār al-Aḥrām ("the fire of Abraham"). In two instances the Kurān speaks of the punishment by fire inflicted on Abraham by his polytheist adversaries, before his departure from Mesopotamia (XXI, 69, XXIX, 24). It is not impossible that this fire could be a reminiscence of Daniel, iii, 13 ff. (the three Hebrews in the furnace). Traditional accounts collected by al-Ṭabarī in connection with Kurān XXI, 69, reveal certain similarities to the Biblical version. Here it is stated: "They imprisoned him in a construction built for this purpose, collected a great quantity of wood and piled it up beneath this construction. Then, Abraham looked up towards the heavens. Heavens, earth, mountains and angels said: 'Lord God, Abraham is about to be burned for our sake!' — 'I know that better than you', God replied, 'If he calls on you for help, grant it.' Abraham addressed God, saying: 'O God, You are the only one in Heaven and I am the only one upon earth, since no one other than me worships You. I place my trust in You!' He was pushed into the fire. The Archangel Gabriel said then: 'O fire, be for Abraham coolness and protection!' The fire was extinguished at once and Abraham was seen in the company of another man who wiped the sweat from his brow and said: 'I am the angel of the Shadow. Abraham came out and was introduced to the king, in whose presence he had not been previously'" (Tafsir, xxvi, 29).

3. Nār Sīnā ("the fire of Sinai"). This fire is mentioned in the Kurān and in ancient Arabic writings, a subject tackled by T. Fahd in Le panthéon de l'Arabie Centrale à la veille de l'hégire, Paris 1968, 9-18, and in ISTISKAND. For further details, see Pantheon, 10 ff. and ISTISKAND.

4. Nār al-sītāb ("the fire of rejection"), called also nār al-tahdluf wa 'l-hilf, refers to a practice dating back to the earliest Antiquity. In times of prolonged drought, the people gathered together all the cattle which they could find; then they tied to their tails and between their knees branches of cisse (sala') and calotrope (ṣubar), made them climb to a barely accessible peak, set fire to the branches and raised to the sky their cries of supplication. They believed that this could cause rain to fall. The poet al-Walīd b. Hisham al-Kahdhāmin (d. 222/837) says in regard to this: "How great must have been the delusion of those who sought to obtain rain in time of drought by means of ṣubar! [How did you conceive the idea] of taking cattle adorned with ṣubar as intermediaries between God and you?" (quoted by al-Djahiz, Hayawān, iv, 468).

5. Nār al-niṣba ("the fire of intimidation"), a sub-group of the Banu Murra b. κ. al-Hayawdn, was called the name of intimidating them with the crackling sound. Hence the name nār al-bawala (the fire of intimidation) which is sometimes given to it. A kākin [q. s.] presented over the ceremony; it was he threw the salt in the fire (Aqānī, ed. Cairo, xx, 39, i. 38); he is called al-muḥawwil (the intimidator) and the fire nār al-ḥifān in a verse of al-Kumayt (d. 126/743), quoted by al-Nuwayri, loc. cit. In another verse of Aws b. Ḥadāḳ (6th century A.D.), this fire is called nār al-muḥawwil (the fire of the intimidator).

There also existed a pact involving salt called al-tāhāfūt wa 'l-ṭākhāfūt (the 'salt of pact'), the term could be analogous with the 'salt of the covenant' of Leviticus, ii, 13, but which is understood otherwise by al-Djahiz who gives to the term milh (salt) two mean-
ings: the first being marka, “meat soup” and the second laban, “milk”, while in Arabic lexicography, milh denotes, in addition to the current sense of “salt”, the term whose antiquity is disputed by the “author”, “butter” (samm), “the sacred thing”, in particular the alliance, the pact (burma, kifl, dhıım), “knowledge” (‘ıım) and “scholars” (‘ulama”), in the sense of Matthew, v, 13. Mulha is the benediction (baraka), the witticism (al-katima al-malıha), it is also whiteness, by analogy with that of salt and, hence, fine colour, attractive face (malıha), Mumelıha, “term whose antiquity is disputed by the author of the TA (ii, 233, 1, 29), is the act of breaking bread with someone and sharing food, an act which symbolises the establishment of sacred and privileged links by the consumption of salt, present in the food or distributed to the commensals, as among the Hebrews, at the beginning of the meal. It is said that salt (milh)—currently bread and salt (quka usa-milh)—exists between Person A and Person B when they are linked by a pact, an alliance. It is stated in TA, ii, 233 1. 13: “The Arabs venerated salt, fire and ash”, and a little further on: “The Arabs swore by salt and water on account of the reverence that they had for them” (1. 19).

6. Nár al-muğdĮ (“the fire of the traveller”), also called nár al-tard (“the fire of return”). It was lit after the departure of an unwelcome guest, in the hope that he would never return. It was applied in particular to those who came to claim blood reparations or to collect the proceeds of ransom or tribute. The following formulaic curse was then declared: “May God take him far away for ever! May he light (usa-auska in al-Dāhīzh, usa-auska in al-Nuwayri) a fire after him and upon his footsteps!”

7. Nár al-ı� (the fire of hospitality”). This was one of the marks of origin, a pact, a term whose antiquity is disputed by the author of the TA (ii, 233, 1, 29), is the act of breaking bread with someone and sharing food, an act which symbolises the establishment of sacred and privileged links by the consumption of salt, present in the food or distributed to the commensals, as among the Hebrews, at the beginning of the meal. It is said that salt (milh)—currently bread and salt (quka usa-milh)—exists between Person A and Person B when they are linked by a pact, an alliance. It is stated in TA, ii, 233 1. 13: “The Arabs venerated salt, fire and ash”, and a little further on: “The Arabs swore by salt and water on account of the reverence that they had for them” (1. 19).

8. Nár al-salama (“the fire of safe return”), lit on the return of a traveller, arriving home safe and well and anticipating a successful outcome from his journey (al-Nuwayri, i, 111, not mentioned by al-Djahiz).

9. Nár al-barb (“the fire of war”), also called nár al-ındĮ (“the fire of warning”) and nár al-ıwa (“the fire of preparations for war”), lit on high ground to warn those who were far away and to summon them to a muster. When the attack was imminent and the muster urgent, two fires were lit simultaneously. Ibn al-Rümî (d. 285/896) mentions them in this verse: “There are two fires: the fire of hospitality and the fire of war. You see them both glowing” (quoted by al-Nuwayri, i, 111; al-Dāhīzh, v 133 (1. supplies other quotations). Ibn al-Muğdıwīr, Ta-rık al-Mustahşır, ed. O. Löfgren, ii, 214, speaks of luminous signs which marked the route of the Rādāräd, linking Nadj-rāın with Baṣra.

10. Nár al-fida (“the fire of ransoming”), lit, after a raid, by the victorious tribe. It signified, for the leaders of the defeated tribe, that they could come and reclaim that which the victims were willing to give back, and redeem that for which a price was demanded. This encounter took place at night, on the one hand to spare captive women the shame of exposure in broad daylight, and on the other, to enable the victors to conceal the real value of the things that they chose to keep, those which they were prepared to give back, and those for which ransom was demanded (a fire mentioned by al-Nuwayri, i, 112; no mention in al-Dāhīzh).

11. Nár al-ğabd (“the fire of treachery”), lit on al-Akbāhāb, the mountain overlooking Mūnā, during the Pilgrimage, to denounce the treachery of a patron towards his protegé (ġār). This was accompanied by a proclamation in these terms: “Such is the treachery of such a one” (al-Nuwayri, i, 111, not mentioned by al-Dāhīzh).

12. Nár Muzdālifa (“the fire of Muzdalifā”), inaugurated by Kuṣayy [q.v.], reformer of the cult at Mecca. It served to guide pilgrims in their nocturnal journey between ’Arafa and Muzdalifā, at the very beginning of the Pilgrimage (see bārān; mentioned by al-Nuwayri, i, 109, not mentioned by al-Dāhīzh).

13. Nár al-şayd (“the fire of the hunt”), lit for the hunting of gazelles and young ostriches. These animals are dazzled by the fire; similarly the lion, on seeing it, stops and stares at it; the frog stops croaking. Thus, they can be taken by surprise. This fire is also used for seeking out the eggs of the ostrich in hollows and crevices.

14. Nár al-ğāf ("The fire of the ogre"). The nomadic Arabs believed that ogres (gğām) aggresses (al-dĮl) and djinn lit fires to lead travellers astray.

15. Nár al-salim (“the fire of the bitten one, lit., of the safe and healthy, by antiphrasis), lit to keep awake one who has been stung by a snake or a scorpion, or bitten by a rabid dog (al-Nuwayri, i, 112; omitted by al-Dāhīzh, who speaks instead of the suspension over the bitten person of jewels and small chains which keep him awake with their tinkling, Hayawdn, iv, 24).

16. Nár al-şarām (“the fire of branding”), lit for the purpose of branding livestock. It denotes the different marks placed on the herds. When someone was asked: “What is your fire?”, he replied: Ǧlāl (“broad mark”) on the neck of a camel, or .createFrom("i") (“long mark”) in the same place, or Ǧhālān (“mark on the thigh”) which may be long or broad (as in the case of the Banū Salīd) or halāka (“round mark like a ring”) on the thigh or on the base of the ear, etc. (cf. Ibn Sīdā, Muşhāsas, viii, 154-6; simāt al-Ćib). With the aid of these marks of origin, knowledgeable persons could distinguish the qualities and defects of camels offered for sale.

There exists a series of fires which are more in the nature of proverbial or metaphorical expressions. A selection follows:

17. Nár al-ḥulābāb: this denotes any fire which is seen but cannot be put to practical use (the glow-worm, sparks from flint or from horse-shoes). Al-Dāhīzh compares it with the nár al-barb, quoting the saying of an Arab nomad: “The fire of the lightning renews the greenness of the branches, while any other fire burns them”, since the lightning presages rain (Hayawdn, iv, 488).

18. Nár al-ţulābāz wa t-hurāţ: this denotes the absence of fire; since these outcasts and fugitives cannot run the risk of lighting fires, lest they be located.

19. Nár al-mišda (the fire of the stomach): this refers to the organic fire of digestion. Good health depends on its strength, its weakness causes ill-health (al-Nuwayri, i, 114; not mentioned by al-Dāhīzh).

20. Nár al-şamud (“the fire of fever”). In this regard, it is said: “The fires are three in number: a fire which neither eats nor drinks, this is the fire of the Afterlife; a fire which eats and drinks, this is the fire of fever which consumes the flesh and drinks the blood; a fire which eats and does not drink, this is the fire of here
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below” (al-Nuwayrî, i, 114; not mentioned by al-Djähîz).
22. Ndr al-sâ’rub (“the fire of youth”).
24. Ndr al-shârub (“the fire of drink”).
25. Ndr al-shâdâd (“the very hot fire of tamarisks”).
27. Ndr al-hâliâf (“the fire of the alfalfa which flares up and withers with equal rapidity”).

Finally, two fires of a quite specific nature should be mentioned:
28. Ndr al-ithâyâl (“the fire of guile”). This refers to tricks which priests, guardians of sanctuaries (sadâne), performed with fire to deceive the people. Al-Djähîz mentions the trickery of the monks of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, in the Church of the Resurrection, but in the Tanbîth (ed. Sâwî, Cairo 1357/1398, 123), fire appears on Holy Saturday (al-sâ’rub al-kabîr) in the church built by Saint Helena. This appears to be a reference to the Faacha candle.
29. Ndr al-barratayn (“the fire of the two barras, two volcans”). This is a reference to the Harrat layla of the Banu Murra and the Harrat al-nâr of the Banû Ghatafan, both situated close to Medina. This fire forms part of the legend of the Arab prophet Khâlid b. Sinân who was sent by God to extinguish it (for details, see Le feu chez les anciens Arabes, 56 ff.).

Yâkût, s.v., lists twenty-two barras dispersed between the east of Hawrân and Medina. The best known is Harrat al-nâr near Khaybar; it was still active at the dawn of Islam, under the caliphate of ’Umar. Medina is situated between the Harrat Wâkîm, to the east, which last erupted in 652/1254 (the lava failed to reach Medina) and Harrat Wabra, situated to the west of the town, at the start of the road leading to Mecca.

Regarding the cult of fire, Arab polygraphs have accumulated a considerable amount of data testifying to the influence of Iranian culture in Arab circles. According to al-Djähîz, this cult, deriving from excessive initial veneration, has existed among all peoples. In particular, there was adoration of the celestial fire (Kur’ân, XXVII, 24): the cult of the Sun at Safa; the Sun, the Moon and Venus worshipped by the persecutors of Abraham (Kur’ân, vi, 74; XXXVII, 86, XLI, 37). The People of the Book make the appeal to God: “Do not let the fire in my home be extinguished” (cf. Leviticus, vi, 6). This is why fire is lit night and day in synagogues, churches, places of worship (buyât al-‘ibâdât, buyât al-nîrân, in al-Nuwayrî, i, 107). Well-paid employees of the cult (sadâne) are assigned to the maintenance of fires in sanctuaries (buyât). Al-Mas‘ûdî, Murûdî, iv, 72-86 = §§ 1399-1412, supplies a long list of places of worship in the Sâ’idân empire, a list subsequently reproduced by heresiographers like al-Shahrastânî and by encyclopaedists like al-Nuwayrî.

Concerning the various philosophical conceptions of fire, inspired for the most part by the Meteorologies and the Treatise on sensation and sensibles of Aristotle, al-Djähîz has preserved a lengthy disputatio between one of his masters, al-Nâqzâm the eminent Mu’tazîli, and his opponents. It is followed by a series of reflections on fire and on colours (Hawâwân, 5 ff., 81 ff.).

Bibliography: In addition to the sources and studies cited in the article, see Thâlîbî (d. 429/1038), Tâhmâr al-kalijî, ed. Cairo 1326/1908, extracts from which have been translated by F. von Hammer-Purgstall and published in German in ZDMG, v-xix (1852-5), ix (1855), 572-6, where the principal source of information concerning fire is Djähîz; Nuwayrî (d. 732/1332), Nihaqât al-arab, Cairo 1923-7, i, 103-9; Kalkashandî (d. 821/1418) Subh al-‘a’râf, ed. Cairo 1313-8/1913-9, i, 409-10, xiv, 398-402 (the Tatars); Al-Raghib al-Isalesî, Muhdarât al-adâbî, ed. Beirut 1961, iv, 622-6; Alâî (d. 1340/1923), Bishîq al-arab fi mufradât al-tâbârîn al-ârâfî (Athdr-i ta’rikhi-yi shahrastanî, ed. Sawi, Cairo 1924).
him to God and called him "the Shadow of God" (Narakî, Takdis, Tehran, 1954, 4,9). To legitimise and support his rule, Narakî went as far as to quote a hadîth reported on the authority of the Seventh Shî' Imâm, that "if the Shî' is just, do ask God to perpetuate his life; if he is tyrannical, you should ask God to lead him to the right path because your being righteous is dependent upon your sultan's rightness" (Narakî, Mi'ridor al-sa'âda, Tehran n.d., 360).

Despite his friendly relations with the Shî' and his legitimisation and admiration of the Kadjar rule in his popular books, in dealing with the Shî' theory of government in a book meant to be read by the student of religion, he refused to recognise the legitimacy of the Shî's rule. In this line of discussion, Narakî refers to nineteen hadîths through which he argues that, during the Greater Occultation (ghaybat-i hubra) of the Twelfth Imâm, and after the death of the latter's four Specified Agents (nuwwâb-i khdss), it is only the qualified fakhsîs who carry the authority of the Hidden Imâm as his General Agents (nuwwâb-i 'imâm) and are genuinely legitimate rulers of the Muslim community (for more details on this subject, see Abdul-Hadi Hairy, ShFim and constitutionalism in Iran: a study of the role played by the Persian residents of Iraq in Iranian politics, Leiden 1977, 55 ff.). Basing himself on another hadîth reported on the authority of the Prophet Muhammad, Narakî considers the fakhsîs as "the trustees of the Prophet", and warns the Muslims to dissociate themselves from those fakhsîs who are tied up with kings ("A'to'â'd al-qiyâm fi ba'yân kázâzâd al-akâm wa-muhimmât ma'âl' al-hâlîl wa l-hâmîl, 1913, 185-8).

As is obvious, this type of argumentation shows a vole-face in Narakî's approach to the problem of rule and legitimacy. The latter line of argument, which provided an important source of reasoning for the founder of the post-1979 régime in Persia to formulate his own theory of government put into operation in 1399/1979 ([Rûh Allâh Mûsawî], Hukmatât-i Islâmî, 1971; for an English tr. of this book, see Khumayni, Islam and revolution: writings and declarations of Imam Khomîney, and annotated Hamid Algar, Berkeley 1981, 27-166).

In the third type of his treatment of the problem, Narakî not only does not attempt to legitimise the rule of either the king or the fakhsî but rather he renounces both of them. In some of his lyrics and mystical poems, he regrets his past activities which were in favour of the Shî', remarking, "I disdain to be associated with the royal crown and throne" (az tâbî'-u takht-i sultânî 'sâr asît) (Narakî, Ghâzâlî-â Mullâ Ahmad Narakî mutâlakillî bi 'Safà, ed. Akhtâr Narakî, 1972, 118-9, 121). He also condemns all things related to asceticism (zuhâ), the prayer-carpet (sâkhâqâda), the rosary (zubba), the religious college (ma'drasa), the people, the Islamic preachers and the fakhsîs; he even declares the latter to be barriers to progress (sadd-e 'râh u mânî'î-nâ' takmil shafa') (Narakî, Takdis, 104, 279, 323). In fact, being a religious leader, Narakî was in practice himself a target of his own criticism.

The explanation for these contradictory views seems to be that Narakî in theory believed in the legitimacy of the 'ulâmâ'î's rule. In reality, however, power and authority were in the hands of the Kadjar ruler who at the same time needed the 'ulâmâ'î's support to protect "the Islamic territory" (bayâd-yi Islâmî) against internal corruption and external invasion. Consequently, Narakî gave his full support to Fâh 'Ali Shâh, especially when the latter was involved in the long, bloody wars with the Russians in the years 1219-28/1804-15 and 1242-4/1826-8. In this connection that Narakî declared a dâkhâh against the Russians (M.T. Lîsân al-Mulk Sîphrî, Narakî al-ta'âvîrârî: salâmî-i Kâdžârîyâ, Tehran 1974, i, 184); and, according to Wilcock, he even, in 1241/1826, "arrived at the royal camp clad in shrouds" as a sign of his own "preparation for jihad and martyrdom" (cited in Hamid Algar, Religion and state in Iran 1785-1906, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1969, 89).

Narakî's criticism of Islamic customs, institutions and even the fakhsîs suggests that he did not find contemporary Islamic society—as well as the custodians of religion, including himself—on the right path, but since he was not able to break with the community, he acted reluctantly in harmony with its displeasing characteristics.

In the arena of religious polemics, Narakî was certainly not inactive. In 1226/1811 when the British Protestant clergyman, Henry Martyn, wrote a treatise in Persian against Islam, a number of Persian men of the pen and religious leaders including Mullâ 'Ali Nûrî, Mullâ Rîdâ Hamadânî and Narakî wrote books in refutation of Martyn. Narakî's refutation appears to have enjoyed a wider readership as it was, it seems, the only book of this nature which did not remain in the form of a manuscript. (For a detailed treatment of this subject, consult Hairy, Nâsikh al-rîyâyât-â-yi tâdâqât-âr-î Fânî dâ khu târîkh-i Tabriz, n.d., vi, 160-3, and the various sources cited there).

Bibliography: In addition to sources cited in the article, see Abdul-Hadi Hairy, The legitimacy of the Qajar rule as viewed by the Shî'î religious leaders, in MES, xxvi/v (1980), 271-86; Ridâ Kull Khlân Hidayât, Bâzârat al-safî-yî Nâsirî, Tehran 1960, ix, 645; Ahmad Kazemi Mousavî, The establishment of the position of Marja' 'a'yt-î Tajîlîd in the Twelver-Shi'î community, in Iranian Studies, xviii (1985), 35-51; Sa'id Na'îrî, Târîkh-i igitmânî-i tala'i sâkhâ-yi Iran dar dawâ-yî mu'âsir, Tehran 1965, ii; Mullâ Ahmad Narakî, al-Kâzâz-în, 1890; Mirzâ Husayn Nûrî, Mushâbakh al-uwâsî, Tehran 1903, 304.

(ABDUL-HADI Hairy)

NÄRANJ, Arabised substantive borrowed from the Persian narang (derived from the Sanskrit, with the meaning of "red") and designating in a collective manner, in parallel with lâyânûn, hesperidene or aurantaceae fruits, including oranges and lemons (modern Arabic hamdiyyân). The term naranj has passed, at a relatively late stage, along with the introduction of these fruits, into the majority of European languages, sometimes with alterations (less in the initial n). Thus, at the beginning of the 14th century A.D., French adopted the expression "la pomme d'oreigne", while Spanish preserved the Arabic form with naranga. Arabic dialects have also retained
NARANDJ, but under the forms naranj, naranj in Syria, Lebanon and Palestine and laranj, laranj in Morocco. It is surprising that Ibn Manzur (7th/13th century) made no mention of the term naranj in his copious Liyan al-'Arab. Furthermore, it should be noted that in some Arabic-speaking countries, naranj is not the prevalent term for the designation of hesperidous fruits; the names in usage are those which refer to the prevalent term for the designation of hesperideous narandj is not the modern botanical science has created putrakilikut (Turkish portakal) which has supplanted naranj in numerous local dialects; modern botanical science has created putrakilikut to define these fruits. In Western Europe, the Crusaders are credited with the introduction of oranges and lemons, whence, for the latter, the Old French name ‘poncire’ (from the Provençal ‘pomisire’—Syrian apple).

From the scientific point of view, the hesperidous or aurantiaceous fruits are classed in the family Rutaceae, and as fruitgrowers began, by artificial means, to increase the number of types and varieties, the latter were distinguished in Arabic by local names other than naranj which seems to have been applied originally to the Bitter, or Seville orange (Citrus aurantium amara or vulgaris or bigaradia) also called naffash. The Common orange (Citrus sinensis Osbeck) is known, besides naranj, by the names Abi suffixay, suffixay, and in the Yemen, ghum. The Mandarin orange (Citrus aurantum deliciosa, nobilis, madurensis) is known as Yusuf Afsandi, yasif. The Grapefruit tree or reddedj (Citrus decumana or macarica) is the zanba, zanba.

Among lemons, it is the Cedrate tree or Adam’s apple (Citrus medica Riso, var. cedreta) which bears the greatest number of names with urtj, urtdj, urtdj, urtundj, urtundj, urtundj, urtundj, matk, matk, matk, kabadh, khabadh, tuffadh mail, tuffadh mai and, in the Maghrib, kas, karis. As for the Bergamot orange (Citrus bergamia), native to southern Italy, although called laymun addiya, it is often confused with zanba-urtdj, or with the Grapefruit tree, the perfume known as bergamot (urt tif barghamad) is extracted from it. The varieties of lemons are all included in the collective substantive larnim, larnim, lim, differentiated by the adjectives hamiid for the Common lemon (Citrus medica) and halim for the Sweet lemon tree (Citrus aurantum aurantiifolia or lorma). The laymun baladi or banzahr is the Egyptian small lime (Citrus lemonum pusilla).

The well-known legend of the ‘Golden apples of the Hesperides’ (τὰ Ἑσπεριδῶν χρισταὶ μῆλα) guarded by the Nymphs, daughters of Atlas, and the Dragon, plucked away and carried away by Hercules for his eleventh ‘labour’, a truly daunting task, has given rise to various hypotheses regarding the location of this fabulous orange-grave. It is supposedly located in Mauritania Tingitana, near the Phoenician trading-centre of Luxus (Larache), or in Cyrenaica, in the city of Hesperis (Benghazi), or in Spain, near Gades (Cadiz), or, finally, in the ‘Fortunate Isles’ (al-Khaddid), the Canaries. All these imaginary interpretations are an invitation to contemplate the existence of a distant memory of the introduction, at a very early stage, of certain fruits of this kind into the western Mediterranean region, and the Phoenicians may well have had a hand in this.

It is impossible to ignore the primal place which citrus fruits of all types have occupied and continue to occupy in culinary preparations, as well as in baking, confectionery, perfumery and the making of refreshing drinks; orange-trees and lemon-trees supply flowers, fruits and leaves suitable for all these purposes. Arab authors writing about the culinary art in the Middle Ages have left us a large number of recipes and descriptions in which these fruits play a major role. Thus in the range of perfumes, odiferous powders include a powder made from the Cedrate tree (urtundj) and another from orange-blossom (zahriyya). Among drinks, orangeade and cedrate syrup were known; acidic juices were obtained from lemons and bitter oranges. Among cooked dishes, familiar lemons are used with orange blossom water in the juice of the bitter orange (naranjiiya) or the lemon (laymiiyya) or with the pulp of one or the other (sum-madiiya). These fruits could also be salted and preserved. One of the major scented waters obtained by distillation continues to be orange blossom water (ma’zahr), an effective means of enhancing the flavour of desserts. Finally, the buds of the blossom of the bitter orange provide, in perfumery, oil of Neroli (‘yr kaddah, dehn al-) first extracted, in the 17th century, by an Italian princess of this name. Arab agronomists, geographers and travellers of the Middle Ages have mentioned, in their works and accounts, citrus fruits and the places where they were cultivated. Thus following al-Idrisi, in the 7th/13th century the Andalusian Ibn al-`Awwâm, in his Kitâb al-Filbâh, quoting the text of the Kitâb al-nubatiyya (see FILHA), repeats that the Hesperides emanate from India. In the following century, the Moroccan Ibn Baštîa, having spent a considerable period of time in that country, specifies three varieties which are cultivated there, one sweet, one bitter and one between the two called ‘zahna, a kind of sweet lemon the fruit of which is salted while still green.

In literature, oranges and lemons have made some appeal to the imaginations of Arab poets; over the space of three centuries, from the 3rd to the 9th/9th to 11th, at least four major poets are known to have evoked the golden fruits. The first is Ibn al-Mu’tazz [q.v.] who, in three verses (faww metre, -ni rhyme) compared the orange with the cheeks of young maidens and, in two verses (arn metre, -ni rhyme), with a golden apple used in a game of polo which was apparently caught up in the foliage. Lemons are for him, in two verses (same metre, same rhyme), golden phials of perfume. In the following century, in three verses (same metre, same rhyme), clearly patterned on those of Ibn al-Mu’addin, Kašadîm [q.v.] refers to the contrast between the golden oranges and their emerald foliage. The same poet evokes the same image of gold against a background of emerald.

NARDIS, the narcisus, in Turkish nergis, in Persian nargis (a fine example is his dâliyya, DTwdn, ed. R. N. Frye, [1990], 40); nevertheless the doubts raised by T. Noldeke already shows the contracted form

25-6) remain valid, especially in view of the fact that the place name New Hormizd Ardashir > Ardashir", was contracted to (widely attested in Pehlevi treatises, Murudj, icographers and continue to have their supporters. We learn that the board had twenty-four (twice Persian with thirty (twice fifteen) men ("dog") to put one's hand in pork meat and blood (Concordance, vi, 405). This could be modified, in the name of Abû Hurayra, to read: "One who plays nard with stakes (kîmâr) is like one who eats pork; one who plays without stakes is like one who puts his hand in pig's blood; and one who watches the game is like one who looks at pork meat" (al-Bukhârî, al-Ahâlî, ed. M. F. 'Abd al-Bâkî, Cairo 1375, 326-8). However, it does not seem possible for us to document in detail any influence of the jurists' negative consensus on the popularity of the game.

Nard was in no way comparable to chess, with which it is often mentioned in one breath, but in a story that originated in the heyday of the Mu'tazila in the early 3rd/7th century, it was praised—no doubt, as a form of relaxation—to play a nard-like game only in order to be really enjoyed, it also required the time was lost when playing, as Ibn Badjdja put it (P. E. Littinck, Ta'rikh, ii, 367, quoting, he says, 'Ughmân al-Khayyâr's Wasâyya li 'l-dâliyya wa l-liyaqâs). For artistic representation of the backgammon board, from a Sâsânid silver bowl to the famous manuscript of Alfonso el Sabio and to a Skîh-nâmâ illustration, see, for instance, M. Rosen-Ayalon, in JSAS, iv (1984), 78, pls. 4, 7; A. Steiger, Libros de axedrez, dados e tablas, in Romanica Helvetica, x, Geneva-Zürich 1941, pls. 73, 75, showing the use of three dice which distinguishes the Western from the Eastern game; and O. Jacoby and J. F. Rawdow, The Backgammon book, New York 1970, 12.


(F. ROSENTHAL)
The white colour of the petals and the yellow, red or brownish colour of the crown are the basis for most of the poetic images used in connection with the narcissus. The poets speak of "the eyes of the lady") is said to stand for "the secret of the states and the kadi also attended the inspections by the sadr-l azam (called kola djikmak, which started at...
Sultan Ahmed, and continued through the Eminönü-Unkapam-Zeyrek route). Those found not to conform were punished if they were not *dirlik* owners; otherwise, they were handed over to their officers. (Teok'ti *Ahdari mab'a purga-i hän-namem-i, 503-5).

In settlements other than Istanbul, *oşun* and *eşrâf* (the chief men) of the town also participated in the determination and control of the *narkh*. As a basis for the prices, the *narkh* values of Istanbul could be sent to the provincial cities (e.g., *Tehr-dagh* *sügli*, dated 1053/1643, 117a, and *Bursa* *sügli*, dated 1050/1640, 122, in Ankara Milli Kütüphanesi).


NARMAŞHIR, *Narmâşir*, a town and a district of eastern Kîrman [q.v.] in mediaeval Islamic Persia, lying to the south-east of Bam [q.v.], adjacent to the southern end of the Dâsh-i Lûr and on the road connecting Kîrmân with Sîstân. The classical Islamic geographers list the district as one of the five khanas of Kîrmân and describe the town as prosperous and populous, the resort of merchants who travelled from Khûrûsân to *Umân* and an emporium for Indian goods. It had a protective wall with four gates, a citadel and a congregational mosque constructed out of fired brick. As late as the 8th/14th century, Mustafâ describes the town as still in existence, but by the 19th century, when travellers such as E. Porter (1810) and Sir Percy Sykes (1895) traversed the area, it had disappeared. Its site seems to be marked by ruins at the site of a small village now known as Cughûkûbâd “Sparrow town”, administratively in the *bakhsh* or sub-district of Fahradj. *NARKH* — *NARNAWL* 965
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India [see Berar], in lat. 21°15’N. and long. 77°4’E., in the former Haydarbâd native state (now in Maharâshtra State), at the southernmost end of the Satpura hills. The fortress is presumably pre-Muslim, since Firuzâghâgh (Gûmân-i İbrâhîm), second son of Shih Shah, was involved in the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857-8, hence the town was afterwards awarded to the loyal Mughal prince, *Bhârîm*. There is evidence of all phases of Indian Muslim building, from early Dîhl sultanate, through Khâdji, Tughlûkûd and Lûdî, to early and late Mughal and to Mughal-inspired Râjdîpî. The earlier phases are mostly to be seen in and around the *dârgâh* complex; many Lûdî-style buildings, frustratingly but typically undated, occur not only in Narnâwal itself but also sporadically all the way to Dîhl (at, e.g., Rewâr, Sûnhâ and Gurgâûn); the best example of the late sultanate styles is in the tomb of Ibrahim Khân Sûr, which stands within the *dârgâh* complex. Ibrahim was the grandfather of Shih Shah, and the building of this

**Bibliography:** See also *Imperial gazetteer of India*, xviii, 379-80; H.K. Sherwani and P.M. Joshi (eds.), *H. Historical gazetteer of Deccan*, ii, A.P. Govt., 1975, with full description of the gateway at 257 and illustration on Pl. xvii. (J. BURTON-PAGE)

NARNAWL, an ancient town of India, in lat. 28°3’N. and long. 76°10’E., in the modern Haryana State, some 80 miles south-west of Dîhl. It was probably (Ishwari Prasad, *Life and times of Humayun*, 95) the birthplace of Shih Shah, his family having been associated with the place for some time. But Narnâwal has much earlier Islamic associations, with the tradition that the *dârgâh* of Shih Shah was involved in the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857-8, hence the town could well be earlier, since the approach from a distance reveals it as an obvious *tell*; but unfortunately Narnâwal has not been excavated. In the 18th century it was at times held by Râjdîp princes and the Marâshî [q.v.]. Its Muslim Nawâb was involved in the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857-8, hence the town was awarded to the loyal Maharâshtra of Patâlî. There is evidence of all phases of Indian Muslim building, from early Dîhl sultanate, through Khâdji, Tughlûkûd and Lûdî, to early and late Mughal and to Mughal-inspired Râjdîpî. The earlier phases are mostly to be seen in and around the *dârgâh* complex; many Lûdî-style buildings, frustratingly but typically undated, occur not only in Narnâwal itself but also sporadically all the way to Dîhl (at, e.g., Rewâr, Sûnhâ and Gurgâûn); the best example of the late sultanate styles is in the tomb of Ibrahim Khân Sûr, which stands within the *dârgâh* complex. Ibrahim was the grandfather of Shih Shah, and the building of this
tomb was Shir's first preoccupation after his arrival in Dihll, having expelled Humayun in 947/1540. ... index;
idem, An historical geography of Iran, Princeton 1984,
89-90; Hudud al-‘alâm, tr. 103, § 23.9, comm. 326.

1. Nasā in Kur̄srānān was situated in the cultivated zone which lies north of the range separating Kur̄srānān from the Turkomun steppes, near the modern Ashkhabād in the Turkmen SSR. It corresponds to the Nišān, Nišān ‘ānān of the classical authors, celebrated for its breed of horses (Herodotus, iii, 106; cf. Strabo, xi, ch. xiv, § 7). Alexander the Great is said to have built an Alexandropolis at Nišān. According to Isidore of Charax, ed. W. Schott, Philadelphia 1914, 8, the tombs of the Parthian kings are near the town. According to S. Nāṣir, in JRAS (1839), 100, believed he saw in the stock of Turkomun horses descendants of the ‘ānān Nāṣiān (Avesta, Vīdēdī, i, 7, seems to have a different locali-
ty in view).

According to al-Ishârī, the town of Nasā was very like Sarakhs and had much water, many gardens and green places and the country round about was very fertile. Al-Tabrūzī, 332, says that the rich gates of the town were buried in verdure. He confirms the abundance of springs but says the water was not of good quality. Muhammad al-Nasawi, Strāt Dījāl al-Dīn, ed. Houdas, 22, says that the place was very unhealthy on account of its very hot and humid climate and that the Turks could only live a short time there. According to al-Nasawi, 50, the town had a strong ngl. name, but Muhammad b. Zufar abridged this, added info-
rma from other works, and presented this to the Sadr or spiritual leader of the Hanafis in Bukhara Burhan al-Dīn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz II b. Muhammad (see Bosworth, art. ‘Ala’ Borhān, in Ebr.). Finally, an unknown author added details in the Mongol period about the Mongol conquest of Bukhara. Thus the Persian text as we know it (ed. Ch. Schefer, Paris 1892, ed. Mudarris Rādawī, Tehran n.d. [ca. 1939]; Russian tr. N. Likoshin, Ta’khent 1897, Eng. tr. with comm. R. N. Frye, The history of Bukhara, Cambridge, Mass. 1954; cf. Storey, i, 369-70, 1300, Storey-Bregel, ii, 1108-12) must be much altered from its original form and sup-
plemented by other hands.

The Ta’rīḫ-i Bukhārā is very valuable for the early Islamic history of Central Asia and for the Ta’hirid and Sāmānīd periods there, with many details from local traditions going back to the pre-Islamic period and with information from otherwise lost works like ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muhammad al-Najdībī’s Ta’rīḫ-i Niṣābūrān and Muhammad b. Tālūt al-Hamadhānī’s Fawā’il al-šāhār and also from the work of the well-known historian ‘Alī b. Muhammad al-Madā‘īnī [q. e.] on the Arab conquest of Transoxania and the rise of the Sāmānīds.
Genealogy provides the historical validation of kinship and all that it involves. Kinship always dominated group life in human society and to a large extent still does today. In Arabia, the remarkable aspect of genealogy was its connection with tribes rather than individuals. With the coming of Islam and its social imperatives, combined with the enormous increase of people constituting society and the growing reduction of the Bedouin component, it could be expected that the power of kinship would change and diminish. However, kinship continued to remain a most important factor in Muslim society, for reasons such as the enduring determination of ‘nobility’ with its attending privileges on the basis of tribal descent (and descent from the Prophet and ‘Ali) and, for instance, the survival of pre-Islamic social custom, the strong trend toward heredity in the bureaucracy and in the crafts and trades, or the eventual domination of the scholarly establishment at certain periods by family relationships. This contributed to the continuous cultivation of a genealogical literature. By dint of their work, genealogists (nasabāṣ, sing. and coll., also nasāb, nasīb, pl. nasāb) exercised a certain influence which at times made their motives suspect; it is not by chance that an emphatic remark of the Prophet that genealogists could be liars is displayed prominently in the nasab literature (e.g. Goldziher, Muh. St., i, 180, Eng. tr., i, 166; Ibn al-Kalbi, Djamhara, ed. Hasan, 17; al-Baladhuri, Ansāb, i, 12; Ibn Kākdūn, ʿIbar, ii, beginning).

It appears clear that interest in genealogy somehow found its outlet already in pre-Islamic Arabia, in whatever language this may have been and regardless of whether one accepts or does not accept I. Shahid’s argumentation in favour of written pre-Islamic documents dealing with tribal relationships (forthcoming). There can be no doubt that genealogical relations were put into writing in the first century of Islam. Tribal registers for military and tax purposes are reported to have already been commissioned by ʿUmar [see ʿibān]. For the activities of the many dimly-remembered early genealogists such as Daghfal or Ibn ʿShaʿrīa [q.v.], we have no reliable historical information; at any rate, they appear to have found no expression in authentic published works. But literary genealogical writing—first, it seems, dealing mostly with individual tribes—is well attested among the earliest Arabic works. In the bibliographies of the historians of the first ʿAbbadid century (see, for instance, al-Ḥaytham b. ʿAdī, al-Madāʾīnī, Muhammad b. Ḥabīb), genealogical works are preponderant. Titles including nasab, pl. ansāb, were numerous; unfortunately, practically nothing is preserved in its original form. We are on safe ground with the assumption that genealogy, in pre-Islamic times and when books were published on the subject in Islam, was always a repertory of tribal lore going far beyond simple filiations and containing stories (aḵkāb) of all sorts, discussing excellence [see ṭafīla] and the political and legal subject of tribal rivalries [see maṭbāla and muṭafāha], and, above all and most basic, featuring poetry. The so far earliest preserved small monograph by Muʿarrid al-Ṣadārī (d. ca. 200/815-16), edited by S. al-Nasih (Taʾrikh Baghdad, viii, 469, cf. Nasab Maṣāʾil, 1960), attests to it, and so does the large standard work, which was never surpassed, the Djamhara al-nasab compiled by Hīshām b. al-Kalbi (d. 204 or 206/819-21) on the basis of information gathered by his father Muhammad b. al-Kalbi (see al-Kalbi; recent editions by Suhayl Zakkār [Damascus 1983, vol. i only?]; and Nādīl Ḥasan [Beirut 1407/1986]; Ḥasan has also edited Nasab Maṣāʾil wa-l-ʾYamānī, Djamhara, ii, 94. This procedure became frequent in the course of time, see Rosenthal, A history2, 97-8. Ibn al-Fuwāṭī, for
instance, describes it in connection with al-Zubayr b. Bakkar's *Djamhara*, i, 105, 321, 379. Ibn Khaldun, *op. cit.*, ii, 14, praises graphic representation in tree form (with the 'column' thus providing an immediate understanding of genealogical relationships; the Bulāk edition reproduces these trees in print.

The Muslim approach to the eternal debate about the greater worth, for society and individual, of either noble descent or personal qualities is succinctly expressed by *hasab wa-nasab* [*q.v.*]. The two words were originally allied, since noble descent and noble qualities were celebrated in Arabia as inseparable for true glory. In Islam, they tended to split into contrasting concepts, *nasab* being defined as nobility by parentage and *hasab* as nobility in character and deeds; the lexicographers' arbitrary re-interpretation of a verse by al-Mutalammis (ed. Völlers, no. i, v. 2) as embodying the contrast is typical for the process (al-Azhari, *Tahdhib*, iv, 329a = L4). Islam distinctly preferred the egalitarian view (and the religious attitude later found firm support in philosophical ethics). In Kurān, XLIX, 13, the statement declaring the best person to be the one most pious followed upon a recommendation of "mutual acquaintance", something later understood as the core of *nasab* relationships; ignorance of *nasab* ultimately means exclusion from humanity (e.g. *Ikd*, iii, 312). The reputed radical proponents of equality, the Shu'ubīyya/Ahl al-nasab were reversed when the Turkish army revolted and effected a complete reversal of policy under Nasr's successor Nūh, Al-Nasafi, along with a large number of Ismā'īlīs and their sympathisers, was massacred in 322/934. For this reason Nāṣīr-i Khwās calls him *Rāsūl-i Shāhīd* and *Shāhīd-i Shāhīd*.

The *Kālām al-Maḥsūl* was the major work of al-Nasafi wherein Neoplatonism was adapted to Ismā'īlī doctrines. This caused a sharp reaction within Ismā'īlī circles and raised a bitter controversy. His contemporary Abū Hātim al-Razāl [*q.v.*], the chief *dīya* of Raya, wrote his *Kāl al-Isāb* to rectify the errors in the *Maḥsūl*. He criticises al-Nasafi with regard to some of his metaphysical conclusions, such as the precedence of *kādār* over *kadār*, the imperfect nature of emanation of the Soul from the Intellect and the dissociation of *shari'a* from those fragments is a desideratum. Two manuscripts, entitled *Kālṣaf at tawāl al-'ālam* to be found in private Ismā'īlī collections in India, are ascribed to al-Nasafi.


**AL-NASAFI, the nisba of several religious figures and scholars from Nasa or Nakhkhāb [*q.v.*] in the environs of Bukhārā (see al-Samʿānī, *Anāb*, ed. Haydarābādī, xii, 92-4). I. *Abū 'l-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. Ṣāhid al-Baṣdīr* (i.e. from the village of Basdīr near Nasa), distinguished philosopher-theologian of the Ismā'īlīs in Sāmānī Khurāsān and Transoxania, who is generally credited with the introduction of Neo-Platonic philosophy into Ismā'īlī circles. He succeeded Ḥusayn b. 'Alī al-Marwazi in the headship of the *da'wa* [*q. v.*] of Niḥāpūr. As a *dīya* he travelled to Transoxania and succeeded in converting the Sāmānī ruler Nasr b. Ahmad and several dignitaries of the court to the Ismā'īlī faith. This success, however, was short lived, and the fortunes of Ismā'īlīs were reversed when the Turkish army revolted and effected a complete reversal of policy under Nasr's successor Nūh, Al-Nasafi, along with a large number of Ismā'īlīs and their sympathisers, was massacred in 322/934. For this reason Nāṣīr-i Khwās calls him *Rāsūl-i Shāhīd* and *Shāhīd-i Shāhīd*.

II. *Abū 'l-Muḥīr Maymūn b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Mākhūl al-Ḥanāfī al-Maḵūlī* (d. 508/1114), one of the mutakallimūn [*see kālām*] whose scholastic position is between that of the early period as represented by 'Abd al-Kāhir al-Baghdādī [*q.v.*], who is still endeavouring to find a convenient arrangement and an adequate formulation of the contents of *kālām*, and the younger mutakallimūn who have...
at hand the necessary formulas for ready use. At least five works by him are known, including: 1. *Tamhid li-kawsid at-teshid* (Cairo, ms. 2417, fols. 1-30; cf. Fihrist... *Muṣʾir, ii*, 51), a treatise in which the contents of the creed are proved according to the scholastic method. The first chapter consists of an exposition of the doctrine of cognition, the last of the doctrine of the imāmate. The work closes with a *murshidā* which contains the *doctrina de Deo* in an abridged form; 2. *Tahṣīr al-adidā* (Cairo, *ms. 2287, 6673; cf. Fihrist... *Muṣʾir, ii, 8*), an elaborate work on dogmatics of nearly the same scheme as the *Tamhid*: 3. *Bahr al-akram* printed at Cairo 1329/1911 differs from the two foregoing works in so far as it deals with heresies and is identical with *Maddān al-tanzil wa hakdik al-taʾwil* (printed in 2 vols., Bulak 1285 and 1299; cf. Brockelmann, *II*, 550, S I, 761; also on the *Muntakhab fi usūl al-dīn* of *al-Asḥāṣī* (d. 1192/1778), *Cairo 1307 etc.; (c) the most important: al-Bahr al-rīḥī of Ibn Ṣugayjum (970/1562-3) in 8 vols., Cairo 1334.

He also wrote a series of commentaries, e.g. two on the *Kitāb al-Nafī* of Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Samarkandī (d. 656/1258) entitled *al-Mustafṣīja* and *al-Manṣūri*; on the *Manṣūrī* (d. 684/1285-6) entitled *al-Mandarī*, see *al-Mandarī fi usūl al-dīn*: 4. *Tawfiq al-Ṭārīq* (Cairo 1294, 1303, 1312; cf. *Tawfiq al-Rahīm* of al-Tārīqī (d. 1192/1778), *Cairo 1307 etc.; (d) the most important: *al-Bahr al-rīḥī* of Ibn Ṣugayjum (970/1562-3) in 8 vols., Cairo 1334.

He also wrote a series of commentaries, e.g. two on the *Kitāb al-Nafī* of Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Samarkandī (d. 656/1258) entitled *al-Mustafṣīja* and *al-Manṣūri*; on the *Manṣūrī* (d. 684/1285-6) entitled *al-Mandarī*, see *al-Mandarī fi usūl al-dīn*: 4. *Tawfiq al-Ṭārīq* (Cairo 1294, 1303, 1312; cf. *Tawfiq al-Rahīm* of al-Tārīqī (d. 1192/1778), *Cairo 1307 etc.; (d) the most important: *al-Bahr al-rīḥī* of Ibn Ṣugayjum (970/1562-3) in 8 vols., Cairo 1334.

He also wrote a series of commentaries, e.g. two on the *Kitāb al-Nafī* of Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Samarkandī (d. 656/1258) entitled *al-Mustafṣīja* and *al-Manṣūri*; on the *Manṣūrī* (d. 684/1285-6) entitled *al-Mandarī*, see *al-Mandarī fi usūl al-dīn*: 4. *Tawfiq al-Ṭārīq* (Cairo 1294, 1303, 1312; cf. *Tawfiq al-Rahīm* of al-Tārīqī (d. 1192/1778), *Cairo 1307 etc.; (d) the most important: *al-Bahr al-rīḥī* of Ibn Ṣugayjum (970/1562-3) in 8 vols., Cairo 1334.

He also wrote a series of commentaries, e.g. two on the *Kitāb al-Nafī* of Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Samarkandī (d. 656/1258) entitled *al-Mustafṣīja* and *al-Manṣūri*; on the *Manṣūrī* (d. 684/1285-6) entitled *al-Mandarī*, see *al-Mandarī fi usūl al-dīn*: 4. *Tawfiq al-Ṭārīq* (Cairo 1294, 1303, 1312; cf. *Tawfiq al-Rahīm* of al-Tārīqī (d. 1192/1778), *Cairo 1307 etc.; (d) the most important: *al-Bahr al-rīḥī* of Ibn Ṣugayjum (970/1562-3) in 8 vols., Cairo 1334.

He also wrote a series of commentaries, e.g. two on the *Kitāb al-Nafī* of Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Samarkandī (d. 656/1258) entitled *al-Mustafṣīja* and *al-Manṣūri*; on the *Manṣūrī* (d. 684/1285-6) entitled *al-Mandarī*, see *al-Mandarī fi usūl al-dīn*: 4. *Tawfiq al-Ṭārīq* (Cairo 1294, 1303, 1312; cf. *Tawfiq al-Rahīm* of al-Tārīqī (d. 1192/1778), *Cairo 1307 etc.; (d) the most important: *al-Bahr al-rīḥī* of Ibn Ṣugayjum (970/1562-3) in 8 vols., Cairo 1334.

He also wrote a series of commentaries, e.g. two on the *Kitāb al-Nafī* of Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Samarkandī (d. 656/1258) entitled *al-Mustafṣīja* and *al-Manṣūri*; on the *Manṣūrī* (d. 684/1285-6) entitled *al-Mandarī*, see *al-Mandarī fi usūl al-dīn*: 4. *Tawfiq al-Ṭārīq* (Cairo 1294, 1303, 1312; cf. *Tawfiq al-Rahīm* of al-Tārīqī (d. 1192/1778), *Cairo 1307 etc.; (d) the most important: *al-Bahr al-rīḥī* of Ibn Ṣugayjum (970/1562-3) in 8 vols., Cairo 1334.
The influence of groups specifically described as “Nazarene”, Ebionites or Elkasaites (M.P. Roncaglia, in Proche Orient Chretien, xxii [1971], 101-26) which, it has been claimed, are perceptible in the Kur'ān, led some to believe that the Kur'ān was a “Nazarene preaching mission” (cf. al-Kur'ān da'wa nasrāniyya, Paulistes, Harissa 1969, by “al-Usṭād Haddād”), a thesis summarised in French by the author, in fact the archimandrite Joseph Dora-Haddad, in Proche Orient Chretien, xxiii [1973], 148-55, but no such conclusions are to be drawn from the presence of several words used by the “Nazareners” in the Kur'ān. Here the word denotes Christians in general, in the eastern groups known to the Muslims, groups which were to be distributed in the classical sources on al-milal wa 'l-nihal into sects: Nestorian (Naṣūriyya), Melkite (Mākāniyya) and Jacobite (Ya'kubiyya).

As for the term masḥi (pl. masḥiyyūn), Arabic transcription of the Greek Μασχα, and derived from the name of Christ (al-Masih), it was only used, according to the Muslim writer al-Sam'āni (al-Ansābi, v, 300), in the 6th/12th century, by Christians among themselves. The forenames Masōḥ, Masḥι, or 'Abī al-Masih, provided the nasab of a Muslim of the 4th/10th century, Abū 'Alī Muhammad b. Zakariyya al-Masḥi of Baghdad. This was also the name of a Nestorian family, also of Baghdad, consisting of physicians and a Catholicos (see masjiyya).

Moreover, in their works, even Christian writers habitually use the terms al-Nasrānī and al-Nasrār when referring to Christians. Only one writer, apparently, Sulaymān al-Ghazi (6th/6th century), uses either al-Nasrāniyya or al-Masīhiyya to refer to Christianity.

The other terms used denote either the Byzantine Christians (Ram) or, especially after the Crusades, the western Christians (Ifriqa). Specific histories of the various religious communities.

The doctrinal position of the Kur'ān, of hadith and of polemics in regard to Christians in general has been examined in the article AH al-khṭāb. Similarly, general aspects of the behaviour of Muslims towards non-Muslims, on the level of institutions and of daily-life contact, have been dealt with under the heading AH al-qimma. The studies cited, both of Tritton and of Fattal, have already given historical examples of the application of different Kur'ānic and judicial principles.

Some histories of particular groups have already been or are soon to be the subject of articles, for example the Copts (s.v. Kītāb, al-Muḥāmmads, al-maṣūḥīm) and the Melkites (s.v. Rūm).

This article will therefore be limited to a summary of the condition of the remaining groups, the Syriacs, divided, as is well known, into two groups: the first, the western or “Jacobite” Syriacs, suspected of Monophysitism, belonging to the patriarchate of Antioch, were particularly well represented in the Syrian region of the formerly Roman and subsequently Byzantine empire, with extensions into the formerly Persian empire. As for the eastern Syriacs, Nestorians, owing allegiance to the Catholics (al-qalqalīk) of Seleucia-Ctesiphon (al-Maḏā'īn, s.v.), they were particularly abundant in the former Persian empire, in which are now Iran and Persia. They were also to be found in the Arabian Peninsula and, further afield, in Central Asia, extending as far as India, China and Tibet.

Christians of Arabia and the Gulf.

New references regarding Christianity in the Arabian Peninsula are to be added to those—still useful—of the nasārā article in EP. The following list

virtues (manākib, etc.), on the Kur'ān, are lacking. Sezgin, GAS, i, 167-9, cf. Brockelmann, F., 170-1, Sl, 269-70, mentions nine other works by al-Nasrāzī, either extant or known by citations, in addition to his Sunna. These include a work on the virtues of 'Allī, the K. al-Khās'ī's fad'āli 'Allī b. 'Abī Tālib, printed Cairo 1308/1890-1; a work on weak and unreliable narrators of traditions, the K. al-Ḍu'afʿā' wa-l-matrūkin, printed Agra 1323/1905-6 and Allahabad 1325/1907-8; a Tasmīyat fūkahd al-āmārī, a Tafsir; etc.

Bibliography: Ibn Khalikān, ed. 'Abhān, i., 77-8, tr. de Salign, i, 58-9; Djabahār, Tabākāt al-huffāz, ii, 266 ff.; Ibn Ḥadjar al-Askalānī, Ṭabdī al-Tahdib, Haydarābād 1325, 1907, i, 36 ff.; Samānī, Kitāb al-Asnāb, facs. col. 559, ed. Haydarābād, xiii, 87-8; Goldizher, Muhammedanische Studien, ii, 141, 249 ff.; idem, in ZDMG, i (1896), 112; Wüstenfeld, Der Inam el-Schībiʿī und seine Anhänger, in Arb. GW Geit., xxxvi, 100-9; Zirkīlī, Ṭabakāt al-Ansāb, i, 164. (A.J. Wensmeyer)

Following Beaucamp and Robin, it is possible to identify two zones of Christianity in the peninsula in the period before Islam: first the south-western corner, comprising the high territories of the Yemen, dominated at that time by the tribe of Himyar and inhabited by a population composed largely of sedentary farmers, speaking a Semitic language distinct from Arabic, South-Arabian; and the rest of the peninsula, inhabited mainly by nomadic herdsmen, speaking Arabic and belonging to fluctuating tribal federations.

The oases of the South, Naḍrān, Ma’rib and the Ḥadramawt, were familiar with Christianity, especially as a result of the Byzantine-Ethiopian invasion of the 6th century. In 518, they had been subjected to violent persecution [see ASHAB AL-UHAD, MA’ Productions, BEIRUT, 1981]; and the studies of Irfan Shahid, *Les communautes syriaques en Iran et Irak des siecles*, (useful for the documentation, with reservations as to interpretation); Irfan Shahid, *Les com
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and all proved to have been in vain. The Christian chroniclers, unlike their Muslim colleagues, saw the world from the point of view of the people, and this was not always rosy (cf. Fiey, *The Umayyads in Syriac sources*, in *Proceedings of the third Symposium on the History of Bilad al-Sham*, Amman 1989, ii, 11-25).

Under the 'Abbāsids.

During the period of the 'Abbāsids, it was not primarily as a result of taxation that the numbers of Christians continued to diminish. The most important factor in conversion to Islam, especially among the educated classes, physicians or kutāb, seems to have been social pressure. Institutionally, the Christian occupied a marginal position and could not be fully integrated into society except through conversion. This was often necessary in order to retain a post or to gain promotion to a higher post.

This fact is made clear in three texts which cover the whole period and thus illustrate the situation in an unbroken sequence. These emanate from the Nestorian philosopher and physician Hunayn b. Ishāq (d. 260/873), from the Muslim poet Abū 'Alī al-Ma'in (d. 449/1058) and from the Jewish philosopher and oculist Ibn Kamīnūn (d. 683/1284) (cf. Fiey, *Conversions des juifs et de chrétiens à l'Islam sous les Abbassides, dans les sources arabes et syriques*, 17th International Congress of Historical Sciences, Madrid 1990). Such self-interested conversions were treated with scepticism by the Muslims, by the caliph al-Ma'in for example, but over the course of time, families continued to observe the new faith adopted by their ancestors.

There were, certainly, blemishes in the record, popular demonstrations accompanied by the pillage and destruction of churches, provoked by the announcement, true or false, of a victory of the Byzantines, or later of the Crusaders, of a massacre of Muslim prisoners, or by the preaching of a fanatic. The Christians, perhaps more vulnerable than the Muslims, were sometimes the victims of extortion on the part of greedy princes, but apart from the execution of a few renegades, there were no massacres of any significance.

It is a fact, however, that Christians gradually disappeared from whole regions of the 'Abbāsīd caliphate, especially in those where fighting between local principalities, out of the control of central authority, provoked instability.

Any attempt at a quantitative evaluation of defections, based on the examination of names (such as has been undertaken, for example, by R.W. Bulliet in *Conversions to Islam in the medieval period*, Cambridge, Mass. 1979) is unlikely to succeed, since names such as 'Alī, Hasan and Husayn were born by Christians as well as by Muslims (cf. Habīb Zayyāt, *Names, forenames and surnames of Christians in Islam* (in Arabic), in *al-Khāisna al-sharbiyya*, i, Beirut 1952, 1-22).

As regards the conversions of the common people, documentation is more sparse. There are, however, recorded cases of Muslim demonstrations of popular piety which resulted in large-scale collective conversions. The funeral of Ibn Hanbal in Baghdad, in 211/855, is supposed to have induced the conversion of 20,000 Christians, Jews and Zoroastrians.

As for the survival of the dioceses, there seems to be no point in distinguishing (as was done by J. Spencer Tringham, *op. cit.* between “Arab” dioceses and “Aramaean-Arab” dioceses; the former, having no real Arab consciousiousness, would have disappeared more quickly. Among the “Arab” dioceses, Sindjâr and the western Syriac Beth'Arabâ'îye (of which the last see was the Dayr al-Mu'allâk near Balad, to the west of Mawṣil), and which comprised the Tu'ayyê, 'Aklâyê and Tanûkhâyê nomads, is attested until the 8th/14th century, Karma and the diocese of the midle Tigris until the 6th/12th century, and its neighbour Bahîr and the Djasîr until about the 3rd/9th century. As for the originally Taghîbî dioceses, that of the south, “‘Ana and the tribes” was to last until the 4th/10th century, that of the north, Djasîrat Ibn 'Umar, until 1915; Takîr remained the see of the western Syriac “Maphriani” until 551/1156. The Nestorian diocese of Balad is attested until the 7th/13th century.

The fact that Christians survived until these various dates does not mean that they felt at ease with their status as ḍimmis. It may well be supposed that they dreamed of reversing the situation, throwing off their subjugation and taking power in their turn.

From this point of view, the impact of the Crusades [p. e.] cannot be ignored. It is true that the Crusaders did not penetrate as far as Mawṣil and Baghîd, but, just as in former times the Christian envoy of the Sâsânids felt his heart melt when he experienced the noise of the ten thousand smantrons (wooden boards) of the Byzantine camp, so the Syriac Christians may well have dreamed of a terrestrial kingdom, finally established with the help of strangers from foreign lands or created in kingdom such as would enable them to mention the names of “Christians here” in the dip- tychs even though they had not felt the same emotional attachment towards the Byzantines, who considered them heretics.

Even if it is possible to refuse the accusations of Ibn Nakkâš and Ibn Kayyim al-Dijawiyîa of active collusion of the Christians with the Crusader enemy, except in the territories conquered by the latter, it cannot be denied that the Christian dioceses were considered as “martyrs” the Frankish prisoners executed there between 1149 and 1195/544-91, and buried in the church of Sîk al-Thalâla. When, in 557/1162, Georgiam Crusaders came to Mawṣil for an exchange of prisoners and paraded in the streets of the town on horseback (a forbidden act for Christians), with crosses (also forbidden) displayed on the tips of their lances, a naive Jacobite sculptor was inspired to depict the patron of his monastery (a saint of the 4th century) in Crusader costume, striking down the demon, i.e. “the other”, Islam. This small picture (reproduced in J. Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne*, 11, Beirut 1965, before p. 593) says more than any number of texts about the mentality of the time. Al-Mutawakkil had only recently commanded the Christians to place wooden images of the Devil on the doors of their homes, and here the situation was totally reversed, if only in a dream.

The hopes which the Syriacs had pinned on the Crusaders were dashed when, in 583/1187, Salâh al-Din recaptured Jerusalem. This loss was felt by the Christians, Nestorian as well a Jacobite, as a cause for national lamentation, as the colophons of manuscripts testify. But their sensibilities were wounded most of all when, in 1189, after Salâh al-Din had sent to Bagâdî the official, great cross carried in battle captured from the Crusaders, this cross was buried in the threshold of the gate known as Bâb al-Nûbi al-Sharîf, so that passers-by could trample it underfoot and spit on it. Did whoever was responsible for devising this humiliation evidently remember that the very name of this gate came from the ceremonial entry, in 836, of George, son of the King of Nubia, with bishops and a veritable retinue of horsemen bearing crosses of gold?

The gulf between Christians and Muslims was now firmly fixed. It became even deeper when the Christ-
ian dream was shattered once more by the capture of Saint Louis, in 1250. The Christians of...

However, other hopes for the Christians were appeased. The Mongols. After 1221 a Syriac chronicler noted: “Advance from the north of pagan Turks. Complete and humiliating defeat of Djalal al-Din, the great king of the Turks (of Khârazm), by Turks who are called in the ‘Turkish language’ Tatârs, and in Syria the Huns”.

After 1232 the same author (an unnamed citizen of Edessa) noted with interest that these barbarians “were determined to annihilate Turks rather than Christians, Muslims rather than Jews”. This was because numerous Mongol tribes, Uighurs, Naimans and Keraitas, were in fact Christians.

Initial contacts with the invading hordes were somewhat painful. There were some deplorable massacres among Christians and monks, but in the course of time new developments became increasingly favourable to the Christians. In 1244 Kherât, king of Armenia, made an alliance with the Mongols. The prince of Mawšil, Badr al-Dîn Lu\'lu\' [q.v.], failing to gain support from the frivolous caliph al-Musta\'ṣîm, capitulated in his turn. At the same time western envoys, Franciscans and Dominicans, had begun to make contacts with the Mongol princes. Initially these contacts consisted, on the Mongol side, of ultimata demanding universal submission to the “Master of the World”, and on the Christian side of exhortations to accept baptism, but relations were established and Eastern Christians participated in diplomatic legations dealing with Europe.

When the Il-Khan Hülagû [q.v.] was approaching Bagdad, the caliph himself included the Nestorian Catholicos in the delegation sent to meet him. But he was not allowed to go because he was needed in his own country. In 656/1258, Bagdad was taken and sacked.

Although Arab chronicles exaggerated the atrocity and the scale of destruction, there were nevertheless some 90,000 deaths. The Christians (and those Muslims who were able to take refuge with them) were systematically spared, on the insistence of the all-powerful Nestorian wife of Il-Khan, Dokuz Khâştûn. The caliphal palace known as Dar al-Duwaydar, as well as the Dar al-Falak and a women’s ribât, were given to the Catholicos, who established a church and a Khâristan within a Khâristan, the Jacobite Maphrian who, among other scientific activities, collaborated with Naṣîr al-Dîn al-Tusî and numerous scholars, including a Chinese, in constructing the magnificent observatory of Hüllâğû at Marâghâ. He died in 685/1286.

After an initial alarm under Ahmad Tegûder (see Fiey, Pourquoi la tentative de rapprochement Mongols-Mamelouks échoua-t-elle sous Tegûder-Ahmad et Khâristân? in Annales d’histoire et d’archéologie, Faculty of Letters, Université St. Joseph, Beirut, iii [1984], 1-33), the Islamisation of the Mongols, begun by the common Mongol princes, was in fact effective. The reaction of the Muslims against the Christians was often violent, in response to what the Christians saw as provocations. Thus at Iribî [q.v.] in 708/1309, almost the entire Christian population of the town was massacred. Yahwâlâhî III (1281-1317), the Christians once again fell into disfavour. The reaction of the Christians by see by an Ongû Türk from China, Yahwâlâhî III (1281-1317), the Christians once again fell into disfavour. The reaction of the Christians by see by an Ongû Türk from China, Yahwâlâhî III (1281-1317), the Christians once again fell into disfavour. The reaction of the Christians by see by an Ongû Türk from China, Yahwâlâhî III (1281-1317), the Christians once again fell into disfavour. The reaction of the Christians by see by an Ongû Türk from China, Yahwâlâhî III (1281-1317), the Christians once again fell into disfavour.
b. Muhammad b. 'Umar b. Hamza, who at the time of the Mongol invasion had recovered his patrimony following a period of internment in Khârâzm (ibid., 59, 99). As Zangi's representative on the council of Nizâm al-Mulk, he was present at the victory near Naşâ over a Mongol detachment and also at Inâné Khân's defeat by the Mongols in the plain between Djarûndân and Astarâbad in 619/1222-3, after which al-Nasawi returned to Kharâzman (ibid., 65-9). He then became nâ'îb to Naşrat al-Dîn Hamza b. Muhammad b. Hamza b. 'Umar, Zangi's successor at Naşâ (ibid., 104). In the dispute among the Khârâzim-Shâh's sons following his death, Naşrat al-Dîn favoured Djalal al-Dîn and declined to read the khubba for Ghiyâth al-Dîn, who therefore launched against him an army under Inâné Khân's son Dolûk (Tilûk). Al-Nasawi, sent to appease Ghiyâth al-Dîn, learned en route that most of the prince's command had deserted to Djalal al-Dîn; he thereupon joined the latter's forces. The money destined for Ghiyâth al-Dîn was instead presented to Djalal al-Dîn's wazîr Sharaf al-Mulk, who ordered Dolûk to raise the siege. But within a few days news came that Naşâ had fallen and that Naşrat al-Dîn had been killed. Al-Nasawi's dependants were massacred and his property pillaged, despite his services to Dolûk's father (ibid., 109).

From this point al-Nasawi's fortunes were closely intertwined with those of Djalal al-Dîn, who in 622/1225 made him kâtab al-malîk von Egypten und seine Zeit, Wiesbaden 1958, 13-14. (P. JACKSON)
future) and lam as the negation of an action in the future. These four particles determine the vowel *la* by themselves (bi-anfusha). (2) The particles *batá* "until", in order that", *la* "so that", *unselas* "unless", *la* "with the fact that" and *la* "with the result that" (only after an order, prohibition, negation, question, wish or offer). These five particles do not determine the vowel *la* by themselves, but by the implicit (*mudmara) and "supposed" (*mukaddara) particle *an*, which can only be made explicit (*masnuna) by use after the particles *li* and *in*. 


**NASDJI** [see Bίσατ Suppl., Ḥarb, Kūtn, Bīnâs, *et al.*]

*NASHÁT,* Mîrāz ʿAbd al-Wâhnâr al-Iṣfâhân, one of the best Persian poets and stylists of the period of the early Kâḏârs. He was a physician in Shīrâz and kâlitâr [q.v.] and governor in his native city, devoting his leisure hours to poetry in which he displayed a great facility. He wrote verse in Arabic, Persian and Turkish and was further celebrated for his great skill in *ḥabâs.* Rumours of his poetical gifts induced the Kâḏâr Fâhâl al-Shâh (1797-1834) to invite him to Tehran as court poet. There Nashât soon rose to great honour and in 1809 was appointed Munshâ al-Mamâlîk (secretary of state [see *mûnshûl]) with the title of Mu'tamad al-Dawla. In this capacity he carried through several important negotiations for the Shâh, such as the restoration of peace among the nomad tribes of Khurâsân in 1812 and 1810. Besides his own poems, he wrote an introduction to Sâbah's *mudmara* which can only be made explicit by use after the particles *li* and *in*.

*Biography:* J. van Ess, Frühe mu'azzilisitische Hörerschöpfungen, Beitrâg 1971; W. Madelung, Frühe mu'azzilisitische Hörerschöpfungen: das Korâh al-Uslâl des Ḥabîl al-'Abîn, anchor (1967) [in English tr., with commentary, of 100 ghazals (for some reason only nos. 76-175) has been published by K. Sh. Dastur, *Divân-i Nashât,* Bombay 1916. (E. Bertelms)

**NASHAWA,** name given by the geographers writing in Arabic to the city of Nakhchivan [q.v.]


All we know about his life refers to the period when he lived in Baghdad, obviously as a state official (*kâtib*); when he left 'Irâk before 280/893, possibly in connection with the downfall of the vizier Ibn Bulbul in 280/893, he went no farther than Faunus, and from there he disappears from our sources. He was a man of vast culture, but he used his knowledge mainly for criticism and therefore did not always win friends. He attacked the philosopher al-Kindî [q.v.] as well as the logicians and the adherents of Greek medicine; he also found fault with *wâlî al-nâbî* and the metrical system of al-Khâlî al-Marzubânî saw in this an immature quest for originality, but others who had a chance of looking at Nashât's books admired him for his independent judgement. Even as a Mu'tazili theologian he remained an outsider. He did not have much in common with his contemporary al-Dubâbî [q.v.], who was going to shape the outlook of the Bâşrân school and much of later Mu'tazili scholasticism. He rather shared the ideas of the "Murdjî'ite" wing which was represented during his time by Abu 'l-Husnân Muhammad b. Muslim al-Sâlîhî. He therefore believed that even mortal sinners will not be eternally punished in Hell as long as they are Muslims, and defined belief as a mere act of consent, without works. He stressed the singularity of God in a way unheard of in the Mu'tazila up to that time, by denying even nominal similarity with creation: God is the absolute Other in contrast to whom man cannot be said to possess positive attributes (like knowing, acting etc.) unless in a metaphorical way. The only exception he made was with respect to the Prophet: when Muhammad brought forth the revelation he spoke the truth in a veritative, not only in a metaphorical way. Moreover, the metaphorical character of human action did not entail determinism; man has a free will because he possesses a soul which grants him free disposition of his body.

None of Nashât's books has been preserved in its entirety. But there are excerpts from a doxographical work which seems to have borne the title al-Kisâb al-Awsat (fi 'l-makâtib). We also possess a few fragments of his K. Nîkâd al-shîrî. The K. Uslâl al-nîsîl attributed to him of which the first chapter (on *imâma*) is preserved is spurious; the book may have been composed by Dja’far b. Harîb. Nashât's poetry has recently been collected by Hirîl al-Nâshât, in al-Maurid, xi/1 (1982), 89 ff.; no. 2, 61 ff.; no. 3, 43 ff.; no. 4, 37 ff., and xii (1983), no. 1, 57 ff. (J. Van Ess)

*Biography:* J. van Ess, Frühe mu'azzilisitische Hörerschöpfungen, Beitrâg 1971; W. Madelung, Frühe mu'azzilisitische Hörerschöpfungen: das Korâh al-Uslâl des Ḥabîl al-'Abîn, anchor (1967) [in English tr., with commentary, of 100 ghazals (for some reason only nos. 76-175) has been published by K. Sh. Dastur, *Divân-i Nashât,* Bombay 1916. (E. Bertelms)
musician Ishāk al-Mawṣili, the author of the K. al-Aghāni (v, 128) relates: "He began the song with a Ṽafādīq followed by a básīṭ; he employed in it the technique of octavevation, he included a refrain... and all this in the singing of only four words." This testimony reveals that the Ṽafādīq developing on one or two words constituted a type of vocal improvisation followed by the básīṭ, a musical form of metrical character following the specifications of al-Fārābī and of other later authors. The sequence Ṽafādīq, básīṭ, etc., appears in an extensive form of composition introduced into Spain by Ziryāb. "It was established in al-Andalus that the one beginning a musical performance should hold, inserted in the Ṽafādīq at the outset of his song irrespective of the rhythm; he would then bring in the básīṭ and conclude with muḥarrāṭāt and Ṽanṣāḏī (rapid singing with light rhythms) following the rules laid down by Ziryāb."

In the contemporary period, the term Ṽafādīq (and also waṭānī) is employed as the equivalent of "hymn"; thus Ṽafādīq waṭānī or Ṽanṣāḏī denotes a national anthem, al-Ṽafādīq al-umāni, the International. It seems that this sense of Ṽafādīq derives from the type of popular usage described in the Muḥājī al-muḥājī, where it is stated that "the people use Ṽafādīq in the sense of madh (praise, e.g. hymn) and also from the translations of Biblical canticles, such as Ṽafādīq Deborah or Ṽafādīq al-anshād for the Song of Songs. The term is also employed in specific cases to denote for example official songs, the songs of children, the songs of Boy Scouts and even the serenade (Ṽafādīq layli). It consists of declaiming, at the beginning of a poem, or at the beginning of a speech which is not in verse, a number of words in an unspecified tempo, and that the isṭihādī consists of declaiming, at the beginning of a song, a single word in a free rhythm (A. Shiloah, La perfection des connaissances musicales, 128-9). Al-Fārābī, in his Kitāb al-Muṣīqī al-kabīr, provides a lucid definition of the Ṽafādīq and of the isṭihādī. Speaking of different parts of the composition, he enumerates the following authors: simple vocalizations, octavevations (a highly-regarded technique of interpretation) and preludes based on the text of the song, adding that "The Arabs give... the name of isṭihādī, when the words which are adapted to it constitute a small part of the logos, or indeed a larger position which is still inferior to a medium part. This will be the Ṽafādīq if this portion is a medium part of the logos or a more extensive portion." (R. d'Erlanger, La musique Arabe, ii, 85). For the 9th/15th century author Fāth Allāh al-Mu'mīn al-Shīrīwānī, the Ṽafādīq or Ṽafādīq al-irāb is composed of two verses on free notes, then two others on timed notes. The básīṭ is, according to him, an isolated fragment sung on a heavy rhythm (op. cit., iv, 233; see also A. Shiloah, The theory of music in Arabic writings, N. Y. 1925, p. 39). In the contemporary period, the term Ṽafādīq (and also waṭānī) is employed as the equivalent of "hymn"; thus Ṽafādīq waṭānī or Ṽanṣāḏī denotes a national anthem, al-Ṽafādīq al-umāni, the International. It seems that this sense of Ṽafādīq derives from the type of popular usage described in the Muḥājī al-muḥājī, where it is stated that "the people use Ṽafādīq in the sense of madh (praise, e.g. hymn) and also from the translations of Biblical canticles, such as Ṽafādīq Deborah or Ṽafādīq al-anshād for the Song of Songs. The term is also employed in specific cases to denote for example official songs, the songs of children, the songs of Boy Scouts and even the serenade (Ṽafādīq layli). Bibliography: Given in the article.

Nāṣīḥ: a singer of Persian origin, acquired as a slave by 'Abd Allāh b. Dīfā'ar b. Ābī Ta'bī [q. v.], and who flourished in the second half of the 1st century A.H. in Medina. His Persian style of singing was a great success there, compelling other singers to imitate it, but Nāṣīḥ himself had to learn the Arab style and songs in order to enlarge his repertoire. He was one of the teachers of the ḵanṣa [q. v.] "Azzā al-Maṣīlī" and of the renowned singer Ma'āṣib b. Waḥīb [q. v.]. Bibliography: Aghānī, iv, 61, 63, vii, 188, xvi, 13; H. G. Farmer, A history of Arabian music to the XⅪth century, London 1929, 48-9, 54-5. (Ed.)

Nāṣīḥ: a singer of Persian origin, acquired as a slave by 'Abd Allāh b. Dīfā'ar b. Ābī Ta'bī [q. v.], and who flourished in the second half of the 1st century A.H. in Medina. His Persian style of singing was a great success there, compelling other singers to imitate it, but Nāṣīḥ himself had to learn the Arab style and songs in order to enlarge his repertoire. He was one of the teachers of the ḵanṣa [q. v.] "Azzā al-Maṣīlī" and of the renowned singer Ma'āṣib b. Waḥīb [q. v.]. Bibliography: Aghānī, iv, 61, 63, vii, 188, xvi, 13; H. G. Farmer, A history of Arabian music to the XⅪth century, London 1929, 48-9, 54-5. (Ed.)

Nasī (A.), intercalary month, intercalation, or person (pl. nasīʾaʾ) charged with the duty of deciding on intercalation. The word occurs in Kurān, IX, 37, and in Muhammad’s sermon at the Farewell Pilgrimage (Ibn Ḥāǧam, 968; see Ṣaḥāḥ). Nasīṣa, nasīṣaʾ, and nasīʿa variants and the word is connected with nasīʾaʾ to “postpone” or “add” or with nasīya to “forbid”. In any case, it is given in Islamic tradition a meaning which brings it into connection with the method of reckoning time among the pagan Arabs. The Kurānic verse describes nasīʾa as “a further expression of unbelief” and it is therefore forbidden to the believers.

The context of the above-mentioned passages, where sometimes the number of months in the year is put at twelve and sometimes the number of “holy” months at four, allows us to connect nasīʾ with the calendar. Kurānic exegesis as a rule connects nasīʾ with the “holy” months and explains it sometimes, it is true, as the postponement of the Pilgrimage from the month fixed by God for it, but sometimes, and preferably, as “transference of the sanctity of one holy month to another, in itself not holy”. The expositors are also able to give the reasons for such a postpone ment in full detail. As a rule, however, these are pure inventions in which suggestions and perhaps memories of old traditions are freely expanded. A collection of such expositions in the form of regular hadīǧī (Koran, 9, 37), it was really the “name of a month” which we have it, according to which nasīʾa denotes neither the intercalation of an intercalary month nor the month itself. This interpretation of the word is the only one really acceptable in the circumstances. The association of the pre-Islamic pilgrimage with annual markets made it necessary to fix the hadīǧī in a suitable season of the year. For that purpose, a prolongation of the lunar year in some way was necessary, and nothing contradicts that older tradition according to which it was obtained by the intercalation of an intercalary month. The lunar month was the only unit of time available for the purpose because it was the only one which the Bedouins, the customers at the markets, could observe directly. Thus one had only to let them know at the hadīǧī of a year whether they had to reckon to the next hadīǧī twelve or thirteen months.

Definite evidence of this intercalation of a month is found in the astronomer Abū Maʿṣūr al-Balḫī (d. 722/886 [g.v.]) in his Khīāb al-ulāy (see J.A., ser. 5, xi [1858], 166 ff), and, following him, in al-Birūnī, who also deals at length with this intercalation in his Chronology (ed. Sachau, 11-12, 52-53). According to him, the Arabs took this intercalation from the Jews. How much in what these scholars tell us is really historical knowledge, and how much intelligent reconstruction, can hardly be decided. It is remarkable, however, that al-Bīrūnī when dealing fully with the Jewish intercalation (op. cit., 52, 1. 17) connects the Hebrew word for intercalary year, ibbur, with naʿābūrāt “pregnant woman” and observes: “they compare the addition of a superfluous month to the year to the woman carrying something which does not belong to her body”. In this connection we may recall that al-Ṭabarī (op. cit., 91, 1. 6) explains the Arabic nasīʾa as nasīʾ “pregnant woman”, among other interpretations, saying nasīʾaʾ al-marʿaʾ “on account of the increase which the child in her means”. This agreement in the two explanations, which can hardly be accidental, might really indicate that nasīʾ in the sense of intercalation or intercalary month is modelled on the Hebrew word ibbur and thus support al-Bīrūnī’s statement which is in itself not impossible. Caussin de Perceval (JA, ser. 4, i, 349) even quotes the Hebrew nāṣīʾ (prince) as a title of honour of the leader of the Sanhedrin, to whom fell the duty of dealing with the intercalation (cf. Bab. Talmud, Sanhedrin, 11s, “the intercalation of the year may only be done with the approval of the nāṣīʾ”). According to one of the meanings of the Arabic nasīʾ given in Tradition, it was really the “name of a man”, a meaning which is all the more remarkable in this connection as it does not suit the Kurānic passage. There is a definite agreement on the fact that in the Jewish intercalation only the month following Adar was an intercalary month while in the Arab system, as the critical examination of Tradition—contradicting the literal interpretation of its text—shows, only the month following Dhuʾl-Hijja, i.e. the intercalated month, in both cases was inserted between the normally last month and the normally first one of the year, Nisān (or, amongst the Arabs, al-Muharram).

Nothing certain is known about the process of intercalation among the Arabs. It can only have been periodic and irregular attempts at correction based on observation of nature, particularly vegetation. The technical part must have been exceedingly simple and primitive. The same is true of the Jewish intercalation in the older period (see Bab. Talmud, Sanhedrin, 10b-13b). As the Jewish system served to move the feast of Passover to a suitable season of the year, the Arab system can only have been intended to do the same for the hadīǧī and the fairs associated with it in the vicinity of Mecca. It was not intended to establish a fixed calendar to be generally observed. The Bedouins had never had one and they have no use for one. According to Tradition, the management of the nasīʾa was a prerogative of the Banū Kināna (ṣ.a.); and, indeed, fairs were held on their lands.

Bibliography: A. Moberg, An-nasīʾ in der islamischen Tradition, Lund-Leipzig 1931, where the most important references are given; J. Fück, Zu an-nasīʾ (Koran, 9, 37), in OLZ, xxxvi (1933), cols. 280-3; M. Plessner, in Ist., xxi (1933), 226-8; R. Paret, Der Koran, Kommentar und Konkordanz, Stuttgart 1971, 202-3.

Nasīʾ (Hebr.), a title used in Judæo-Islamic societies generally to designate descendants of the house of David, who were accorded particular respect. Many individuals of Davidic descent held this honorific title, which was inherited through the patrilineal line. Davidic descent alone did not confer political authority. The nasīʾ Daniel b. Azarya, who served as head of the Palestinian academy, pronounced that members of the house of David were not authorised to hold public office except when appointed by him (T.-S. 12.229, cited in Goitein, A Mediterranean society, ii, 19 and n. 47). Nonetheless,
individuals of the house of David did on occasion claim authority for themselves in Jewish communities, and by the end of the 12th century A.D., nasiḥ had established themselves throughout the Islamic world. The Muslim authorities recognised their special status within the Jewish community and stipulated that the head of the Jews should treat them with deference (hurma) [see Gottheil, 530 top line]. Since the exilarch or head of the diaspora (rīḥ gālīlā, rīḥ gālīlāh, nās al-ghālīl), an official serving as a secular head of the Jews, was always of Davidic descent, he also bore the title nasiḥ? But the title nasiḥ alone does not designate the office of exilarch. David b. Daniel, the son of Daniel b. Azarya, was called "our nasiḥ," "our lord the nasiḥ," and "the nasiḥ of all Israel" in documents up to the year 1089, when he first advanced his claims to the exilarchate. But it was only after he was actually elevated to the office of exilarch that he came to be designated specifically as "our lord the head of the diaspora." Similarly, Daniel b. Hasday (d. 1174), whose title was "exilarch of all Israel," was always of Davidic descent and held the title nasiḥ alone.


Nasib (א), a generic term in Arabic literature applied in mediaeval sources to love poetry. In its modern understanding it denotes the amatory prologue of the kasida [q. v.], the polythematic ode, as distinguished from ghazal [q. v.], the independent love-poem. According to Arabic lexicography, the term is derived from the root n-a-b in its special meaning nasab bi'l-nasib (to make amatory verses about women) (shabbaba bi-hinnafi 'l-shif'a). Another derivation is suggested by R. Blachère, who considers a connection with the term nasib, "a kind of camelmen's lament" [see ghazal].

1. Nasib in Arabic poetics.

The meaning of nasib is rarely defined by mediaeval scholars, nor can the semantic relation between the terms hasib and ghazal be established with precision. As a generic term, nasib first appears in the Tabakāt al-šu'ara' by Ibn Sallām al-Djumābī (d. 231/845 [q. v.]), together with fakhr [see muqaddara], madīh [q. v.] and hidjī [q. v.]. According to this classification, it must be older than the Tabakāt, the four terms constitute "the houses of poetry" (buyūt al-ši'ra), i.e. the principal poetic themes (ed. Hell, Leiden 1916, 87). It is evident that nasib here refers to love poetry in general, for Ibn Sallām not only uses the term when discussing the kasida but also with regard to ghazal poets. Thus he reports a tradition saying that Djamīl [q. v.] surpasses Quthayyir [q. v.] in his "amatory verses" (fl'-nasib, op. cit. 124). The meaning of nasib is limited to the emotional aspect of love poetry in Ibn Kutaybā's (d. 276/890 [q. v.]) famous description of the tripartite kasida (Shīr, 14), for in the tradition which he quotes a distinction is made between nasib and ghazal; he also notes a specific phrase at the "deserted campsite," a leitmotif of the amatory prologue. This differentiation seems unusual and is, apparently, not supported by other sources.

A list of "poetic themes" (aghrād) containing the term nasib is provided by Kudāmā b. Dijā[far (d. 320/932 [q. v.]) in his Nakd al-šīr (ed. Bonebakker, Leiden 1956, 25). He mentions, moreover, to attempt a definition of nasib as contrasted to ghazal (op. cit. 65), which has influenced later authors. According to Kudāmā, nasib denotes the poetic expression of the traditional amatory themes, whereas ghazal means love and preoccupation with women: nasib is "the expression of ghazal" (díkkru ghazal), and ghazal is "the content itself" (al-ma'nā fūsikhu).

From the 10th century onwards historians, moreover, use the term nasib in works of literary theory with varying semantic connotations, and nasib apparently remains the more general concept. This is evidenced in al-Muwāṣāna bayna šīr Abī Tamām wa 'l-Buhtūrī by al-Amidī (d. 370/981). He applies the term to the whole variety of erotic themes and motifs employed by the two poets, after a detailed survey he declares that now "all subdivisions of the nasib have been treated" (madāt anusahaan abī nasib kallūbi), and proceeds to discuss the transition from nasib to madīh (ed. Šakhir, Cairo 1965, ii, 291). As to ghazal, it is clearly conceived by al-Amidī as a "subdivision" (naw') of nasib, specified as "description and praise of women, passionate desire, remembrance, longing and grief" (ii, 59).

In a later treatise, al-'Umda fi maḥafs al-šīr by Ibn Rashik (d. 463/1071 [q. v.]), a whole chapter is devoted to nasib (ed. 'Abd al-Hamīd, Cairo 1963, ii, 116-28). As in the Muwāṣāna, the term denotes love poetry in general and is explained by Ibn Rashik as a synonym of taghazzul and taghīb. With regard to ghazal, however, he explicitly refers to Kudāmā, slightly rephrasing his definition (ii, 117). But Ibn Rashik is not quite consistent in his application of the term. In a previous chapter of the 'Umda, when discussing the point that every occasion demands its own kind of speech, he enumerates, by way of demonstration, several generic terms, among them ghazal, which is listed together with nasib (jest), mukātaba (correspondence), madījīn [q. v.] (frivolous verses), kha'miyiya [q. v.] (bacchic poem). There can be no doubt that these terms signify genres in the modern understanding, i.e. texts of a certain kind. The list suggests that Ibn Rashik has been influenced by diwan recensions of "modern" (muwāda) poetry, which are often arranged according to genres. All terms mentioned in this context figure as headings of chapters, ghazal being employed with reference to love poems. Since the amatory prologue forms part of a greater unit, it is not listed, but must have been subsumed under the heading of madījī (G. Schoeler, Die Einteilung in das Aramäische, in ZDMG, cxviii [1973], 9-55, cf. 42 ff.). Thus Ibn Rashik, without being aware of it, referred to two different systems of genres.

From the evidence of the 'Umda it would seem that a semantic evolution of the term ghazal towards the notion "love poem" had taken place, but if so, it has not been accepted unanimously by later authors. Al-Thbrīzī (d. 502/1109) in his introductory lines to the Bah al-nasib of Abī Tamām's (q. v.) Hāmāsī (q. v.) diwan as sharī'ī al-Hamāsī, ed. 'Abd al-Hamīd, Cairo 1385) heavily relies on Kudāmā, without mentioning him, however, and Ibn al-Athīr (d. 637/1239 [q. v.]) uses the term ghazal when discussing the amatory prologue of the kasida (al-Maṭāl al-shīr, ed. Tabāna, Cairo 1959, iii, 96). In the same chapter (118), ghazal and nasib are united in one sentence. While commenting on the introduction of a particular kasida, Ibn al-Athīr states that the poet presented "as contrasted to the guise of love poetry" (fl hay'at al-ghazal), expressing it "in the form of nasib" (fl ma'ārid al-nasib), as G. J. van Gelder translates (Beyond the line, Leiden 1982, 148).
Here, again, ghazal and nasib seem to be conceived, in accordance with Kudama's definition, as content and form. The semantic relation of the two terms in mediaeval sources deserves a more detailed study, but a few conclusions can be drawn from the material presented above. It is evident that nasib constitutes the older generic term, and that it has always been applied to love poetry in general. Its accepted meaning hardly changed, on the whole, whereas ghazal has been conceived in different ways: as content (ma'nd) of nasib, b. as subdivision (nasib) of nasib, c. as independent love poem.

Turning from the question of terminology to the genre itself, the amatory prologue of the kasida, there is some information on it in mediaeval poetics, usually in connection with a discussion of the ode. As in other literatures, the origin of the genre is attributed to the ingenuity of an individual person. The first kasida was allegedly composed by Muhalhi b. Rabî'a, the uncle of Imru' al-Kays [a.e. Ibn Sallâm, Tabâkât, 13]. The aspect of proportion is discussed by Ibn Rashik, who quotes a tradition to the effect that the amatory theme should not exceed the madâth in weight and length (ii, 123). He also treats the question whether a māthiyyâ [q.v.] might be introduced by amatory verses, which he denies (ii, 151). It is true that the combination of love poetry and lament of the dead has never been accepted as a convention in classical Arabic poetry, but there is some evidence of it in early Islamic and Umayyad texts. The structure of the ode, and how the amatory prologue should be linked to subsequent themes, has been widely discussed in mediaeval poetics. The subject is studied in detail by G.J. van Gelder (op. cit., see Index).

Western scholars from the 19th century onwards have always applied the term nasib to the first section of the ode, whereas ghazal has been conceived as "love poem". In the following survey, nasib and ghazal will be used as generic terms in the Western tradition, denoting the amatory prologue and the independent love poem respectively. It should be kept in mind, however, that modern studies by Arab scholars underline the specific aspect, in accordance with mediaeval poetics, and that the first section of the kasida is often referred to as "prologue" (mālāt, mukaddāma).

2. Nasib in Arabic poetry.

Arabic love poetry in the classical period, whether nasib or ghazal, is based on a common heritage, a reservoir of formulas, motifs and images from the Bedouin past. As a result, the two genres present certain similarities and have often been treated together without differentiation. However, since the nasib constitutes an integral part of a greater unit, it is related to other themes and influenced in its composition by the form as a whole. With the gradual transformation of the tribal kasida into the ceremonial ode of Islamic times, moreover, its components changed as to structure and function. Accordingly, the nasib must be considered from two different aspects, as love poetry within its social context, and as structural unit of the polytheistic ode.

a. Pre-Islamic period.

The nasib is the only kind of love poetry preserved from the ġihiyâ qa'[s.v.]. The earliest texts date back to the end of the 5th century, but the kasida appears already fully developed and suggests a well-established tradition. As is characteristic of oral literature, the poet rarely refers to his own individual experience. Although he always speaks in the first person, his verses are based on a collective experience, which is recreated in such a way that each member of the tribal aristocracy can identify himself with it. In the nasib, as in other sections of the ode, the poet conducts himself as the hero, the Bedouin par excellence (cf. A. Hamori, The Poet as hero, in On the art of mediaeval Arabic literature, Princeton 1974, 3-30). The attitudes he adopts, the problems he encounters, and the moral solutions he offers represent the main aspects of Bedouin life and conform to the values of tribal society. Repeating them means safeguarding the tribal system. This is the principal function of the kasida and provides a key to the interpretation of the nasib.

Pre-Islamic odes extend from 30 to more than 100 verses. The nasib varies from 3 to about 20 verses, but not necessarily in proportion to the length of the ode. It consists of short narrative units, interrupted by descriptive passages and allusions to the poet's emotional state. The basic situation is always the same, the separation of lovers belonging to neighbouring tribes. In spring the tribes camp together, but when the season of abundant pasture ends, they depart and lovers must separate. The nasib invariably refers to a love-affair of the past, or to the time of separation. The following three motifs are most frequent (cf. I. Lichtenstädtér, Das Nasib der altabischen Qasidas, in Islamica, v [1931-2], 17-96).

1. One morning the poet and two friends discover a "deserted campsite" (dâr, manzîl), where he once spent happy days together with his beloved. He describes the "traces" (atâl) consisting of hearth stones, tent-poles and trenches almost obliterated by wind and rain. He alludes to the loneliness of the place, which is now visited by wild animals, and calls out to it, but receives no answer. After indulging in visions, memories, tears and complaints, he resolves to forget his beloved, since there is no hope for a reunion.

2. The poet and his fellow-travellers rest at night in the desert. While his companions are asleep, the poet is awake, or suddenly awakened, and perceives the "vision" (khyâl, tasâf) of his beloved, whom he knows to reside in a distant place. He wonders how she managed to cross the perilous desert on foot to reach him. The poet evokes memories of the past and renews love and sorrow, but finally he overcomes his grief and sends the khyâl back. The "vision" has been interpreted by mediaeval scholars as a dream, but the narrative structure of early versions indicates that the khyâl originally was conceived as an apparition confronting the poet in the external world (cf. R. Jacobib, Th. Khâyâl motif in early Arabic poetry, in Orientis, xxii [1990] 50-64).

3. One morning, the poet discovers to his dismay that the beloved's tribe is about to depart. He watches the preparations, describes the litter bearing his beloved, and at last observes it passing out of sight, while the tears are streaming down his face. He imagines the route her tribe is going to take and contemplates following her, but the feeling of futility and loss prevails.

Not all conventional details of the narrative are present in each version. The poet chooses among them, sometimes uniting two motifs in one nasib, or alluding to it in a few lines. There are two further situations of tribal life occasionally referred to. The poet perceives camels bearing litters of women from afar, and asks himself whether his beloved is travelling with them, or he watches the lightning of an approaching thunderstorm shining from the direction where her tribe dwells.

A detailed description of the beloved can be inserted at different points of the narrative. It usually
constitutes a sort of catalogue, whereby her beauty is praised and her social standing emphasised with stereotyped epithets and comparisons. As the poet is the Bedouin hero, she is the heroine, whose perfection is expressed in his composition. As to her character, she is depicted as capricious, unyielding at first, unfaithful in the end. It is she who takes the initiative in ending the affair, who "severs the bond". In the pre-Islamic *nasīb*, the woman seldom appears emotionally engaged in the relationship. The poet, on the other hand, displays violent passion and grief, which manifests itself in copious tears and sleeplessness by night. A favourite motif in this context is "the long night", whose stars seem never to disappear; its most famous rendering is a passage in the *Mu'allaqa* [q.v.] of Imru' al-Kays (vv. 42-6).

The concept of love implied in the *nasīb* is closely related to the norms of tribal society, where individual interests are subordinated to the interests of the group. Illicit love affairs between members of neighbouring tribes were obviously tolerated, or even approved of, since the poet boasts of them. They heightened his prestige and did not disparage the woman, whose freedom of choice indicates the strength of her social position in the *gāhiliyya* (cf. Lichtensteinäder, op. cit., 81 ff.). But faithfulness after separation, the perseverance in futile love, was not disapproved by tribal ethics, since it would threaten the collective welfare. The woman is expected to depart with her tribe, and the poet is blamed by his friends, the voice of reason, who advise him to leave his folly and to regain his sobriety of mind. This seems to be the principal message of the *nasīb*. Love means pleasure and prestige; if there is no longer hope to gain these ends, it should be abandoned.

There are compensations, however, which brings us to the question of how the *nasīb* is connected with subsequent themes. Several patterns of the *kasīda* can be established, one of them closely related to a motif of the *nasīb*, the poet's complaint of his old age and failing success with women. His melancholy mood is then compensated by memories of the pleasures and activities of his youth. Here, the *nasīb* serves as a justifiable and self-praising continuation of this in with G. Richter's theory that the polythematic ode generated from the *nasīb*. It is consistent with a limited number of texts, but cannot be generally applied (Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der altarabischen Qasīda, in ZDMG., xci [1938], 552-69; cf. also R. Jacobi, Studien zur Poetik der altarabischen Qasīda, Wiesbaden 1971, 101 ff.).

The *nasīb* is usually followed by a description of the poet's camel, sometimes without transition (takhalillus), but there are also formulaic expressions connecting *nasīb* and camel section. After narrating the departure of the beloved's tribe, the poet reflects whether his camel will be able to catch up with her, and embarks upon a praise of its strength and endurance. If the *nasīb* ends with the decision to forget his love affair, he turns to his excellent camel for consolation. Some odes are composed without a camel theme; in this case, the poet resolves to forget his beloved, and turns to more important issues, e.g. praising his patron.

In the tripartite ode the camel section is followed by a self-praise [see mufakharah], a praise of the poet's tribe, or a panegyric [see madih]. In some panegyrical odes from the end of the 6th century, *nasīb*, camel theme and madih appear to constitute a narrative sequence. The poet stops at a "deserted campsite", then continues his journey, and finally reaches the addressee of his madih (cf. Jacobi, Studien zur Poetik, 85 ff., 104). The panegyrical ode is most important for the history of the *nasīb*, as it is the main form to survive in later court poetry.

Pre-Islamic odes present characteristic features of oral literature, e.g. additive style and semantic independence of details as a common feature, the *nasīb* like all thematic units, retains a certain degree of autonomy, even if it is linked to other themes. In this respect, texts from the *gāhiliyya* differ from odes composed in Islamic periods, which must be kept in mind when the origin of the genre and the function of the *nasīb* within its context is considered. Various theories have been advanced, some of them from the aspect of comparative literature, either suggesting influence or pointing out analogy (see Bibli.), but no explanation has been generally accepted so far. Most of these studies contain valuable points, however. Thus A. Bloch drew attention to the mnemonic function of the *nasīb*, which usually includes a sequence of place names, motivated in accordance with the narrative unit selected by the poet (Qasīda, in Asiatische Studien, ii [1948] 106-32). It is conceivable that they constitute ancient itineraries inserted into the *nasīb* so as to be more easily remembered.

At our present stage of knowledge, the origin of the *kasīda* remains a matter of speculation, but a careful assessment of the evidence presented by pre-Islamic texts points to a gradual assimilation of independent thematic units, modified by metre and rhyme, and later growing into a coherent form. The *nasīb* seems appropriate as an introduction, if viewed from the aspect of tribal ethics. It is concerned with a love affair of the past which the poet tries to forget. His feelings are still involved, and when he is reminded of his beloved by the *afīl* or the *khayyil*, his sorrow is renewed, he weeps and complains, but then recovers and returns to the manoeuvr expected of him by his tribe. Thus the *nasīb* seems meaningful and has a definite function within the structure of the ode. With the breaking up of tribal society, however, the "heroic" attitude becomes obsolete, and later poets are faced with the alternative either to abandon the *nasīb*, or to reinterpret it and to provide it with a new function.

b. Early Islamic period.

In the first half of the 7th century, the time of the *mukhadramān* [q.v.], poets still follow pre-Islamic tradition, but they also seek new modes of expression, and there are subtle changes with regard to concepts of thought and moral attitudes. Instead of alluding to a love affair of the past, the *nasīb* now sometimes refers to a present affair the poet wishes to continue. Thus is the Hudhali poet Sā'īda b. Dhu'ayya promises to remain faithful to his beloved for years after separation (Shāh al-ahār al-Hudhaliyyin, ed. Farrādā, Cairo 1938-65, no. IX 2, p. 1173), and his clansman Abū Dhu'ayb [q.v.] expresses his firm belief in a reunion (op. cit., no. XVIII 1, p. 121). Another *mukhadram* even dispenses with the habitual gloom of the *nasīb* and gaily declares that "we will soon sport again with Laylā" (sa-nalhu bi-Laylá), since her tribe is not the frivolous attitude are incompatible with the function of the traditional *nasīb*, since the poet projects his hopes into the future.

Some poets manifest a degree of psychological insight unknown before. This is evidenced in the *diwān* of al-‘Aṣyā.za Masmūn, who is famous, more over, for his introduction of bacchic themes into the *nasīb* (cf. K. Dalgleish, Some aspects of the treatment of emotion in the *Diwān* of al-‘Aṣyā.za, in JAL, iv [1973], 97-111). It is even more striking in the verses of Abū
Dhu’ayb, one of the most innovative poets of the period. He seems to be the first to treat love as an independent theme, and he also tries out the combination of nasib and marjiyya in an ingenious way (cf. R. Zohayb, [q.v.], who in a nasib describes a quarrel with his wife (Dihān, ed. Aبد al-Kādir, Cairo 1368/1944, 153 ff.). Significant changes are further apparent in the rendering of conventional motifs. The “vision” (khayāl) of the beloved, once haunting the sleepless poet, is now conceived as a pleasant dream fulfilling his secret wishes (cf. Jācobi, The khayāl motif, 58 ff.). There is also an attempt to transfer the motif from its Bedouin setting to urban environment (cf. Ibn Makhbūl, Dihān, ed. Hasān, Damascus 1381/1962, no. 37, 1-2).

The nasib in the early Islamic period anticipates the development of Umayyad love poetry in several ways. The most important aspect is a new concept of love indicating that the ideal of the “Bedouin hero”, who renounces love and the beloved, is about to disappear. The nasib poet describes the love of an independent individual. It also suggests that poets gained more insight into their emotional needs and problems, which means discovering a new kind of reality, their own self (cf. Jācobi, Time and reality in Nasib and Ghazal, in JAL, xvi [1983], 1-17). These changes can hardly be due to the immediate influence of Muhammad’s preaching, but must be regarded as a result of the intellectual and moral trends of the time.

c. Umayyad period

In the course of the 7th century, pre-Islamic oral tradition is gradually transformed according to the demands of a literate urban society. The ghazal, both in its elegiac and in its frivolous variant, now constitutes the principal erotic genre voicing the intellectual and moral trends of the time. As a consequence, the nasib looses some of its former significance, but poets in the employment of the caliphs and their governors continue to introduce their odes with amatory verses as a rule, expressing love, longing and sorrow, as also the melancholy and resignation of old age. The pre-Islamic “heroic attitude”, however, the proud rejection of the beloved, is abandoned, and when al-‘Arāzīdak [q.v.] boasts, in the spirit of tribal fakhr, of the many women he forgot (Dihān, ed. Sāwī, Cairo 1354/1936, 78, 5 f.; cf. also 87, -1), he speaks as an individual, and not as a representative of his social group.

The Umayyad nasib develops in contact with ghazal poetry and assimilates some of its innovations in content and style. It therefore differs considerably from the pre-Islamic nasib. The traditional inventory of motifs and images is still in evidence, but the structure of narrative units is dissolved, the “deserted camp-site” or the “departure of the beloved” being only alluded to in one or two lines as a rule. A notable exception is the nasib of al-‘Akhbār [q.v.], the most conservative of Umayyad court poets. He continues the tradition of al-‘Aṣīrīa, moreover, of inserting bacchic scenes into his nasib. Poets also lost interest in descriptive detail, which figures so prominently in verses of the khayāl. Instead, they concentrate on their emotional state and on their relation with the beloved, whose beauty and perfection are praised but not catalogued as before. Memories are not evoked to be soon forgotten; as in ghazal poetry, their function is to justify the poet’s concern in his present love affair. The emotional impact of the nasib is frequently enhanced by stylistic means (exclamation, repetition). A further innovation is the blending of motifs which in pre-Islamic oral tradition are kept strictly apart.

The nasib varies in length from 4 to more than 20 verses. It occurs in combination with hajja, madih and, very rarely, with marjiyya. The juxtaposition of love poetry and satire, usually without transition, was favoured by professional poets, as evidenced in the Nasākād [q.v.] of Djarīr [q.v.] and al-‘Arāzīdak, and must have been appreciated by their audience (cf. van Gelder, Genres in collision: Nasib and Hājd, in JAL, xxi [1990], 14-25). In the panegyrical ode, the nasib is either placed before the madih, or it is followed by a rahīl, the poet’s desert journey to his patron (mamlūk), which in the tripartite kāṣida now replaces the former description of the poet’s camel, and is sometimes blended with the madīh (Jācobi, The camel-section of the panegyrical ode, in JAL, xiii [1982], 1-22; cf. 14-19).

The poet’s aim to impress the dangers of the way and the hardships he endures on the way to the mamlāk is also apparent in the nasib, where elements of the rahīl are introduced under various pretexts. In the motif of the nocturnal “vision”, the only narrative unit which in the tripartite kāṣida is developed into a complete individual story, the rahīl visits a group of travellers, all of them asleep. Besides dwelling on the pleasures he enjoyed in his dream and on his disenchantment in the morning, the poet always emphasises and sometimes describes at length the traces of hardship and exhaustion visible on the sleepers and their mounts (cf. al-‘Arāzīdak, Dihān, 219; Djarīr, Dihān, ed. Sāwī, Cairo 1353, 526, 10 ff.). Thus in the Umayyad ode the panegyrical function not only determines the camel-section, but also affects the composition of the nasib.

The khayāl motif frequently forms the end of the amatory prologue, and is now sometimes used as a transition to the following section. This is a favourite technique of Dhu ‘l-Rumma [q.v.] (cf. Dihān, ed. Macartney, Cambridge 1919, nos. 1, 25, 41, 52, 67, 86, 78, 70). Dihān in the Umayyad ode pays attention as one of the great achievements of Umayyad poetry. In contrast to most contemporary poets, he retains the descriptive elements of the ancient nasib and vividly depicts scenes of the desert, thereby creating an atmosphere of Bedouin life. But the result is far from being an imitation of the pre-Islamic nasib, for his amatory verses, despite of their richness in descriptive detail, reveal the emotional depth and heightened tension of Umayyad love poetry, together with a nostalgia for a mode of life about to disappear.

There are different reactions to the changes of society, however. At the beginning of the 8th century, the elegiac prologue of the kāṣida is not accepted without reserve. Al-‘Arāzīdak composed 50% of his panegyrics without nasib, and explicitly preferred ghazal verses of ‘Umar b. Abī Rabī‘a [q.v.] to the “weeping at the aṭalīl” (Agh, 1, ii, 134). He also sometimes describes sensual pleasures in his nasib, if only in a dream (Dihān, 349). About the same time, an anonymous periflage of the aṭalīl was recited and received with enthusiasm at the court of al-Walīd b. Yazīd [q.v.] (Agh, 1, ii, 27), the first “anti-nasīb” in Arabic poetry.

d. ‘Abbāsid period

The ‘Abbāsid nasib reflects in all its aspects the intellectual brilliance and sophistication of the time. This regards content, style, and, above all, its func-
tion within the structure of the ode. As to the first aspect, “modern” (muhdath) poets like Bashshar b. Burd [q.v.] and Muslim b. al-Walid [q.v.] add to the Umayyad elegiac concept of love a courtly dimension. The social superiority of the beloved, her cruelty and power are emphasized and contrasted to the poet’s devotion, which is never compensated, but heightens his moral standard. The courtly attitude is to be perceived in varying degrees in ghazal and nasib alike, but whereas in ghazal the verses of the poet’s love affair are often provided with an urban background, in the nasib a Bedouin setting is retained as a rule, forming a stylised world deliberately opposed to reality. As a result, the poet’s message acquires a timeless validity appropriate to the ceremonial function of the ʿAbbāsīd ode.

The transformation of the “Bedouin encampment” referred to by pre-Islamic and Umayyad poets into a place of symbolic significance could only be achieved by techniques of the “new style” [see nasib]. Rhetorical devices, e.g. parallelism, antithesis, allusion, and particularly metaphor, are ingeniously applied so as to produce an intricate pattern, in which the lines of the nasib are related to each other and to the following sections of the ode on different linguistic levels. This is evidenced in the dīwān of Bashshar (J. Scott Meisami, The Uses of the Qasīda: thematic and structural patterns in a poem of Bashshar, in JAL, vii [1977], 20-33). The antithes is based on an analogy supported by the ideal of courtly love: the relation of poet and beloved on the one hand, and of poet and patron on the other. Loss and frustration experienced in love are compensated by the caliph’s grace and generosity; the transitoriness of human affairs, symbolised by the atīḷ, are counterbalanced by the cosmic power of the ruler to rejuvenate the earth. The analogy is not limited to odes to the caliph, and can be put to different use, moreover, by forming a parallel, the patrim’s behaviour equaling that of the beloved (cf. Meisami, op. cit. 48 ff.).

The technique of contrasting nasib and madiḥ is still in evidence in odes of the Buŷdīd-period poet Mihyār al-Daylami [q.v.] (S. Sperl, Mannerism, 48 ff.), but further analysis is required in order to establish its application in later poetry. As for al-Mutanabī [q.v.], one of the most famous panegyrists, his works are composed without a madiḥ, whereas others, e.g. al-Buhturi and Ibn al-Rumi [q.v.], mostly refer to urban gardens (Schoeler, Arabische Naturdichtung, Berlin 1861, 439, 3). Despite his or other poets’ preference concerning the nasib, odes with amatory prologues continued to be composed throughout the Middle Ages up to the 19th century, and even after the kasīda had become obsolete as a genre, atīḷ, khayāl and other topos of the nasib did not lose their aesthetic appeal to modern Arabic poets and their readers.

As has been established, the amatory prologue underwent considerable changes in the course of the first centuries of Islam. It remains to ascertain the generic features which determine its identity as a literary form. If we disregard individual attempts to change the character of the nasib, and innovations limited to a particular period, they are to be defined as follows: a. an elegiac concept of love, b. the evocation of memories and a. Bedoùin setting alluded to by generic signals, i.e. place-names of the Hijāz, traditional names of the beloved, terms and formulas from pre-Islamic love poetry. Since they constitute a linguistic code which must be understood, they depend on a society familiar with a normative poetic convention. Thus it is to be assumed that the nasib, more perhaps than most other genres, served as a means of identification for the intellectual elite of mediaeval Islam.

Bibliography: For older bibl., see El’ act. s.v. In addition to studies mentioned in the article, see general works on Arabic literature, in particular: R. Blachère, HLA (Index); GAP, ii (Index); E. Wagner, Grundzüge der klassischen arabischen Dichtung, Darmstadt 1967 8, i, 83 ff., ii, 115 ff.—For a detailed analysis of texts, cf. R. Blachère, Les principaux themes de la poésie érotique au xiie siècle des Umayyades de Damas, in AIEO Alger, v (1939-41), 82-126 (= idem, Analecta, Damascus 1975, 333-78); Ḥādīn ‘A. al-Balahāwī, al-Muḥdthāl al-akhlīdī fī ḵasīda, Baghdād 1974; H.
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According to Yakut, it lay on the upper course of the Hirmas in the midst of numerous gardens. Ibn Hawkal, who in 358/968 visited the town, which lay at the Root of Djabal Bālūs, speaks of the pleasant life in it, apart from the dangerous scorpions found there. Al-Mukaddasi describes the fine houses and baths, the market, the Friday mosque and the citadel. Ibn Djuhayr also visited it in 380/1184-5, and mentions its gardens, the bridge over the Hirmas inside the town, the hospital (mārjūn), several schools and other places of interest. In the 9th/14th century it was the most important for the most part in ruins; but the Friday mosque was still in existence and the gardens around it from which rose-water was exported (Ibn Baštāna). Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfi, according to whom the walls had a circumference of 6,500 paces, praises its fruits and wine but laments the unhealthy moistness of the climate, the large number of scorpions and the plague of midges. The town passed into the hands of the Ottomans in 921/1515 (von Hammer, GÖR, ii, Pest 1828, 449). It became the capital of a sandjak in the pashalik of Ardabil (Hamd Allah Mustawfī, Bombay 1311, 167; Baladhuri, i'Armenie, ii, Paris 1818, 161-2).

In the present century, Nusaybin's strategic importance has arisen not only from its position on the southern fringes of the eastern Anatolian highlands but also through the passing through it, with a station, of the Istāq Khilāf, that runs from the Montgol but were suffocated in them with smoke (Appx. to Barbehaeus, Chronography, ed. Wallis Budge, ii, p. xxxiv). The Hasanāyе Kurds in 1403 pillaged Nusaybin and the country around (ibid., p. xxxvi).
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Dimna [q. v.], going back to the Sanskrit Pancatantra, but much more significant was the classical Greek and Hellenistic component, derived in great part through Arabic literature to the end of the Umayyad period, listing on p. 533). His caliph's chief secretary, the pupil of the latter philosopher, as an exemplar of the Shu^ubTya, in Studies to Gabrieli's art. IBN AL-MUKAFFA (d. 328/940) and of two generations later like Ibn Abd Rab-
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literary and belletristic vein. The former’s ‘Uyun al-
akhbār includes lengthy sections entitled kīdāb al-sulūn on the qualities necessary for rulership, k. al-barh on the conduct of warfare and k. al-sulūd on the quality of leadership, and is now in worldly ad nut (see Richter, 59 ff., and G. Leconte, Ibn Qutayba (mort en 276/889), l‘homme, son oeuvre, ses idées, Damascus 1965, 145-6). Ibn ʿAbd Rabbīḥī likewise opens his adh collection al-Idr al-farīd with sections on government (sulūn), the conduct of war and a subsequent one on the addressing of kings, and appears to have drawn upon sources parallel to those of Ibn Kūṭayba (see Richter, 72-9).

The Fürstenspiegel genre continued in Arabic literature for at least two or three centuries more. Works which were either themselves mirrors for princes or contained elements of the genre include two works, both extant, by al-Īwārī (d. 450/1058 [q.v.]), including a Nasihat al-mulūk and a K. Rāwānīn al-wuzūrd wa-siyāṣat al-mulūk, the latter being one of several composed on the adh-tanzīl (see on this, D. Sourdel, Le vissrat ʿabbāsīde, Damascus 1959-60, i, 13-14). Al-Thāʿalībī (d. 429/1038 [q.v.]) composed at the court of the Kh.ʿizr-Shāh Maʿmūn b. Maʿmūn (see Kh.ʿazar-Shāhs) a K. Adh adh al-mulūk al-kh.ʿazār-Shāhī (ed. and Eng. tr. Tevfik Topuzoğlu, Kīdāb ʿAdh adh al-Mulūk al-Kh.ʿazār-Shāhī of ... ath-Thāʿalībī, Ph.D. diss., Manchester 1974, 2 vols., unpublished).

Such works were as popular in the Muslim West as in the central and eastern Islamic lands, as already evidenced by Ibn ʿAbd Rabbīḥī’s Ṣīḥ (whose contents, however, are entirely within the Baghdād-centred traditions of the Maṣḥīḥ; it does not seem that any distinctive, local versions of the genre ever developed in al-Andalus or the Maghrib), see, e.g., Ibn Abī Randaka al-Turtushī (d. 520/1126 or 523/1129) Kitb Kanz al-Mulūk fi kayfīyyat al-sulūk, 654/1256 for princes of the easterner Sibt Ibn al-Djawzī (d. 565/1169 or 568/1172) Kalūm wa-Dimna fi ṣirād adh adh al-adīb al-Sūlīyī of the Sicilian emigrant to Mecca, Hudjdjat al-Thawbt, Ph.D. diss., Manchester 1974, 2 vols., unpublished (q.v.).


2. In Persian literature.

The genre in Arabic was always of a pronounced literary character, reflecting the dominant role accorded to adh and its practitioners in Arab-Islamic culture. The literary, idealising element remains discernible in the Persian mirrors for princes, but practical considerations obtrude much more perceptibly here, perhaps in part reflecting the fact that two of the outstanding Persian composers of works in the genre, Kay Kāwūs b. Iskandar and Nīgām al-Mulūk [q.v.], were themselves exponents of the art of practical politics and far from being academic theoreticians. It was seen in section 1. above that the contributory pre-Islamic Persian strand in the development of the genre, derived from the collections of animal and bird fables and from works on the conduct of the Sasanid emperors and the organization of their courts, was always notable. Furthermore, Middle Persian literature had quite an appreciable amount of moralising works containing admonitions, ethical directives

language work were subsequently translated into Arabic (according to Ibn Khallīkūn, by Sāfī ʿl-Dīn Abū ʿl-Ḥasan al-Īrābī for a Turkish Atabeg of Mawṣūl towards the end of the 6th/12th century) as al-Ṭibr al-
maṣūkh fi nasihat al-mulūk, and this had a much wider circulation than the Persian original, being frequently copied in Mamlūk and Ottoman times, whereas so few of the Persian version circulated that Goldzieher, e.g. believed that it had been irretrievably lost (Streitschrift des Ghazālī gegen die Bāṭinīja-Sekte, Leiden 1916, 98) until ms. turned up in Istanbul and Tehran. As well as imparting the usual Islamic and pre-Islamic Persian counsels for the ruler, al-
Ghazālī’s part of the work expresses the ʿṢūfī view of life which one would expect from such a noted practitio-
nor of Sūfism as its author: the ruler’s spiritual life is of paramount importance. Following the traditional Islamic view, al-Ghazālī stresses that kingship is a gift bestowed by God, for which the ruler will be fully accountable on the Last Day; the ruler does not owe his power to his fellow-men and is not accountable to them, hence he must be especially careful to avoid the meretricious attractions of this world. The patently different emphasis of the second part, on the qualities required by kings, is seen in the extensive quotation of the examples set by the Sāsānīd Persian emperors and in its praise of the justice and benevolent rule of the “mother for some 4,000 years until God decided to send the Prophet Muhammad for mankind and to let the political sovereignty pass to the Arabs; even so, the fame of the wise and just Khusraw Anūshshārān still redounds during Islamic times because his salient qualities of justice and magnanimity are valid for all times and valid during all manifestations of God’s favour to subsequent religions and dynasties. The anonymous author recognises, in the period of the decline of the caliphate’s effective power, the falt accompli of the practical exercise of power by the sulūn [q.v.], and regards this last as divinely-inspired also; maxims like “the sultan is God’s shadow on earth” are cited with approval, and the sultan’s power is viewed as being consecrated by the old-Persian idea of the “divine effulgence” (farābī, q. v.) on the one hand, and the mentioning of Sibt Ibn al-Djawzī’s Kitb Kanz al-Mulūk fi kayfīyyat al-sulūk, 654/1256 (see on this, D. Richter, 72-9)); including a K. Adh adh al-mulūk al-kh.ʿazār-Shāhī (ed. and Eng. tr. Tevfik Topuzoğlu, Kīdāb ʿAdh adh al-Mulūk al-Kh.ʿazār-Shāhī of ... ath-Thāʿalībī, Ph.D. diss., Manchester 1974, 2 vols., unpublished).

The most notable author of these times to compose in the genre was the great theologian Abū Hāmid al-
Ghazālī (d. 505/1111 [q.v.]). As well as touching on the topic of rulership and its duties in such works of his as the K. al-Mustazhirī and the Persian-language Kīmāyī yi saʿāda, it seems that al-Ghazālī wrote a special treatise on the Islamic religious ideals required of a godly ruler and on practical questions of statecraft for a Saldjūk prince, either Muhammad b. Malik-
Shāh or his brother Sandjar [q.v.], and this forms the first part of the work which has been generally attributed to him and called the Nasihat al-mulūk. The second part of this, however, is probably the work of an unknown Persian author of a generation or so later working very much in the Persian ethical and political tradition (see Patricia Crone, Did al-Ghazalli write a Mirror for Princes? On the authorship of Nasihat al-mulūk, in ISAT, x [1987], 167-91). Both parts of this Persian-
and advice on correct behaviour in various walks of life, the so-called andarz "teachings" and pand-namāk "book of counsels" literature (see J. Rypka et alii, History of Iranian literature, Dordrecht 1968, 37-9), and the emphasis was carried over into the Islamic period when New Persian Islamic literature developed from the 3rd/9th century onwards; it may further be seen in the moralising element prominent in such literary collections of stories as the Gulistān and Būstān of Sa’dī (q.v.). As in Arabic, the genre in Islamic Persian literature begins with works on a modest scale or with sections in works essentially concerned with broader or with different topics. From the middle years of the 5th/11th century the references are within the Ta’rīkh-i Mas‘ūdī of the Ghaznawid author Abu ‘l-Fadl Bayhākī (q.v.) to earlier works like Ibn al-Muḳaffā’s translation of the pre-Islamic Persian Khudāy-namāk "Book of kings", which he calls the Ta’rīkh-i Malūk-i ‘Affām, and his comments on the ideal conduct of the ruler, his coercive powers and the subjects under his jurisdiction (see Bosworth, The Ghaznavids, their empire in Afghanistan and eastern Iran 994-1040, Edinburgh 1963, 48-50; Marilyn R. Waldman, Toward a theory of historical narrative, a case study in Persian-Islamic historiography, Columbus, Ohio 1980, 69-70). The founder of the dynasty, Sebūkṭīgūn (q.v.) allegedly left behind a wasyān, a collection of aphorisms and pieces of advice on the business of kingship, the Pand-namāk, known to us from its inclusion in a general history of the 8th/14th century, Muhammad b. ‘Abbās Qubān-kāra’s Maṣgīma al-anṣāb, but that a Turkish steppe barbarian like Sebūkṭīgūn could have put together this sophisticated opuscule, whose contents include much that is discernible in the longer and more elaborate Persian mirrors for princes. It is highly unlikely, and it must surely have been composed well after his death in 387/997 and attributed to him in later Ghaznavid times as the heroic founder of the dynasty (see M. Nazīm, The Pand-Namāk of Subuktīgūn, in JRAS [1933], 605-28; Bosworth, Early sources for the history of the first four Ghaznavid sultans (977-1011), in IQ, viii [1963], 16-20 = The medieval history of Iran, Afghanistan and Central Asia: a reader in sources, London 1972-xiii, xiv-xv; Lambton, 81-3; Bagley, op. cit., introd., pp. xii-xiv). Its brisk practicality made it a favourite with later generations of the Perso-Islamic cultural world, and at least five Ottoman Turkish translations of it were made.

The vizier to the Salṭḏūq sultans Alp Arslān and Malik Shāh (q.v.), Nizām al-Mulk, composed his Siyāsāt-namā or Siyar al-mulāk at the court of the latter sultan in 484/1091-2, possibly at Malik Shāh’s suggestion, and placed within it the distilled wisdom of some four decades of administrative activity in Persia; the result is the supreme work of its kind in Persian. In some ways, it was a political manifesto, setting forth the things which he considered his master the sultan should undertake and reproving his lack of concern with certain vital affairs of rule; his exemplars here are not only the old Persian kings but also such forceful Islamic despots as the Buyid ‘Adud al-Dawla and Maḥmūd of Ghazna. But Nizām al-Mulk’s basic premise was that the divine authority of the ruler, whether he be caliphate or sultan, as being designated by God and as holding his power in trust from God, with the corollaries that the ruler’s supreme task is the furtherance of right religion and the suppression of all religious and social deviance and that it is the duty of subjects to give unconditional obedience. This concept of the ruler’s untrammeled power was to live on throughout the Islamic lands virtually unchallenged until modern times, and in this wise, Nizām al-Mulk, good Muslim though he was, was restating the old Persian traditions of government based on force majeure and opportunism, as distinct from the traditional Islamic idea of true authority being based on the Qur’ān and the Sunnah. Because of the high proportion of illustrative anecdotal and historical material within it, the Siyāsāt-namā is a significant, if not always totally reliable, straight historical source, above all for the period of the caliphate’s decline and disintegration on the rise of provincial dynasties like the Sāmānids, Saṭāfīrdīs and Ghaznawids, and for various socio-religious protest movements arising in the Persian lands, from Mazdakism to Ismā’īlīsm (see Rosenthal, op. cit., 81-3; Bagley, op. cit., introd. pp. xiv-xv; Lambton, The dilemma of government in Islamic Persia: the Siyāsāt-namā of Nizām al-Mulk, in Iran JFBPS, xxii [1984], 55-66).

Even more in the traditional Islamic mould than al-Ghazālī’s Nasīḥat al-mulāk, and in fact heavily depen-
dent on that author’s *Kimīyā-yi saḏdat* and, to a lesser extent, on his *Bahār al-fawāʾid* (tr. Julie S. Meisami, *The sea of precious virtues* (Bahār al-Fawāʾid), a medieval Islamic mirror for princes, Salt Lake City 1991). This was written in Syria, probably at Aleppo, by an unknown author for one of the Ahmadī’s *q.v.* Atabegs of Adharbaydžan, and its tone is homiletic rather than prosaic and practical, with its examples almost entirely Islamic; it reflects the atmosphere of *dhād* against the Crusaders and the contemporary resurgence, under the Seldžūks and Zangids, of Sunnī orthodoxy, and not the continued influence of the Persian past.

The genre of mirrors for princes retained an enduring interest for later generations of Persian writers, and this interest is visible in such works as the *DhakhTrat al-mulūk* of the Kubrāwī Ṣūfī saint of Kaḥṣmūr, Sayyid Ṭāhir Ḥamadhāni (d. 768/1366) ([see *Ṣāl 之势 al-Dīn Ḥamadhānī*]), the *Nasikh-i Shāhrukh*, written in 813/1411 by Dījal al-Dīn Zakariyyā’ Khān, the *Timūrid Shahrubkh* ([q. v.]); and the *Salāt al-mulūk* of Ṣafī Allāh Ṣuṭūbī Khūndî (d. 927/1521) ([q. v.]), written as a guide for the strongly Sunnī Shaybānīr rule of Ṣabīyād Ṭāhir Khān ([see Rypta et al., op. cit., 427]).

Ḥamadhānī’s work was written in Muslim India and the role of mirrors for princes remained equally popular within the Persian cultural world of India. This Indian aspect of the genre has not been thoroughly studied, but a concern with statecraft, the art of war and political ethics were of burning relevance to a Muslim society like the Indian one, which had to maintain itself against strong non-Islamic internal forces such as the Hindu princes and against invaders from the north. Its subconscious influence is also felt in 15th-century Timūr. Muslims never became anything like a numerical majority of the population over the country as a whole, hence writers in India were more exercised by such topics as *dhād* and by the status of non-believers within the Indian *Dīr al-Islām* than were writers in the Persian lands proper. Some Indo-Muslim writers in the mirrors for princes vein during the Sultanate period, like Fakhār-ī-Mubāhid Khūndī, *Shāh* ([fl. late 6th-early 7th/late 12th-early 13th centuries] [q. v. in Suppl.]) recognised in his *Aḥād al-mulūk* that unbelievers should be treated justly and assigned a protected, if subordinate, place in society; whereas the Tughluqīd period author Dīyāʾ al-Dīn Barānī (d. after 758/1357) ([q. v.]), in his mirror, the *Fatūhād-yi Ḥākemīr*, took up a rigorous attitude on the treatment of infidels, involving the necessity of humiliating them. The Mughal empire saw the production of various mirrors, such as the *Aḥlākī-i Ḥumayūn* of Ḥiyāyār al-Dīn Ḥusayn (written in 912/1506-7 for Bābur’s son Ḥumayūn [q. v.]), and the *Aḥlākī-i Ḥakimī* by Ṣāḥib Ṭāhir al-Munāhī (wrote 987-8/1579-80 for the half-brother of the Emperor Akbar, Muhammad Ḥakim Mīrzā [q. v. in Suppl.]). From the reign of Ḥādīrgān—whose *Dīyā∗ al-Dīn Barānī ([q.v.]), Fatūhād-yi Ḥākemīr, Khudā Bakhsh’s real sons respected what they considered the poet’s depriving them of their rightful inheritance. Nevertheless, *Nasikh* soon achieved fame as a poet in both Urdu and Persian, as a teacher and as a corrector of other men’s poetry. His *Saksena* (101) refers to his “florid and ornate poetry, often now considered more important as an arbiter of language. The same cannot be said of his Urdu style, and this interest in ethical and didactic literature may have stimulated the composition of these works—in the first part of the 11th/17th century stem no fewer than three works in the genre, Kādūr Allāh Khākānī’s *Aḥlākī-i Ḥādīrgānī*, Ṣhāykh ʿAbd al-Hakk Dīhlwī’s *Rīsālā-yi Nūrīyya-yi Sulānīyyah* ([the only one of these works by an *ʿalām* who was not also a courtier; and the *Mawza-yi Ḥādīrgānī* of Muhammad Bākīr Nāṣīmī [q. v.], red. ed. with Eng. tr. as *Advice on the Path of Governance*, an Indo-Persian mirror for princes, by Sajīda Sulṭanat Alvi, Albany N.Y. 1989). This last work does not seem to show that the genre had developed much originality in Muslim India, although a lessened pre-occupation with threats from the infidels may reflect the more secure conditions of the time compared with the earlier, troubled Sultanate period (see Alvi’s introd., 29-34). Finally, Ṣyypī, History of Iranian literature, 427, 20th century. His failings are clearly explained by Muhammad Sadiq in his *A history of Urdu literature* (134-7). He says: “Nasikh is one of those poets who make up in ingenuity for what they lack in inspiration”. *Sadiq* also mentions his “excessive interest in difficult rhymes”.

This last work does not seem to show that the genre had developed much originality in Muslim India, although a lessened pre-occupation with threats from the infidels may reflect the more secure conditions of the time compared with the earlier, troubled Sultanate period (see Alvi’s introd., 29-34). Finally, Rypta, History of Iranian literature, 427, 20th century. His failings are clearly explained by Muhammad Sadiq in his *A history of Urdu literature* (134-7). He says: “Nasikh is one of those poets who make up in ingenuity for what they lack in inspiration”. *Sadiq* also mentions his “excessive interest in difficult rhymes”.

Nāsīkh — Al-Nāṣir

following matters: the elimination of Hindi words, and preference for those of Arabic and Persian origin; determination of the gender of nouns, which had been vague from the days of Dakhani Urdu, and of the spelling of common words, particularly in the use of long or short vowels. Thus idhar (here/hither) and uthar (there/thither) were preferred to idhar and uthar.

Nāsīkh also wrote, in Persian, a very short treatise on Urdu rhyme, Risāla-yi-taṣāfiya, of no great importance.

Bibliography: For a detailed study of Nāsīkh, see Shāhīb al-Ḥasan Nawānghāwī, Nāṣīkh: Tadżāwa us-taḥāf Lucknow 1973. A shorter study is the 130-page Introduction to selected verse, Rashīd Ḥasan Khān, Inšākāb-i-Nāṣīkh, New Delhi 1972. For shorter accounts, see Muhammad Ṣadiq, A history of Urdu literature, Oxford 1962, 17, 133-6, and Ram Babu Saksena, A history of Urdu literature, Allahabad 1927, 17, 101-6. Among many editions of his diwāns, the one published in Lucknow in 1923 may be recommended.

(A. Haywood)

Al-Nāṣīkh wa l-Mansūkh [see naskh]

Nāsim, Dāyā Shānkark Kāwī (1811-32), a Kashmiri pandit who studied poetics under the ghazal poet of Lucknow Ṭināgh [q. v. in Suppl.]. His fame rests entirely upon one poem, a romance called Gulsāz-i Nāsim, composed when he was 22. It greatly resembles Mīr Ḥasan's Ṣulam and is generally awarded the second place among Urdu poetic romances. Nāsim also translated the Arabian Nights into Urdu. Nāsim is among the great Urdu muthnavī [q. v., 4. in Urdu] (muthnavi in the sense of poetic romances) writers, and is one of the very few Urdu authors who were Hindus.


(G. E. Leesm) Nāsim-oghlū [see ak ḥisārī]

Al-Nāṣir [see al-ṭurūfah]

Al-Nāṣir, honorific of the fourth sovereign of the Ayyūbid sultans [see al-muwahhidūn], Abū ʿAbbās Mūḥammad b. Yaʿqūb al-Mansūr b. Yūsuf b. Abī Mūṣīm. He was proclaimed on the death of his father on 22 Rabīʿ 1 I 595/25 Jan. 1199. The beginning of his reign was marked by the suppression of a rising led by an agitator in the mountainous country of the Ghamāra [q. v.] and a long stay at Fās, during which the rebuilt a part of the wall of the kāṣba of the city. Hearing of the rising of Yabỳ b. Ishĥ Ibn Ghanīyā [see ghanīa, bani] in Ifrīkiya, he set out for the eastern part of his empire and laid siege to the town of Mahdīyya [q. v.] which was taken on 27 Dīnāmād I 602/9 Jan. 1206. He returned to Morocco in the following year, leaving as his deputy in Ifrīkiya the shaykh Abī Mūḥammad ʿAbbās al-Waḥīd b. Abī Ḥafs al-Muḥāṭirī, ancestor of the Ḥaḍīdīs [q. v.]. In 599/1202-3 he had dispatched from Alger some 100,000 troops to administer the Ayyūbid possessions in Ifrikiya, a fleet which took the island; this remained in Muslim hands till 627/1230. In 607/1211, al-Nāṣir sent an expedition to Spain which ended in a disaster for the Muslim troops at Las Navas de Tolosa [see al-shaṣira] on 13 Saʿfar 609/16 July 1212. This severe reverse deeply affected al-Nāṣir, who returned to Morocco and made his subjects take the oath of allegiance to his son Yūsuf. He then retired to his palace. He died at Rabat (Riḥāb al-Fath [q. v.]) on 10 Ṣaʿbān 610/25 Dec. 1213. According to some

chroniclers, he died a violent death on the same date in Marrakesh, his capital, the victim of a conspiracy hatched by his viziers.

This ruler, whose reign marks the beginning of the decline of the Ayyūbids, left behind virtually nothing of lasting memory, and no inscription in his name seems even to have been carved at Marrakesh, where, on the night of 11 Rabīʿ I 607/2-3 September 1210, the Kāṣ̲ārīyā was devastated by a catastrophic fire. It is nevertheless recorded that he built a workshop for coinage money at Fās.

Bibliography: See that for al-muwahhidūn.

Al-Nāṣir, the name of two Ayyūbid sultans.


After the death of his father at the end of Dhu ʿIl-kāda 624/November 1227, Dawūd succeeded him on the throne of Damascus and the Mamlūk Izz al-Dīn Aybak acted as regent. Dawūd's uncle however, covetous of territory, did not leave him long in peace. Al-Malik al-Kāmil [q. v.], first of all claimed the fortress of al-Shawbak [q. v.], and when it was refused to him he occupied Jerusalem, Nābulus and other places (625/1228). In this perilous position, Dawūd appealed to another uncle-Malik al-Aṣḥāf, who administered Damascus and was generally known as Aṣḥāf. The latter came to Damascus, but then took al-Kāmil's side and arranged with him a formal division of the whole kingdom. By the arrangement between the two brothers, al-Aṣḥāf was to receive Damascus and Dawūd Harrān, al-Rākka and Hims, while al-Kāmil took southern Syria with Palestine, and Hamāt was left to Dawūd's brother al-Malik al-Muṣṭafār. But when Dawūd would not consent to this, al-Aṣḥāf began to besiege Damascus. After al-Kāmil had concluded peace with the Emperor Frederick II, he joined al-Aṣḥāf and after a three months' siege, forced his nephew to yield (Shaʿbān 626/June-July 1229), whereupon al-Aṣḥāf was recognised as lord of Damascus under al-Kāmil's suzerainty while Dawūd had to be content with al-Karak [q. v.], which was taken by al-Aṣḥāf and several other conquests. In spite of this unfriendly treatment, Dawūd remained loyal to al-Kāmil when the other Ayyūbīds combined against him, and entered his service in Egypt. Soon after al-Kāmil accompanied by Dawūd had taken Damascus, he died in Radjab 635/March 1238 and Dawūd, whom al-Kāmil had appointed governor of Damascus, had to return to al-Karak. In Egypt, al-Kāmil's son al-Malik al-ʿAdīl was recognised as his successor and appointed his cousin al-Malik al-Dāwūd Yūnūs governor of Damascus. When Dawūd tried to assert his claims to Damascus, he was defeated at Nābulus. In the following year Yūnūs, who did not feel secure against al-ʿAdīl, exchanged Damascus with his cousin al-Malik al-Ṣāḥīb Ayyūb for Singār, al-Raḵka and Ṣanā. This pleased neither al-ʿAdīl nor Dawūd, so they joined forces for an attack on Ayyūb.

The events that followed are related in al-Malik al-Sāḥīb al-Dīn Ayyūb, so that the reader may be referred to it. After Dawūd had lost all his possessions except al-Karak, he appointed his youngest son al-Malik al-Muʿṣāzam Iṣā as his deputy and fled to Aleppo (647/1249-50), where he was kindly received by al-Malik al-Nāṣir Yūsuf (see below). His private fortune in the form of valuable jewels, valued at least 100,000 dinars, he entrusted to the care of the caliph al-Mustaʿsīm [q. v.], who acknowledged the receipt of them but never could bring himself to restore the treasure entrusted him. Soon afterwards, Dawūd's
two older sons, who had felt themselves neglected, turned to al-Malik al-Salih Ayūb and offered him al-Karak in return for feuds in Egypt, which offer the latter had accepted. Alleged unfavourable reports about Dāwd, al-Malik al-Nāṣir Yusuf had brought to Hims in the beginning of Sha'ban 648/October 1250 and put under arrest. In 651/1253-4, he was released on the intercession of the caliph, on condition that he was not to stay in any lands under the rule of al-Malik al-Nāṣir Yusuf. He therefore went to Baghdaḏ, but was not admitted into the city. He then lived for a time very wretchedly in the region of ʿAṣīr and had to find a place of refuge in al-Anbār. His appeals to the caliph were not answered; finally, however, the caliph obtained for him permission to settle in Damascus. After several unsuccessful efforts to get back his property in Baghdaḏ which had been confiscated, he was in the desert when he was taken prisoner by al-Malik al-Mughlīḏ, then lord of al-Karak and al-Shawbak, and brought to al-Shawbak. As the caliph thought he could be of use to him in the impending fight with the Mongols, he sent an envoy to al-Shawbak to fetch him; the envoy was bringing him back to Damascus when he heard of Hūlāḡū's capture of Baghdaḏ; he thereupon left Dāwd who went to al-Buwaḏyā, a village near Damascus. Here he died of the plague on 27 Dhu al-Miʿād 650/October 1250. Abu ʿl-Fida speaks highly of Dāwd's eloquence and poetical gifts.


II. AL-MALIK AL-NĀṢIR, SALĀḤ AL-DĪN YUSŪF, often referred to as al-Nāṣir Yusuf, the last Ayyūbid ruler of Aleppo and Damascus (ruled 634-58/1236-60).

Born in 627/1230, he came to the throne as a child, owing to his father al-ʿĂzīz Muhammad's premature death, and his long reign was a troubled and ultimately tragic one, for he died in the autumn of 658/1260 as a prisoner of the Mongols. His reign falls into three phases: (i) the regency of his grandmother Dayfa Khāṭūn, 634-40/1236-42; (2) the ascendancy of the amir Šams al-Dīn Luḥuʾ al-Ammīn, 640-8/1242-51; and (3) his fully independent rule, 648-58/1251-60. The first two phases were successful and even triumphant; his dominions grew until by 649/1250 he controlled almost the whole of Syria and Diyar Muḍḥar. But these achievements were lost in his last decade of rule and by the time the Mongols appeared in Syria, his régime was on the verge of disintegration.

Dayfa Khāṭūn proved a vigorous and effective regent, whose power was never challenged despite Islam’s rejection of a legitimate role for women in public affairs. The Mongol threat, however, eroded her real power to the more famous Shāḏjar al-Dūrūt [q.v.]. Her main task was to preserve Aleppo’s autonomy in the period of disorder around the death of al-Malik al-Kāmil [q.v.], having already before the latter’s death allied with al-Malik al-Aḫrafa Muṣṣa of Damascus and with the Saljuqūṣ of Rūm, so that Kay Ḵhwarāw II (634-43/1237-46 [q.v.]) was formally recognised as al-Nāṣir’s suzerain, including on the coinage of Aleppo. She also fought off the expansionist efforts of the Ṭabāq āb of Mawsil, Badr al-Dīn Luḥuʾ [q.v.], and the ravages of undisciplined bands of Khāزوارīn troops, the remnants of Djalāl al-Dīn Bingburnū’s [q.v.], army, not definitively suppressed till 640/1242.

But the hopes of Dayfa Khāṭūn that by her death (640/1242), her grandson’s掌门 would be secure, proved illusory; the Rūm Saljuqūṣ allies of Aleppo were crushed by the Mongols at Kūse Ḵagh [q.v. (641/1243), bringing Mongol raiders into the fringes of northern Syria. More immediately pressing, however, over the next seven years was Aleppo’s mercurial relationship with al-Malik al-Salīḥ Ayūb of Egypt, whose ambitions embraced not only Damascus but also Diyar ʿAzīz. The amir Šams al-Dīn Luḥuʾ, accordingly allied with the rulers of Hīmṣ, Damascus and even the Franks of Acre, and the distraction of the Crusade of King Louis IX of France enabled Aleppo to consolidate its position in northern Syria, so that by 648/1250 al-Malik al-Nāṣir entered Damascus, which was to remain his capital for the rest of his reign.

His principality now almost replicated that of Nūr al-Dīn a century before, with a centralised polity and recognition of his overlordship by e.g. the local, autonomous rulers of Diyar Bakr and Diyar Rabiʿa. At this point still only 18 years old, he remained under the influence of Shams al-Dīn, but the latter was killed in an abortive invasion of Egypt (winter of 648/1251), depriving the rest of his reign and most trusted counsellor; for the rest of his reign, he was to be reduced to passivity and indecision. Despite peace with the Mamlūk régime in Egypt, his freedom of action was seriously reduced by the factionalism of his Turkish mamlūkūs (including those of the Bahriyya mamlūkūs of Egypt who in 651/1254 fled to his lands under Baybars al-Bundukdār [q.v.]) and the Kurdish element of his army. Europes. He invaded Egypt, the influence of Shams al-Dīn, but the latter was killed in an abortive invasion of Egypt (winter of 648/1251), depriving the rest of his reign and most trusted counsellor; for the rest of his reign, he was to be reduced to passivity and indecision. Despite peace with the Mamlūk régime in Egypt, his freedom of action was seriously reduced by the factionalism of his Turkish mamlūkūs (including those of the Bahriyya mamlūkūs of Egypt who in 651/1254 fled to his lands under Baybars al-Bundukdār [q.v.]) and the Kurdish element of his army.
madrasa intra-muros to the north of the Umayyad Mosque and a (no longer extant) ddr... even Akkush was pardoned, they quickly disappeared. Kabdjak died in 710/1310. Asandamur was arrested and imprisoned in the duumvirate of Salar and Baybars. An attempt in Muharram 707/July 1307 to use the Nasiriyya in a military coup miscarried, and the sultan was formally enthroned as sultan with the title of al-Shahab. Under the surface, deep divisions existed. The most powerful group in Cairo were the Burjids, the Circassian Mamluks recruited by Kalâwûn. They had insisted on the election of their fellow-countryman, Salâr, as sultan instead of the Mongol, Salar. This decision, the rise of the Mamluks to military and political dominance. Meanwhile, the young sultan was building up his own military household, the Nasiriyya Mamluks, and becoming increasingly restive under the duumvirate of Salar and Baybars. An attempt in Muharram 707/July 1307 to use the Nasiriyya in a military coup miscarried, and the sultan was formally enthroned as sultan with the title of al-Shahab. Under the surface, deep divisions existed. The most powerful group in Cairo were the Burjids, the Circassian Mamluks recruited by Kalâwûn. They had insisted on the election of their fellow-countryman, Salâr, as sultan instead of the Mongol, Salar. This decision...
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3. AL-NASIR HASAN, (748-52/1347-51, 755-amtrs. He also carried out the difficult operation, his Mamluk household, and promoted its members, which had been fatal to some earlier sultans, of into Syria on their behalf. Al-Nasir steadily increased [q.v., Oldjeytii who made a final and abortive raid prudently fled early in 712/1312 to the Ilkhan...[khdss]) from 1/6 to 5/12, while the remaining 7/12 of the province of Damascus (713/1313-14) was fol-

Throughout his third reign, al-Nasir had a series of confidential advisers, who acquired great wealth from the sultan's lavish bounty. Two of them held great offices of state: Tankiz al-Husami, governor of Damascus to 740/1340, with whom al-Nasir was con-

Still further outside the court circle but nevertheless influential in Syrian affairs was the great tribal chief of Al Fadl, amir al-'Arab Muhammân b. ʿIsâ, one of the sultan's principal agents for the purchase of Arabian horses.

Unlike his successful predecessors in the Mamlûk sultanate, al-Nasir did not owe his position and authority to leadership in war. In a Syro-Egyptian state no longer threatened by external enemies, he built up his autocratic power by the force of his per-
timacious, devious and ruthless personality. The security he established for himself is shown by the fact that, unlike any other sultan, he made the Pilgrimage to Mecca three times (712/1312, 719/1320, 732/1332). He confirmed the hereditary nature of the sultanate, although competing amirs usurped the power under the late Kalâwûnîs. 
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Nasir Muhammad b. Kalâwûn al-Sâlih wa-ʿawâlîdhi, ed. Barbara Schäfer, i (text), Wesban 1977, 3-

124, ii (German tr.), Wiesbaden 1985, 15-160; (5) Saafadî, al-Wâfî bi ʿl-wâfâwâfî, Wesban 1962-
numerous relevant biographical notices including al-Nâṣir Muhammad at iv, 335-74). Later comp-


2. AL-NÂSIR AHMAD (742-3/1342). He was the son of al-Nâṣir Muhammad by a concubine, the singing-

woman Bayâd. From the age of about 10 he lived almost continuously in the castle of al-Karâk. He was explicitly rejected as heir to the sultanate by his dying father (18 Dhū l-Hijdja 714/4 June 1341). The amir Kâwûnî, ruling in the name of the infant al-ʿAṣghar Kudjuq (Küükûk), fearing an attack, sent an expedi-
tionary force against al-Karâk under the amir al-Kutlubugha al-Fakhru (Râbî II 742/October 1341), who, however, went over to Ahmad, and proclaimed him sultan in Damascus (Radjab 742/January 1342). In Cairo, Kâwûnî was overthrown, Kudjuq deposed, and Ahmad invited to come to his capital. He was reluctant to leave al-Karâk, and only after much pressure did he arrive in Cairo, in Arab dress and with a small retinue (28 Ramadân 742/6 March 1342). His enthronement on 10 Shawwâl/19 March was a splendid occasion, attended by the notables of both Egypt and Syria. However, he profoundly alienated the magnates who had installed him by secluding himself in the Citadel with a circle of favourites from al-Karâk, on whom he entirely relied. On 2 Dhū l-Hijdja 742/9 May 1342 he left for al-Karâk at a day's notice, taking with him the two chief financial and secretarial officials as well as the regalia, his father's treasures, horses, cattle and sheep. Again seceded in al-Karâk, he rejected state business and refused to return. The magnates thereupon deposed him, and installed his brother, al-Sâlih Iṣmâʾîl, as Sultan. A series of military expeditions sent against al-

Karâk ended in Ahmad's capture. He was put to death on 6 Râbi I 745/18 July 1344 at the age of 26. 


3. AL-NÂSIR ʿHASAN, (748-52/1347-51, 755-
AL-NAṢIR 993
62/1354-61). He was the son of al-Nasir Muhammad by a concubine. He was enthroned at the age of 11 on 14 Ramadān 748/18 December 1347, after his brother, al-Muraḍ Hādżī, had been overthrown and killed by a conspiracy of the magnates. A council of regency was set up, but the real power was held by two brothers, the amīr Baybūrgā Ṣurūs and Māndjāk al-Yuṣuf, together with Shāykhūn (or Shāykhū) al-Umāri, all three veterans of al-Nasīr Mūhammad’s Mamlūk household. On 24 Shawwāl 751/25 December 1350 Hasan arrested the amīr Baybūrgā, who was succeeded by his cousin Bulūgīn; but his chief hope of extending his territory lay in the decline of the kingdom of Kayrawān.

Another revolt of the amīr brought about the deposition of Shālīb and the restoration of Hasan on 2 Shawwāl 755/20 October 1354. He was, however, under the domination of Shāykhūn and another Nāṣīrī veteran, Shārghātmūs. The former died late in 758/1357, and on 26 Ramadān 759/27 August 1358 Hasan arrested Salīh Salīh, was installed as sultan (28 Dju‘ād-Dhīl 762/17 March 1361 by Yālbughā, who had been planning to overthrow the sultan. A fight followed between the Royal Mamlūks and those of Shārghātmūs, and the former were victorious. Hasan now sought to secure his position by promoting his own Mamlūks and also, most unusually, the descendants of Mamlūks (awlād al-nās [q.v.] ) to key positions. Growing resentment between the sultan and his own Mamlūk, Yālbughā al-Umāri, led to a coalition in which Shāhān was defeated. He was captured and put to death on 9 Dju‘ād-Dhīl 762/22 February 1361 by Yālbughā, who installed Hādījī’s son, al-Mansūr Mūhammad. Al-Nasīr Hasan left as his chief memorial his beautiful madrasa-mosque in Cairo.

Bibliography: Sa‘afāt, al-Wī‘ī bi l-‘usūgifī, xi/2, 265-7 (first reference only); Maktūfūt, K. al-Suluk, ii/3, 745-843, iii/1, 63; Ibrāhīm, Cairo, x, 187-232, 302-17; Weil, Chalifen, iv, 466-89, 500-5. 5. AL-NASIR MUHAMMAD (901-4/1496-8). He was the son of al-As‘āfr Kāṭibiyāt [q.v.] by a Circassian concubine, Ṣa‘alābīy, and born in Shawwāl 887/November-December 1482. When his father died, the incarceration in Cairo, by the faction of Kānsaw Shāmṣūmī [a min Ṭārābay and Karbūyā al-Annās, who had recently expelled the chief of the rival faction, Akbārdī al-Dawāḏār, Kāṭibiyāt’s cousin. Kānsaw Shāmṣūmī has designs on the throne, but on the day before Kāṭibiyāt’s death, 26 Dhu ‘l-Ka‘dā 901/6 August 1496, he brought about the accession of al-Nasīr Muhammad. He was himself appointed amīr di‘ārat, dāddār, wazīr, and chief kāḍī. The appearance of Akbārdī at Gaza, and the mutual sympathy between him and the young sultan, provoked Kānsaw Shāmṣūmī to attempt a coup. On 28 Dju‘ād-Dhīl 902/1 February 1497 al-Nasīr was formally deposed by the caliph al-Mutawakkil, and Kānsaw Shāmṣūmī usurped the sultanate. Al-Nasīr, however, held the Citadel, and aided by his maternal uncle, another Kānsaw, maintained a stout resistance, in which artillery and firearms were used by both sides. Seriously weakened by desertions to the sultan, Kānsaw Shāmṣūmī was defeated, and on 1 Dju‘ād-Dhīl II/4 February he fled, while al-Mutawakkil obligingly reinstated al-Nasīr. The power behind the throne was the sultan’s uncle, who held only a minor domestic office. Kānsaw Shāmṣūmī unsuccessfully attempted another coup on 10-19 Dju‘ād-Dhīl 902/21-22 February 1498, and 902/26 May 1497, after fighting with Akbārdī at Kāṭib, was put to death Akbārdī returned to Egypt, and accumulated the offices of amīr, wazīr, wādādār, and chief kāḍī. A new factionalism developed in which Akbārdī confronted Kānsaw, who was supported by the other partisans of his namesake. Akbārdī attempted a rising on 4 Dju‘ād-Dhīl 903/20 February 1498, and was defeated, and fled to Upper Egypt. Urged by the sultan to return as a liberator, he entered Cairo on 25 Dhu ‘l-Ka‘dā/25 July, accompanied by uncouth tribesmen of Banū Wālī and Banū Azzāla. Thereupon Kānsaw brought in tribesmen of the Banū Harām, and disorder ensued. Again the Citadel was besieged, but by late Dhu ‘l-Ka‘dā/August Akbārdī was in flight to Syria. Kānsaw was now appointed wādādār and subsequently wazīr and amīr.] In his relations with his nephew deteriorated, and in Radjab 903/February-March 1498 the sultan’s mother made them swear mutual loyalty, but to no avail. On 15 Rabī‘ I 904/31 October 1498 al-Nasīr was assassinated, probably at the instigation of amīr of his father’s Mamlūks in league with Kānsaw, who was duly elected sultan two days later.

Although al-Nasīr was a transient and insignificant figure, his reign presents points of interest. It is notable for the unprecedented use of firearms and artillery in factional warfare. The sultan himself had a force of 500 black slaves carrying firearms—an innovation which alarmed the antiquated Mamlūk cavalrymen. The murder of the black commander, Farādī, in a skirmish, with Mamlūks on 27 Dju‘ād-Dhīl 903/20 February 1498, and the subsequent dispersal of the force (perhaps by sale to the Ottomans) probably marked the turning point in the sultan’s fortunes. Another feature of interest is the employment of Arab tribal warriors by the factional leaders, anticipating the polarisation of Ottoman Egypt into Niṣr Sa‘d and Niṣr Harām.

The abandonment of the old capital by the Zirid al-Mu'izz [q.v.] and his flight to al-Mahdiyya in 449/1057 had left Irikiya a prey to anarchy. The country districts were in the hands of the Arabs, and the towns had chosen their own rulers; on all sides governors were in rebellion; leaders of the tribes imposed their authority on the threatened citizens; some towns turned to the Hammâdisd who were able to protect them. The people of Kasîliya [q.v.] for example sent a deputation to al-Nâsir to convey him their homage; the people of Tunis did the same. At their request, the Hammâdisd sent them their lord, 'Abd al-Hakk of the Sanhadja family of the Banû Khurâsân. The latter worked wonders; he negotiated agreements with the marauding Arabs which secured the safety of the city. Later, after casting off Hammâdisuzuereignty, he made Tunis the capital of a kingdom.

If the arrival of the invading nomads had meant an immediate accession of strength to al-Nâsir and an increase of population and economic activity to his capital, they were not without danger as neighbours. The Arabs soon involved him in a dangerous adventure. In 457/1064 the Athbadj, one of their tribes, asked him to help them against their enemies, their brethren the Riyâb, who had joined the Zirid ruler Tamir [q.v.]. Al-Nâsir agreed, seeing in this an opportunity to impress and annex Irikiya. He put himself at the head of a large army which included Arabs, Sanhadja, and even Zanata, led by the king of Fâs, al-Mu'izz b. 'Atiyiya. The Riyâb in their turn received subsidies and arms from al-Mahiyya. The armies met at Sbiba, near the ancient Sure. From the first, the Zanata of Fâs, won over by the enemy, gave way, while the Zirids of Tamir, driven into difficulty, reached Constantine with 200 men, then the Ka'â, the outskirts of which were systematically sacked by the Arabs.

After this disaster, al-Nâsir tried to make terms with the prince of al-Mahiyya; the negotiations failed, perhaps through the fault of the ambassador, and al-Nâsir, incited again by the Athbadj, resumed hostilities against the unfortunate Zirid kingdom. He entered Lurbus (the ancient Lorbès) and Kayrawân (460/1067), but these successes led to nothing; he had to abandon them again as he could not hold his conquests. These adventures, into which he was dragged by the Arabs and which brought him no lasting advantage, lasted for some ten years. In 470/1077 al-Nâsir made peace with the Zirid Tamir and gave him his daughter in marriage.

The Scare scourgewhich had ruined the kingdom of Irikiya began now to threaten seriously the Hammâdisd kingdom. The Zanata, hereditary enemies of the Sanhadja lords of the Ka'â, found among the hereditary enemies of the Sanhadja, and even the Zanata, made a vigorous effort to invade and perhaps annex Irikiya. He put himself at the head of a large army which included Arabs, Sanhadja, and even Zanata, led by the king of Fâs, al-Mu'izz b. 'Atiyiya. The Riyâb in their turn received subsidies and arms from al-Mahiyya. The armies met at Sbiba, near the ancient Sure. From the first, the Zanata of Fâs, won over by the enemy, gave way, while the Zirids of Tamir, driven into difficulty, reached Constantine with 200 men, then the Ka'â, the outskirts of which were systematically sacked by the Arabs.
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had Ibn Ra'àk assassinated, forced the caliph to give him the amirate together with the leadership of pilgrimage. But though he and his more celebrated brother Sayf al-Dawla, and later married his daughter to the caliph's son. But he included in his demands one for the recognition of his son Abû Taghlib as his successor, which Mu'izz al-Dawla was unwilling to grant. He again attacked the Hamdanids, occupying both al-Mawsil and Nişâbûn. But they were more successful in witholding him on this occasion; and an agreement was arrived at whereby Abû Taghlib undertook the payment of tribute for his father's former holdings.

In 356/967 both Mu'izz al-Dawla and Sayf al-Dawla died. Almost the last action recorded of Nâṣîr al-Dawla is the advice he then gave his sons to refrain from attacking Mu'izz al-Dawla's son and successor Baghîtîyân [q. v.] till he should have exhausted the resources bequeathed to him. For on the death of Sayf al-Dawla, to whom he had been much attached, Nâṣîr al-Dawla lost all interest in life, and so antagonised his family by his avarice that they resolved to take the control of affairs into their own hands. Abû Taghlib, who had in any case taken his place as tributary, and his mother, Nâṣîr al-Dawla's Kurdish wife Fatâma bint Abu Bakr, proved their power possessed of this title was borne by 1. AL-NâSIR AHMAD, son of Al-Hâdî Yahya and his lakab him the amirate together with the highest of the positions he occupied by a revolt of the Turkish forces under Tûzûn in 332/943-5 the caliph again sought refuge with the Hamânâdis. Sayf al-Dawla now tried, though without success, to defeat Tûzûn in battle, while al-Hâsan removed the caliph for greater safety from al-Mawâsîl to al-Râkba. After some months, however, al-Mu'tâkî was persuaded by Tûzûn's professions of loyalty into returning to Baghdad, only to be met on the way by the amir, who blinded and deposed him. On this Nâṣîr al-Dawla again withheld his dârs. But Tûzûn and al-Mu'tâkî [q. v.], the new caliph, came against him and forced him to pay. Tûzûn, however, died in 334/945-6, whereupon Nâṣîr al-Dawla made a bid to recover the amirate. But later in the same year Baghdad was occupied by Ahmad b. Bûya Mu'izz al-Dawla [q. v.]; and after some months, when Nâṣîr al-Dawla's career hinged chiefly upon the maintenance of his power against that of the Bûyids. The struggle began immediately. As soon as he was established in Baghdad, Mu'izz al-Dawla led an expedition against the Hamânâdis, and though Nâṣîr al-Dawla forced him to return to the capital by himself occupying the east bank and blockading the Round Gate, he drove the Nâṣîr and subsequently Nâṣîr al-Dawla's son and successor Mu'izz al-Dawla that he succeeded in suppressing it. Mu'izz al-Dawla's object in coming to Baghdad was no doubt to preserve some order in the Hamânâdis dominions until he should be able to absorb them. For he now took one of Nâṣîr al-Dawla's sons as a hostage for his obedience, and two years later another expedition against al-Mawâsîl. This again came to nothing, however, since Mu'izz al-Dawla was obliged to make peace before attaining his object, owing to the outbreak of trouble in Persia, where his brother required his assistance. Nâṣîr al-Dawla now agreed to pay tribute for Diyar Râbi'a, the Dîjlâra and Syria, and to have the names of the territories over which he had control. The contemporary Miskawayh notes that by bringing fictitious claims against landowners he would force them to sell to him at low prices, till he became not only the lord, but also the owner, of most of the region of al-Mawâsîl.

Bibliography: Miskawayh, Taghârîb al-unâm, in Amedroz and Margoliouth, The eclipse of the Abbasid Caliphate; Mas'ûdî, Murûdî, viii; Ibn Hawkal; Ibn al-Asîr, viii; Ibn Khallîkân, i; Ibn Khaldûn, iv; Ibn Tağıîbîrîdî, al-Nuqûm al-zâhira, ed. Juynboll, ii; Tânûkî, Nişâbûrî al-muhadhdînâ, ed. Margoliouth, i; Freytag, Geschichte der Dynastien der Handmanden, in ZDMG, x, xi, M. Canard, Histoire de la dynastie des Hamânâdis; and see Hamânâdis. (H. Bowen) NâṢîR AL-DawLa [see ibn Bâkiyya]. NâṣîR al-dîn [see CHÔRÎ-DILÎ; Mâzûmâ; MAHMÜD i; MAHMÜD ii]. NâṣîR AL-DÎN KUBACA [see SIN]. NâṣîR al-dîn AL-ŢUSî [see al-ŢUSî]. NâṣîR AL-DÎN LI-DÎN ALLAH, honorary title of several Sayf-ids. i. Among the Caspian Sayfids, this title was borne by 1. AL-NâSîR AL-KÂRîb AL-UTCRIŞI [see HÂSAN AL-UTCRIŞI] and his great-grandson 2. AL-NâSîR AL-SÂQQâR AL-HUSAYN B. AL-HÂSAN B. 'ALî. The latter gained for himself a dominion beginning in Hawsam, where he could find associations with the earlier period of Sayfî rule. He laid great emphasis on the religious character of Zaydism; he gave out of the state treasury funds to support people who learned the resources bequeathed to him. For on the death of Sayf al-Dawla, to whom he had been much attached, Nâṣîr al-Dawla lost all interest in life, and so antagonised his family by his avarice that they resolved to take the control of affairs into their own hands. Abû Taghlib, who had in any case taken his place as tributary, and his mother, Nâṣîr al-Dawla's Kurdish wife Fatâma bint Abu Bakr, proved their power possessed of this title was borne by 1. AL-NâSîR AHMAD, son of Al-Hâdî Yahya and his...
brother's daughter Fatima; on him, see the next article. All succeeding bearers of the title except the next one: 2. Abu 'l-Fath al-Nasir al-Daylami, so-called from his first Caspian sferne of activity, were of his family although of different lines. In the Yaman, in contrast to his predecessors, he began operations south of San'a, fell in 447/1055 fighting 'Ali al-Sulayhi [see Sulayhiids] there and was buried near Dhamar. The life of 3. al-Nasir Shalih al-Din was marked by internal strife which ultimately caused his death. In the first half of the 8th/14th century, several pretenders had disputed the succession. About the middle of the century, his father al-Mahdi 'Ali b. Muhammad attained considerable influence, which was however much reduced in the period before his death at Dhamar in 774/1372. Shalih al-Din became sole Imam and advanced as far as the Tihama against the Rasulids [q.v.]. But when in 793/1391 he died at San'a, his death was concealed for two months on account of the insecurity, and his body was concealed in the castle in a coffin covered with plaster. It was only when rumours of his death reached the Ka'di al-Dawwar in Sa'da that the latter arranged for his burial at San'a. The son 'Ali b. Shalih al-Din could only obtain recognition as 'Imam of the Dhahdah' and fell in 840/1336, one of the many victims of the great plague. When in spite of opposition a Zaydi power was set up in Yemen, it was destroyed by the young ruler of the Tahirids, who was a member of the Tihama (q.v. from the Tihama (850-923/1446-1517), especially by its second member 'Abd al-Wahhab b. Dawud, from 883/1478, until at the end of the 9th/15th century al-Hadi Izz al-Din al-Husayn b. al-Hasan again re-established and extended their power. His son 4. al-Nasir al-Hasan b. Izz al-Din (ca. 900-929/1494-1523), who primarily inherited from his father a love of learning, could only maintain a limited power in the north. He had to put up for a long time with an anti-imam al-Mansur Muhammad b. 'Ali al-Saradji in San'a. 5. al-Nasir al-Hasan b. 'Ali b. Dawud at the end of the 10th/16th century organised in the north one of the centres of resistance to the Turks, who were penetrating into the country since 927/1512 and 943/1536, but was taken prisoner by them in 948/1542, could only maintain the pretenders within the family of al-Mansur b. al-Kasim (d. 1029/1620), the liberator from the first obscurity following his demise. All of Imam Ahmad's successors, of which al-Hawali lists nine and Zabara eight, are doctrinal in nature and, with one exception, no longer extant.

mother, a Turkish slave called Zumurrud Khatun, were more balanced. During al-Mustansir’s and al-Nasir’s caliphates, she made a name for herself by establishing important pious foundations and by energetically interceding for positions for the Hanbalis in Baghdad.

After the secular power of the Abbassid caliphate had been restricted for centuries, and had even disappeared completely because of the dominance of the Buyyids and the Saldjiks [q.v.], al-Nasir succeeded in restoring ‘Abbassid sovereignty. He strengthened and consolidated the caliphate against all kinds of military, political and ideological attacks. For the period of his own reign, and down to that of his grandson al-Mustansir [q.v.], he restored this specifically Islamic institution to its former prestige. On the other hand, he unintentionally contributed to the later fall of the caliphate of Baghdad at the hands of the Mongols.

Al-Nasir’s policy aimed at orienting and obligating all Muslims towards the caliphate as the sole spiritual and secular centre of this world. The way to this aim he saw in a rapprochement of the different opposite dogmatic trends in Islam, perhaps even in an attempt to reunite them. The same objective was served by a sophisticated policy of alliances with Islamic and non-Islamic partners, by the reorganisation of the futuwwa [q.v.], that is to say by establishing it as a men’s confraternity attached to the caliph himself, and by the systematic spread, inside the Islamic world, of an encyclical from his own hand dealing with hadith.

1. Political events. Al-Nasir again disposed of an army of his own, but the most important strategic advantages came from his policy of alliances. With the support of the Khvâr’azmshah Tekîsh [q.v.], in whom he had recognised the strongest rival of his own most powerful enemy, the Buyyids of Tughrîl, he succeeded in wiping out once and for all the Saldjuk dynasty in Persia by having the ruler killed by the sword on 29 Rabî’ I 590/25 March 1194. The decline of the Saldjuk empire had revealed itself long since by internal unrest in Persia. Already in 583/1187 al-Nasir had ordered in Baghdad the ancient Saldjuk palace, the symbol of tutelage by a foreign regime, to be torn to pieces (Ta’rikh al-khulafâ’, fol. 266). He had sufficient reasons to justify the opinion that the caliph addressed a direct request to the Khvâr’azmshah to intervene against the Saldjuk sultan. Yet the contemporary sources do not provide a consistent presentation (cf. Mir‘ât, fols. 263a-264a [the decisive passage is missing in the Haydarâbâd edition, viii, 444-5], with Kâmil, xii, 106-8). A message of the caliph to Tekîsh, in which he is said to complain vehemently of the Saldjuk sultan (Kâmil, xii, 107), is considered to be an important document in this context.

Shortly after having overthrown Tughrîl III, al-Nasir, for the same reasons which had induced him to invoke Tekîsh’s help against the Saldjiks, felt forced to look for military support from the outside against Tekîsh himself. This he received from the Ghûrids [q.v.] (Kâmil, xii, 135-7). Only one year after the fall of the Saldjiks, the caliph found himself confronted, in the person of the Khvâr’azmshah, with a new power that was more dangerous to him than that of the Saldjiks. Tekîsh, after the death of his brother Sultan Shâh in 589/1193, had not only become absolute ruler of the region south of the Aral Sea, including Khurasan (Marv), but also considered himself as the heir to the entire Saldjuk empire. In his quarrel with the caliph over the province of Dîjbûl, i.e. Persian Írâk, he felt that the right of exercising secular power was entirely on his side, as it had been with the Saldjûks before him. Apart from the military confrontation (590/1194: Kâmil, xii, 108-9; Târîkh-i Dîjbûn-gushâ’, ii, 32-3, 591/1195: Mir‘ât, viii, 445; 592/1196: Kâmil, xii, 112; Mir‘ât, fols. 255b-266a [missing in the Haydarâbâd edition, viii, 449]; Târîkh-i Dîjbûn-gushâ’, ii, 39, col. 565a [continued temporarily as the caliph’s gain]; later he had to acknowledge that it belonged to the Khvâr’azmshah’s territory, just like Khurasan and Turkistan), the dispute between Tekîsh and al-Nasir expanded into a wide-ranging legal fight, which reached its climax after Tekîsh’s death in 596/1200 (Kâmil, xii, 156-8) during which the caliph declared dead the only Khvâr’azmshah in the world, a much harsher tone than that of the Saldjûk, Muhammed II claimed recognition of his sovereignty (Siyar, xxxi, 139-43), which was to be also expressed by mentioning his name in the khutba in Baghdad. According to Kâmil, xii, 135, Tekîsh too had demanded this, and in case of refusal he had threatened to march against Baghdad.

Years of mutual provocation (Târîkh Man- sirî, fol. 132a-b: Târîkh-i Dîjbûn-gushâ’, ii, 120; Sina, 51; Kâmil, xii, 298, 319) and several wars waged by the Ghûrids in the name of the caliph (Târîkh-i Dîjbûn-gushâ’, ii, 47-66) now followed. The non-Muslim Karâ Khootây [q.v.], who in the end were on the side of the militarily stronger Khvâr’azmshah (Târîkh Manşûrî, fols. 123a-125a) were also implicated. The Khvâr’azmshah, whose power reached from the Caspian Sea to the Gulf of Oman, was to be also connected by this rival, the Umân (Kâmil, xii, 316-8), arrogated to himself the title of “second Alexander” and questioned altogether the legitimacy of the ‘Abbassid caliph. With the help of a fatawa, he declared al-Nasir deposed, nominated as anti-caliph a Shî‘î from Tirmîzh who was a direct descendant of Hûsain b. ‘Ali b. Abî Tâlib and had his name, ‘Alî b. Mukh, placed on the coinage and mentioned in the khutba (Târîkh-i Dîjbûn-gushâ’, ii, 120-2). Through diplomacy, al-Nasir tried to resolve this conflict and the threat of Muhammed II’s march against Baghdad in 614/1217-18, but he failed (cf. Mir‘ât, viii, 582-3, and Sina, 51-2, for the unsuccessful mission of ‘Umar al-Suhrawardi [q.v.] to Muhammed II regarding the function of the caliphate). Baghdad was nevertheless spared a direct attack, for the Khvâr’azmshah, Târîkh-i Dîjbûn-gushâ’, ii, 120-2). Through diplomacy, al-Nasir tried to resolve this conflict and the threat of Muhammed II’s march against Baghdad in 614/1217-18, but he failed (cf. Mir‘ât, viii, 582-3, and Sina, 51-2, for the unsuccessful mission of ‘Umar al-Suhrawardi [q.v.] to Muhammed II regarding the function of the caliphate). Baghdad was nevertheless spared a direct attack, for the Khvâr’azmshah, in whose relations with the Mongols, withdrew to Khurasan and Transoxiana in the winter of the following year (Târîkh-i Dîjbûn-gushâ’, ii, 98; Sina, 64; Târîkh al-Suluk, 449). During the Friday sermon, Muhammed II had the ‘Abbassid caliph declared dead (Kâmil, xii, 318).

According to the approved method, al-Nasir probably had entered into negotiations with the Mongols about delaying and overpowering the Khvâr’azmshah. If credence can be given to a contemporary western source (Epistular, 144-7, Letter of 1221), al-Nasir, driven to extremity by the advance on Baghdad of the Khvâr’azmian army, had ordered the Catholics of the Nestorians to request the intervention of the “mysterious King David”, i.e. Ongu Khân [q.v.] against the Khvâr’azmshah. The army of the Mongol rafter in fact included numerous Nestorian Christians. All Muslim historiographers are silent on this indeed extraordinary, but by no means unlikely, mission of a Christian dignitary on behalf of the highest Muslim ruler to obtain military aid from unbelievers against a Muslim army. In the 7th/13th century it was only surmised that al-Nasir summoned the Mongols into the Muslim territories by means of an embassy which is not specified any further (e.g. Kâmil, xii, 440). The same connection later is hinted at in Bidâya, xiii, 106-7; Suluk, i, 218). A description of a delegation sent by al-Nasir is only found in the 9th/15th century, but there is no allusion to Christians...
either (Rawdat al-safd, iv, 397-400). Other historiographers, however, explain the penetration of the Mongols into the Islamic territory of the Khwarazm by the following: The member of a Mongol trade mission had been accused by Muhammad II of spying and had therefore been tortured or killed; this is said to have provoked the Mongol's vengeance (Tārīkh Manṣūrī, fols. 136a-140a; Tārīkh-i Īljām, ii, 99; Rawdat al-safd, 85-7). It is not possible to discover completely the actual events, but in any case one of the greatest tragedies in Islamic history began with the Mongol invasion of the Khwarazmian empire. After the death of Muhammad II in 617/1220, his son Djalāl al-Dīn Khwārazmshāh (Mankubirīn or Minġīnīr [see al-Nasawī] [q.v.]) (Sīyar, xxii, 326-9) continued his father's legal claim against the caliph. In 622/1225-6 he invaded ʿIrāk and extended his conquests as far as 200 km from Bagdād (Kāmil, xii, 425-6; Mīrī, viii, 234; Tārīkh Manṣūrī, fol. 149a-b). His battles against the caliph as well as those against the Mongols he declared to be ʿdjāhād. The year 618/1221-2 (cf. Akhbar, 109; Mīrī, viii, 619; Tārīkh-i ʿIslām, fol. 135a; Sīyar, xxii, 238-9, and the quotations from ʿAbd al-Latif al-Baghdādī, in BEO, xxiii [1970], 125-8) showed how unstable the alliance between the caliph and al-Nasir actually was. Thus, if it ever existed, in fact was. The Mongols were preparing for a direct attack on Bagdād. Renouncing earlier enmities and summoning up all power, the rulers of Irīb and al-Mawsil joined forces with the caliph on behalf of ʿdjāhād. As already had been the case with the Khwārazmian call to ʿdjāhād against the east, the Ayyūbids were apprehensive over their way of helping hands against the Mongols. A battle did not take place because Čingiz Khān withdrew to the east. Thus the Mongol threat against ʿIrāk seemed to have been warded off for the time being.

A few years after al-Nāṣir had come to power, the Ayyūbids for their part complained of his lack of interest in the "Holy Combat" of Muslims. Their bitter disappointment influenced the situation in the eastern Arab lands and in south-east Asia Minor. ʿSalāḥ al-Dīn [q.v.] and al-Nāṣir, each with his own appetite for expansion, sought to enlarge their territories wherever an occasion presented itself, especially in al-Ḍājrāz. The caliph extended his territory northward exactly at a time when ʿSalāḥ al-Dīn urgently needed his assistance at the ill-fated siege of ʿĀkkā [q.v.] by the Crusaders, which lasted for two years (585-7/1189-91). In 585/1189 al-Nāṣir conquered Taḵrīt (Rawdatayn, ii, 178; Kāmil, xii, 42), ʿSalāḥ al-Dīn's birthplace, which had submitted to the Ayyūbids in 579/1183-4, together with Irīb (Miṣdār, 215). Other places on the Euphrates were also captured by al-Nāṣir (Kāmil, xii, 58-9) and ʿSalāḥ al-Dīn's rights, as well as his projects of expansion in al-Ḍājrāz, thus were curtailed. The caliph's subversive lack of interest vis-à-vis ʿSalāḥ al-Dīn was apparently rooted in the fear that military successes of the Ayyūbids, especially after Jerusalem had been reconquered from the Franks in 583/1187, might spread to the caliph's territory. After all, ʿSalāḥ al-Dīn's army, having conquered the strategically-important town of al-Mawsil in 1186, had been only 200 km. from Bagdād. Notwithstanding an active exchange of delegations during the entire period of his caliphate, al-Nāṣir showed himself clearly aloof, even distrustful, towards Ayyūbīd requests to grant diplomas of investiture (ṭaklīd, pl. taklīlāt) and to give military assistance against the Franks (Miṣdār, 51: taklīd granted in 576/1180; Miṣdār, 62-5: necessity of the ʿdjāhād and excommunication of the caliph in 577/1181-2; Miṣdār, 162-4: negotiations regarding the situation in al-Mawsil in 579: ʿNJāmān, 184-5; isolated excommunications concerning the ʿdjāhād addressed to the caliph in 580/1184-5). ʿSalāḥ al-Dīn was severely criticized in Bagdād when he awarded himself the epithet al-Malik al-Nāṣir (Bidāya, xii, 327). In 586/1190 ʿSalāḥ al-Dīn put a region directly bordering on the caliphate under the administration of a vassal who, at that time, was well-disposed towards him (Kāmil, xii, 56; Čikāhirī of Irīb is invested with the region of the Banū ʿKidjādāk).

After the reign of the Saljūqs had come to an end in 590/1194, the interest in this region of both the caliph and ʿSalāḥ al-Dīn's successor al-Malik al-Afdāl [q.v.] intensified. Al-Afdāl skillfully tried to build good relations with al-Nāṣir. He expected to be able to use the caliph as a possible intermediary in present and future conflicts with the Zangids of al-Mawsil. On the other hand, the concept of ʿdjāhād against the Crusaders gradually lost impact in the letters exchanged with the caliph after ʿSalāḥ al-Dīn's death in 589/1193. In the same way, requests for a premature grant of a taklīd or for military assistance stopped. In 615/1218, at the time when the Crusaders attacked Damietta, the caliph declined a call for help, but in 616/1219 he summoned his rulers to prepare for a battle in ʿIrāk, and al-Nāṣir had to reckon with a direct attack on Bagdād. Renouncing earlier enmities and summoning up all power, the rulers of Irīb and al-Mawsil joined forces with the caliph on behalf of ʿdjāhād. As already had been the case with the Khwārazmian call to ʿdjāhād against the east, the Ayyūbids were apprehensive over their way of helping hands against the Mongols. A battle did not take place because Čingiz Khān withdrew to the east. Thus the Mongol threat against ʿIrāk seemed to have been warded off for the time being.

F. The futuwwa. Against the background of these events and shortcomings, the unification and reorganisation of the federal system of the futuwwa, carried through by al-Nāṣir, was neither bizarre (Kāmil, xii, 440: pure ʿajlap) nor an isolated political idea. To al-Nāṣir the credit is due of having consolidated on a moral basis the various forms of the futuwwa which, at his accession to the throne, hardly kept to the virtuous requirements of the original ideal
of the fatâ'. These forms were developed by al-Nâsîr into a mean of political power in the service of the caliphate. The reformed futuwa was provided the caliph with the framework for a new awareness of solidarity among Muslims of all confessions and social ranks up to the princes. At the same time, the renewed rules of this new community, related directly to the person of al-Nâsîr, entailed dependence on the 'Abbasid caliph as the highest authority (kibla) in the Islamic world (Tâdîf, fol. 108b).

In his chronicle, the Mîṣâr, al-Malîk al-Mansûr [q.v.] in his annals, abounds about the separate steps leading to the final execution of the reform. Soon after assuming power, the caliph joined a branch of the futuwa which was influenced by Sûfism. In 578/1182-3 its gâshî, performed with him the rite of initiation, which consisted in putting on the trousers (sâ'udi) of the futuwa (Mîṣâr, 86). Al-Nâsîr also established contacts with other leaders of Sûfi groups of fitâdîn (Mîṣâr, 177). The caliph’s turning to the Sûfi manifestation of the futuwa incited an important section of the population to follow his example and to take more seriously the required virtues, which had regained influence in public life.

3. Supervision of communications. Moreover, already before the actual reform, al-Nâsîr succeeded in realising important parts of his political and social ambition. Formally, however, he acted in his own person the permission to shoot with pellets (al-ramy bi ‘l-bunduk) to his own ends. He also tried to bring pigeon breeding under his control. This brought the advantage of being able to supervise communications. In 590/1194 he had all fully-grown carrier pigeons killed in Baghdîd in order to force the population to use only his young pigeons, which flew on courses fixed by himself (Mîṣâr viii, 437), so that any pigeon post first came into his hands or into those of his confidants. In order to obtain an audience with the caliph, one had to have received a pigeon from him first, which honour guaranteed the noble character of the receiver. Thus the following saying came into being in Baghdîd: receipt of a pigeon from the caliph, adherence to the futuwa, and ‘shooting with pellets’ (al-ramy bi ‘l-bunduk) was impossible for a man to tell a lie (Mîṣâr, 180).

4. The reform. From 599/1203 onwards, al-Nâsîr personally decided on the admission into the futuwa of princes and governors (Mîrâ’t, viii, 513: al-‘Adî’s admission). In doing so, the caliph confirmed them as rightful and absolute leaders of the fitâpîn in their territories, but, since he himself was their superior in the hierarchy of the futuwa, their adherence increased their dependence on him. The adherence of any prince automatically caused the admission into the futuwa of all his subjects. This should have prevented any individualistic trend in the Islamic community. Notwithstanding this, there remained a great number of different groups and gangs (’uyûrân [q.v.] of the futuwa, which vied with each other and, because of their great power in the districts of Baghdîd, often conjured up situations that were close to civil war (Djdmû, ix, 222, 226, 228). This caused the caliph in 604/1207 to issue a decree in which the futuwa was fundamentally reformed. Non-observance of this decree was a capital offence. The new futuwa was described as ‘the purified futuwa’ and was completely centralised under al-Nâsîr under the following principles: 1. ‘Ali b. Abî Talîb is the unquestionable foundation of the futuwa; he is the basis of all legal decisions. 2. Al-Nâsîr li-Dîn Allâh is explicitly recognised as emulator of ‘Ali. 3. It is the futuwa’s task to perform a ‘purified, imamate duty, which grants victory to the religion of Allâh’. 4. Any fatâ’ who maltreats a fellow-member is expelled from the futuwa. 5.Hadîqat of the Prophet himself confirm the caliph’s legal position when issuing this decree (Djdmû, 172).

In his Tâdîf al-wasîdî, al-Khartâbî, a contemporary inclined to Shi‘ism, gives information on the reform. Al-Nâsîr changed the genealogy of the futuwa by having its tree brought down to his own name from Adam, through the Prophet Muhammad and his son-in-law ‘Ali (Tâdîf, fol. 117a-b). He also claimed the exclusive right to grant futuwa titles and orders. In his Kitâb al-Futuwa, written in the spirit of Islamic law, Ibn al-Mî’mâr (d. 642/1244) describes the hierarchic structure of the entire society of the futuwa. All members were comrades (râfhî, pl. râfîhî), but were related as a younger one (gâshî) to an elder one (kabîr) or—with the same meaning—as a son (ibn) to his father (ab) and grandfather (gâdîd). The community of râfhî is called ‘house’ (bayt), and several baytî are brought together under the same ‘head’ (hizb, pl. abzâh). Supreme master of all these groups was the caliph (Kitâb al-Futuwa, 190-9). In Al-Nâsîr’s futuwa, the function of head (nakîb) of the nobility was held by a member of the ‘Alî family, the Amir al-Mu’âyya (or al-Mu’âyya’ya) (’Umdat al-fâtîm, 150).

By indicating himself as the highest authority (kibla, see above) for all fitâpîn, al-Nâsîr established a relation between ãrâfî and futuwa. For this, it was necessary to find a compromise between Sunnis and Shi‘is. Inside the futuwa the caliph could not favour one group over the other, nor could he accept both groups as being independent from each other if he wanted to maintain his claim to power, namely, keeping the community of the believers within the structure of the state. His policy had to be built unconditionally on the points of agreement between the two parties. In this way, he succeeded in making the futuwa confederations, organised and quarrelling among each other before his reform, into ‘an element of social solidarity’ on behalf of the caliphate. Al-Nâsîr thus created a powerful organisation which, more than his army, made his caliphate acceptable as a binding form of sovereignty for all large and small political factions in the Islamic lands. The authority which the caliph thus exercised over his subjects allowed him also to regain an important part of his secular power and prevented, after the downfall of the Saljûks, tutelage by an outside secular ruler. The reorganisation of the futuwa was more than a tactical measure. It was not ‘an artificial resuscitation of the caliphate’—as still assumed by Taeschner (Futuwa, in Schweizerisches Archiv für Volkskunde, lii [1956], 145)—but an effective means of making policy, in which greater importance was attributed to the ‘Abbasid caliphate. This structure of the federal system continued under al-Nâsîr’s successors, but the ’uyûrân resumed their attacks as a result of the weakening of the ‘Abbasid dynasty in the last years of its existence in Baghdîd. This form of courtly futuwa came to an end with the fall of the ‘Abbasid caliphate at the conquest of Baghdîd by the Mongol Hulâgû [q.v.] in 656/1258. From 659/1261 onwards, an aftermath survived in Mamlûk Egypt [q.v.].

5. The theory of the caliphate. For his legitimation as caliph, and for the futuwa as instrument for the theoretical foundation of his claim to power, al-Nâsîr found an energetic propagandist in the Shi‘î Sûfî Abu Hafs Umar al-Suhrawardi, who supported the union between sunna and moderate Shî‘a on the one hand, between futuwa and Sufism on the other. In his works, the futuwa is part of tasawwurî,
and his theory on the caliphate definitely posited that 
Sufism could be sanctioned by the caliphate. In his 
Iddlr al 'akhirat, I 'burtah on the caliphate a theory in 
which the concepts of futuwwa, Sufism and caliphate 
are coordinated in an ascending order. In analogy 
with the relation between shaykh and murid [q. v.], he 
considers the caliph as the mediator (wusita) between 
The Unique One and the people, appointed by God 
(Iddla, fol. 88a). As such, he is "God's representative 
on earth". This is not the standard argument in the 
orthodox Sunni theory on the caliphate because the 
reference to consensus is missing. Since the concept of 
khilafat Allih cannot be deduced from the Qur'an, the 
argument that the caliphate is a necessity is put by Ibn 
Khaldun [q. v.] on the same level as the assertions 
according to which the caliphate is required by mere 
reason; the consensus itself (ijma) comes only in the 
second place and confirms the reason (al-Thar, 1, al-
Mukaddima, 339-40). Al-Nasir's court theologian does 
not mention ijma at all. He does not seem to have 
 omitted unintentionally this important concept of 
Sunni law, because when he explains that the Imam 
is the absolute mediator between God and man, he 
comes close to Shi'i notions according to which the 
Imam, because of his authority as teacher and his 
charismatic function, is beyond consensus. According 
to al-Alids and al-Nasir, the caliph is the only 
fatihah, i.e., the function of mediator in an absolute way, just as the 
Shi'i, once he has obtained the dignity of shaykh, is a mediator between God and the novice (sili or murid) 
(Iddla, fol. 88a).

The concept of khilafa was in any case widening in 
the 7th/13th century. It was not only used in its legal 
and political meaning of amir al-mamlnin, but, in 
the language of the mystics of the Sufi orders, it was also 
language of the mystics of the Sufi orders, it was also

"The exalted caliphate is a register (daftar) and tasawwuf is part of it; tasawwuf in its turn is a register of which the futuwwa is a part. Futuwwa is specified by pure ethics (al-akhldk al-zakiyya); tasawwuf includes pious acts and private religious practices (awzad), the noble caliphate comprises mystic situations, pious acts and pure ethics" (Iddla, fol. 89a-b).

The comparison of the caliphate, to which tasawwuf and futuwwa are subordinated, with a 
register reminds one of the likewise hierarchical rank of the 
concepts shari'a, jurfa and hadtha found in al-
Suhravardi's Rishtat al-Futuwwa, fol. 186b. Khilafa 
and shar'a are the higher concepts which, in their 
relations to each other, require unconditional unity. With 
these axioms, the caliph, through his protagonist al-
Suhravardi, took the wind out of the sails of those 
critics who maintained that he neglected the require-
ments of the shar'a. At the same time, he opened the 
caliphate to two forms of organisation of 
human society which came into being simultaneously and 
which apparently were mutually conditional, namely, 
the reformed confederation of men, the futuwwa, and 
the order of tasawwuf.

According to contemporary statements, the caliph "in the middle of his reign" intended to give up 
his governmental function in favour of ascetic practices 
and the life of a Sufi (Akhbard al-zuhada, fols. 96b-101b; 
Siyar al-nubala?, xxii, 202, cf. 197: at this time al-Nasir 
was also engaged in transmitting hadiths, cf. Naki 
al-hymyan, 95; Wafii, vi, 314). After some time, however, 
he distanced himself from this intention and returned 
completely to governmental business. All the same, 
by recognising a direct relation between mystics and the caliphate, al-Nasir had created the possibility of 
becoming accepted on a larger basis.

6. Al-Nasir's religious programme (da'wa haddiya). The caliph's religious-political propaganda 
(da'wa haddiya, roughly 'guiding call') also bears 
comparison to such a wider basis. In order to spread it, he 
sent emissaries to Syria, Egypt, Asia Minor and Persia. 
Al-Nasir's da'wa was quite different from the 
Sunn? orthodox one of his father and predecessor al-
Mustadh [q. v.], as well as from that of the Zangid Nurl 
Al-Din b. 'Imad al-Din [q. v.] and of Salih al-Din 
[q. v.]. Al-Nasir was no longer concerned about the 
'moral armament and unity of the Sunnis' against the 
Shi'a, but about equating all Islamic confessions. 
In this respect, the rapprochement of the Isma'ilis 
under their Grand Master Rukn al-Din Hasan III [q. v.] towards Sunni Islam was convenient on the one 
hand, while on the other he had succeeded in 
protecting the legitimacy of the caliph against the claims of 
the 'Alids by involving futuwwa and tasawwuf in the 
theory of the caliphate and in meeting, perhaps person-
ally, al-Bid 'a's, as his domestic policy 
clearly shows. He was in close contact with the 
Nahits of the 'Alids and was surrounded by Imami viziers 
and other high officials and counsellors. In an inscrip-
tion found in the Ghaybat al-Mahdi in S?mmar? 
[q. v.], which he caused to be renovated expensively 
and to be enlarged into a mausoleum (maqba?), he 
designates himself as builder and protector of the Shi'i 
sanctuary (Mi'nmar, 178). Nor did he exclude himself 
from certain branches of the Isma'iliya: in the 
inscription on the B?b al-Tilam in Baghd?d [q. v.] 
(Dam'i, ix, 215) he borrowed the Isma'i'lli eulogy, and 
his messengers of the da'wa haddiya, as well as his 
futuwwa emissaries, were provided with a special war-
rant, the waskala dam'ia or waskala sharifa (Dam'i, ix, 
222 et passim). The caliph's attempt to control, as far 
as northern Syria, the supervision of the markets and its 
centres, as well as his efforts to be present with 
his propaganda activity. When receiving the 
warrants, al-Nasir's officials committed themselves 
throughout reciprocal absolute vows of fidelity to each other and, altogether, to the caliph.

7. Anti-philosophical tendencies. From al-
Nasir's domestic policy it is clear that he did not con-
sider the Shi'i as a threat and an undermining influ-
ence in the Muslim community. For him, the danger 
of inner disintegration came rather from the 
philosophers and their followers. Although he 
had occupied himself with "the sciences of the ancient 
Greeks" (ulam al-a'wil?, if only in a rudimentary 
way, razzias, auto-da-fes and all possible reprisals 
took place against suspects (Iddla, fol. 85b; Rash'd, fol. 
16a: destruction of philosophical literature; Dhayl, i, 
443, ii, 71, 73; Akhbar al-Mahdi, 119-21; Zami', ix, 
81; Bidaya, xii, 45: burning of libraries; Dhayl, ii, 66-
8; Bidaya, xii, 65: denunciations). From this period 
dates al-Suhrawardi's Rash'd al-na'asibh al-imaniyya wa-
kashfi al-fadli'h al-yumaniyya, the most important 
polemic against philosophy, which is at the same time 
a written defence of the caliphate as understood by al-
Nasir. One of the most striking features of this work is 
that it keeps its distance from any polemic against the 
B?u'ayna ya? [q. v.], considered to be the promoters of 
the "Greek sciences". This attitude is perhaps related 
to the conversion to Sunni Islam of Hasan III, ruler of the 
Assassins of Alamut [q. v.] in 608/1211-2 (K?mil,
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xii, 306-7; Tarih-i Dzahān-gushā, ii, 120, 242-3), by which the Bātiniyya ceased for a number of years to be the most dangerous enemy of the 'Abbāsids. Indeed under al-Nasir the Assassins, so feared before, became loyal allies, a fact which the caliph considered as his greatest success in religious matters, his greatest political achievement being the destruction of the Sālīdūs.

8. The accusation of Shi'ī inclinations. Al-Nasir is often reproached by Sunni chroniclers as having been a partisan of the Shi'īs (mutashayyiyīn); Mubarrid, Siyar, iv, 142; kāna yaragayya'ndū Mufarridī, iv, 163; Fakhfakhī, 232; Siyar, 200. Two remarks should be made in this connection. Because of his excellent spy network (Siyar, 200), al-Nasir was considered on the one hand to be “all-knowing”, even in religious matters. A later chronicler remarks that the Shi'īs indeed considered him as the infallible, sinless Iman, for “the infallible Iman knows what is in the womb of a pregnant woman and what lies behind the wall” (Ta'rīkh al-'ulūma', 449). On the other hand, the caliph’s tolerance towards the Shi’īa—apart from his personal propensities—is to be seen as a reaction to the concrete political situation. If al-Nasir wanted to raise the caliphate in Baghādīd to a real and effective power, he could only succeed by taking into account and by exploiting the interests of the Shi’īya, which were directly affected by his undertakings. He had to shape his subjects’ political consciousness in such a way that the person of the caliph was forearmed against accusations from the outside (i.e. that he was the ‘Alīd anti-caliph against the Khārāzmshāh) and from the inside (i.e. against the criticism of the Ḥanbalī Ibn al-Dżawżī, Dhaylī, ii, 420). During al-Nasir’s reign the cutting edges of the conflict between Shi’īs and Sunnis, which had lasted a long time had shaken the ‘Irākī metropolis, seemed to have been blunted.

9. The caliph as traditionist and reformer. Al-Nasir also recognised the importance of religious propaganda of the ulama; in particular, he acquired the duties and authority of the traditionists by concerning himself personally with the science of hadīth. Since his education and campaigns, which centered on abolishing the traditional separation of powers—the worldly power in the hands of the caliph or the sultan, the spiritual power in the hands of the ulama—and towards uniting them in his person, he claimed that, as successor of the Prophet and as the instructing imām of the world—only he, from the beginning of his reign could in fact be united in the person of the caliph.

During al-Nasir's period the madrasas became a more important institution, although they were as yet not exclusively in the hands of the ulama. Al-Nassir had this collection of hadīth, which went back to the Prophet, translated and transmitted by Ahmad b. Hanbal’s students and collected by Ahmad b. Hanbal himself, in order to make it one of the main sources of the caliph’s attention to the hadīth. Since all his undertakings were directed towards this end, al-Nasir has become a model of the complete political reformer.

Following the example of the Prophet, al-Nasir succeeded in being recognised in the field of ‘ilm. Having become a muqaddīd, he transmitted, in order to underpin this claim, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal’s Musnad to Ḥanbalī scholars as part of sāmā' collections (Dhaylī, ii, 218; Mū’ī, viii, 556). He further put together seventy hadīth collections which went back to the Prophet. Through tājda, he transmitted them equally to representatives of all four Sunni madhābīn (Mū’ī, viii, 543-4; Siyar, xxi, 197-8; Bundārī, Dhaylī, fol. 28a; Dubaythī, Dhaylī, fol. 10a). Under the title Rūḥ (Rauḥ) al-‘arīfīn, al-Nasir had this collection of hadīth, which was disseminated systematically in ‘Irāq, Syria and Egypt, in Rūm and the Islamic Community in this world and in the hereafter.

He reformed education in Baghādīd insofar as he succeeded—as the Sālīdūs had done before him—in bringing the nomination for the chairs at the Great Mosque under his control. Besides influencing intellectual life, this also, or rather above all, had economic consequences because it meant control of the sources of income which were at the origin of different conflicts of interest in the city. The caliph, in collaboration with al-Suhrawardī, thus not only showed the duties and authority of the traditionists by concerning himself personally with the science of hadīth. Since all his undertakings were directed towards this end, al-Nasir has become a model of the complete political reformer.

The caliph’s attention to the tobāts and the origin of the orders apparently coincided with the reorganisation of the future madrasas as centers of education. Following the example of the Prophet, al-Nasir succeeded in being recognised in the field of ‘ilm. Having become a muqaddīd, he transmitted, in order to underpin this claim, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal’s Musnad to Ḥanbalī scholars as part of sāmā’ collections (Dhaylī, ii, 218; Mū’ī, viii, 556). He further put together seventy hadīth collections which went back to the Prophet. Through tājda, he transmitted them equally to representatives of all four Sunni madhābīn (Mū’ī, viii, 543-4; Siyar, xxi, 197-8; Bundārī, Dhaylī, fol. 28a; Dubaythī, Dhaylī, fol. 10a). Under the title Rūḥ (Rauḥ) al-‘arīfīn, al-Nasir had this collection of hadīth, which was disseminated systematically in ‘Irāq, Syria and Egypt, in Rūm and the Islamic Community in this world and in the hereafter.
religion. According to him, the work does not stand up against the standards of hadith criticism (Ta‘rīkh al-
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(NELMIE GARTMANN)

NASIR AL-DIN SHAH (r. 1848-96), fourth ruler of the Kâdîrî dynastie [q.v.] of Persia. Born on 6 Dâsfar 1247/17 July 1831 in the village of Kühmâran near Tabriz to the then Prince Muhammad Mirzâ (later the Shah) and his mother, the harem lady of the Miski-Dâjjân (later Mahdi-î Ulyâ: Queen Mother, d. 1873), daughter of a powerful Kâdîrî chief, nasal-î din epitomised the eventual union of the contesting Kâwânî and Davâlû clans of the Kâdîrî tribe. The young Crown Prince's right of succession to the throne was not fully secured before 1847, when a complex power struggle within the royal family, fuelled by the rivalry of officialdom and by European envoys, turned to Bâbî and Davâlû clans of the Kâdîrî tribe. The young Crown Prince's right of succession to the throne was not fully secured before 1847, when a complex power struggle within the royal family, fuelled by the rivalry of officialdom and by European envoys, turned to Nasir-al-Dîn's momentary advantage. His childhood and early youth turned out to be even less cheerful because of Muhammad Shah's contempt for Nasir al-Dîn and his mother, haphazard education, irregular allowance and isolation within the palace even though he benefited from his mother's full moral support. His brief but eventful governorship of Adharbâyjân ended upon the death of his harem lady when he was declared the Shah in 14 Shâwhâl 1264/13 September 1848. Crucial to success of the young Shah's swift and unchallenged accession was the capable and ambitious commander of the Adharbâyjân New Army, Mirzâ Tâkî Khân Amir Kabîr [q.v. in Suppl.], who in collaboration with the British consul in Tabriz organised the young Shah's triumphant march to the capital in October 1848. Equally instrumental was Mahdi-î Ulyâ's interim government consisting of a fragile coalition of high-ranking officials who orchestrated the removal of the previous prime minister, Hâjîî KhânMirzâ Akâşi.

The first phase of Nasir al-Din's reign (1848-1858) was characterised by a prolonged struggle to assert the monarchical authority over the office of the Prime Minister (sadr a'zam), to weaken the Kâdîrî nobility, challenge the restraining policies of European powers, and suppress popular and religious dissent. Although at first he willingly delegated full power to Amir Kabîr as the royal guardian (aîbâk), the Prime Minister, and the commander-in-chief of the army (amîr-i nizâm), the Shah found it exceedingly difficult to reconcile the Prime Minister's stern conduct and his draconian reform measures in the areas of finance, military, and the administration, with the scattered interests of the nobility. Mahdi-î Ulyâ's sustained opposition to Amir Kabîr was shared by the discontented bureaucrats and Kâdîrî notables. The Shah's own desire for greater political initiative and for a larger allowance eroded Amir Kabîr's support base leading to his dismissal in November 1851 and shortly afterward his tragic execution in January 1852. The much-delayed compromise, which was in part exacerbated by the undue intervention of the British and the Russian ministers and their proxies, remained a dark spot in the Shah's political career. Even in his short term of office, Amir Kabîr consolidated Nasir al-Din's throne, not only by bringing a semblance of order to the otherwise chaotic government bureaucracy, but also by destroying the internecine Davâlû conflict. Nasir al-Din's short term of office was marked by the abolishing of the office of Prime Minister, who nevertheless had an important influence on the Shah's political behaviour. In search of greater security but also to balance the British influence at the close of the Crimean War (1854-6) the Shah entertained an old ambition of the Kâdîrî rulers for the reassessment of Persia's sovereignty over the long-disputed vassalage of Herat. Moved by patriotism and by military glory, he took advantage of the chaotic condition of Herat to break relations with Britain over a scandalous affair involving Charles Murray, the British Minister in Tehran. Soon he launched an expedition under the command of his uncle Sulûân Murâd Mirzâ Husûm al-Sâlânî, who eventually captured Herat in October 1856. Faced with a British declaration of war, Nasir al-Din's conditional proposal for withdrawal from Herat was answered by the British landing of a British force in Bushîhr in December 1856. The waning Persian resistance soon encouraged the British to move to the interior, forcing upon the Shah a humiliating withdrawal from Herat and a hasty compliance with the terms of the Paris Peace Treaty of March 1857. Faced with increasing popular criticism at home, but partly as a result of intrigues within the harem and the bureaucracy, in August 1858 the Shah dismissed Aîk Khân Nûri and sent him to a lifetime exile. Defeat in war and the disastrous collapse of the subsequent expedition against the Turkomans of Marw in October 1860 convinced Nasir al-Din as to the expediency of diplomatic accommodation with the neighbouring powers, a hallmark of the remaining years of his rule.

The second phase of Nasir al-Din's reign (1858-71) was marked by the abolishing of the office of sadr a'zam and the appointment of ministers to the newly-created ministries, with the Shah acting as his own Prime Minister. After a brief period of lukewarm experimentation with western-style reforms (1858-60), the Shah's personal supervision drew him further into a complex political game in which his prime objective was to obstruct the monopoly of power by any one minister or faction. Having been exposed as early as 1855, but more so after 1858, to the reformist views of the celebrated Mirzà Mâlkum Khân [q.v.], the Shah increasingly adopted an autocratic approach...
while ignoring Malkum’s rationalisation reform plans. His constant juxtaposition of ministers, and a redefining of their functions and responsibilities, contributed to the confusion in the administration. The Shah’s main rationale was to preserve a fragile balance between the powerful conservative camp headed by Mirzā Yūsūf Mustawfī al-Ma‘malīk, the chief state accountant, and the weaker reformist wing championed by Farrukh Khān Amin al-Dawla. The selective nature of the reforms initiated by the Shah from mid-1860s is most visible in the construction of the telegraphic network. Direct and speedy contact with the provinces increased the Shah’s control while at the same time he remained loyal to the Kādjar practice of delegating to the provincial governors enormous power. Up to 1888 the Shah’s eldest son Mas‘ūd Mirzā Žil al-Sultān governed from his provincial capital in Isfahan over as many as sixteen provinces and governorates in central and western Persia.

The rise of the celebrated reformer Mirzā Huseyn Khān Mushtir al-Dawla (q.v., and see dustūr, iv, Iran) to the premiership (November 1871) marked the beginning of the third phase of Nāşir al-Dīn Shah’s reign (1871-86). Royal tours to Ottoman İrāq (November 1870-January 1871) and to Europe (May-September 1873, to include Russia, Prussia, England, France, Italy and Turkey) provided the Shah with first-hand experience of the outside world and allowed greater recognition of the Persian state. Nāşir al-Dīn’s diaries of these tours, as well as diaries of his later visits to Europe (March-August 1878 and May-October 1889), register his sincere and occasionally amusing impressions of prosperous and exotic Europe. He remained more impressed with the royal splendour, the natural scenery, and the trivia rather than with the political institutions or industrial achievements. Throughout, the Shah and his retinue were received with great esteem and fascination, often one reminiscent of the old Persian monarchy. During the first tour, the granting of the Reuter concession, notorious for its all-embracing monopoly of Persia’s natural resources, its finance and communication systems, and finalised under the auspices of Mushtir al-Dawla. On his return, in response to a palace revolt orchestrated by the conservatives the Shah was forced to demote his premier to the rank of Minister of War and repeal the Reuter concession. The administrative, military and judicial reforms that were implemented by Mushtir al-Dawla until his dismissal in 1880 and which were largely on the model of the Ottoman Tanzimat (q.v.) were meant to strengthen and rationalise the government by restraining the arbitrary power of the monarch. Yet Nāşir al-Dīn, in spite of his apparent support for reforms, managed to utilise the resistance of the conservative princes and muzzafīfs in order to deflect Mushtir al-Dawla and eventually to concentrate power in his own hand. In the area of foreign policy the Shah exploited the tense rivalry between his imperial neighbours, especially after 1881, in order to maintain a fragile equilibrium conducive to tranquility, the stabilisation of the frontiers at the expense of dispensing with the periphery (Khīwa, Marw, Sarakhs, Herat, eastern Sīstān, and Bāhrāyn) and the restraining of European imperial access to the interior at the cost of refraining from infrastructural reforms such as railways and navigation, which were hardly in any case feasible because of the rivalries of outside powers.

A shift in Nāşir al-Dīn’s political conduct, characterised by personal disillusionment and growing popular discontent, marked the fourth and the final phase of his reign (1886-96), beginning with the death of the conservative patriarch Mirzā Yūsūf Mustawfī al-Ma‘malīk who served as nominal premier since 1891. After more than a decade of stiff resistance, the Shah’s consent to the opening of the Kārūn river navigation (October 1888) and the granting of the British-operated Imperial Bank of Persia (January 1891) announced a new era. The Shah was persuaded to grant concessions by the British envoy Sir Henry Drummond Wolff in an attempt to resuscitate the repealed Reuter concession, but the opening-up to Europe was further facilitated by the rise of a younger generation of statesmen trained in the Shah’s inner court and in the foreign service. The rise of the young Mirzā ‘Alī Asghar Khān Amin al-Sultān (d. 1907) to the premiership (officially appointed in 1888) was largely due to his willingness to augment the Shah’s personal gains and to negotiate on his behalf with foreign powers. He gratified Nāşir al-Dīn’s narcissistic profligacy and exploited his emotional insecurities in exchange for greater control over the government and foreign policy, while the Shah promoted his own younger son, Kāmrān Mirzā Nā‘ib al-Saltana, the War Minister, as a counterbalance to the premier. The advice of the reform-minded Mirzā ‘Alī Khān Amin al-Dawla (d. 1904), the head of the State Consultative Council, had some moderating influence on the Shah’s conduct. The nationwide protest in 1891-2 against the Régie tobacco monopoly granted to a British subject in 1889 nevertheless indicated an imbalance in Nāşir al-Dīn’s domestic policy and a dramatic turning-point in popular discontent against the Shah and his premier. In order to pay for the growing bureaucracy and royal expenditure the sale of concessions, limited though this was, the Shah disenfranchised the merchants of the bazaar and alienated their wulama’ beneficiaries, who now were lionised by activists such as Sayyid Dūmāl al-Dīn Asadābādī ‘al ‘Afghānī’ (q.v.). The growing domestic dissent continued even after the cancellation of Régie. The Shah’s assassination on 18 Dhu ’l-Ka‘da 1313/1 May 1896 inside the shrine of Šaykh Bāqir at Qom and his burial in an adjacent room of the same shrine. Nasir al-Din was buried in an adjacent room of the same shrine. Nasir Al-Din Shah's complex personality was embellished however by his artistic and literary accomplishments, historical and topo-
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graphical interests, patronage of mixed Perso-European art, architecture and urban development as well as secular and religious scholarship, high and popular literature, Persian music, and Shafi'i passion plays (qayya' [q. v.]). Many European innovations, from postal services, passports, street cars and gas lighting, to photography, museums, military music, plays (ta'ziya [q. v.]). Many European innovations, from postal services, passports, street cars and gas lighting, to photography, museums, military music, plays (ta'ziya [q. v.]). Many European innovations, from postal services, passports, street cars and gas lighting, to photography, museums, military music, plays (ta'ziya [q. v.]). Many European innovations, from postal services, passports, street cars and gas lighting, to photography, museums, military music, plays (ta'ziya [q. v.]).

Nasir al-Din himself. His numerous diaries of his domestic and international travels, mostly published in his own time, are unique among the Islamic rulers of his time for portraying him as an avid though not specially perceptive observer with an eye for details and a lucid style. His preoccupation with details is also evident in the affairs of the government and the army, at the cost of his losing sight of the broader picture. His astute handling of the ulamâ, the nobility and foreign representatives was unique; their productions however are for the Persian poets of India, who were by this time only that he travelled a great deal but finally settled in the most part of little artistic value. Of his life we know only that he travelled a great deal but finally settled in.
Sirhind, where he enjoyed the favour of the governor Sayf Khân Badakhshân and of the Amir al-Umar? Dhu 'l-Fikr Khân. His principal work is a version of the love story of Madhumalat and Manûhar in Persian verse, the original having been written in Hindi by Shaykh Djamîn. The same subject was taken up after Nasîr 'Ali by Mir 'Askâr 'Adî Khân Râzî (d. 1107/1696), one of the governors of Dihlî under Awrangzib (1659-1707), who called his poem Mîhr u mäh. Besides the poem, Nasîr 'Ali wrote a short ma'âni, Sûfî in character, and a description of Kašgâr, both of which still survive. His lyrical discourse, was collected by his friends after his death; it consisted of the usual ghazals, some sâdîs-nâmâs and poems in praise of the Kalandar dervîses (litb. Lucknow 1244, 1281, and Cawnpore 1892).

Bibliography: H. Ethe, G I Ph., ii, 252, 310; V. Ivanov, Curzon collection cat., nos. 278-9, and Asiatic Society of Bengal Coll., nos. 813-17. There are ms. in most European libraries. (E. Berthelot)

Nâşîr b. Khusraw, whose full name was Abû Mu'în Nasîr b. Khusraw b. Hârîth al-Kubadhiyânî, Persian poet and prose writer, a noted traveller, and an Ismâ'îlî philosopher and dâ'î [q.v.]. He was born into a family of landowners and officials in 394/1004 in Kubadhiyan, and his decision to set out on pilgrimage to Mecca. He left Cairo in 441/1050, proceeded to Mecca, remaining there for six months, performed the pilgrimage and then left to go to Bâlîkh, where he arrived in 444/1052. This marked the end of his period of travels and the beginning of the next phase in his life. Nasîr assumed the task of preaching on behalf of the Ismâ'îلîs. In his own writings, Nasîr constantly refers to himself as the budgâdî [q.v.] of Khurâsân, indicating his leadership role in charge of the Fâtimid da'wa's activities in the region. This phase of his life, which in a sense is the most productive in terms of output as a writer, is also the most obscure. Faced by obvious opposition in the predominantly Sunnî, Sâlihî-controlled milieu of Bâlîkh, he had to seek refuge in the valley of Yumgân in Badakhshân [q.v.], which was then under the control of a sympathetic Ismâ'îlî local ruler. It is during this period that some of his key surviving works and poems were composed. His work reflects the ambivalence he felt about his work and "exile" in Yumgân. He laments the lack of intellectual fellowship, the sense of isolation and the climate of opposition within which he had to work. On the other hand, he draws comfort in his writings from his commitment to the work of preaching, his sense of his mission in life, and his literary pursuits. The exact year of his death is not known. It fell sometime between 465/1072 and 471/1078. He is buried in Yumgân, where his modest tomb has become the site of pilgrimage.

The works of Nasîr i-Khusraw that have survived indicate a wide range of intellectual and poetic discourse. They represent a significant contribution to Muslim literature in Persian during the 5th/11th century, and his Ismâ'îlî writings are the only contributions in Persian that have survived by a major figure of the Fâtimid da'wa. They are a continuation and elaboration of the pattern of intellectual exposition initiated by early Fâtimid writers such as Abû Hâtim al-Râzî (d. 322/934) and Hamîd al-Dîn al-Kirmânî (d. after 411/1020-21) [q.v.]. Though it is very probable that some of the distinctively Ismâ'îlî elements in his writings might have undergone change through revisions by non-Ismâ'îlî writers, Nasîr's ideas and works were preserved and had a substantial impact on the subsequent development of Ismâ'îlîsm among Persian-speaking Muslims and have exercised a continuing influence on the Ismâ'îlîs of Central Asia, Afghânîstân and Iran. The impact of his writings, however, has not been limited to the Ismâ'îlîs and his poetry and prose have earned Nâşîr-i-Khusraw a reputation as an important figure in mediaeval Persian literature.

The Dîvân, a collection of poetry, is probably his best known work. Some of the poems, in particular the famous "confessional ode", are reflections on his inner conflicts and spiritual development. His commitment to the cause of the Ismâyîlî da'wâ is explicit in the poems but is inferred by a much wider range of human and religious concerns. The tone throughout is moral, exhortative and occasionally philosophical.

The Safar-nâmâ, an account of his travels, falls within the genre of mediaeval Muslim travel literature. It is a description of places, persons and...
events, as well as an interpretation of contemporary Muslim society and culture, enlivened by Nasir’s personal observations and insight. Nasir’s other surviving works, fall within the tradition of Fâtimid, Ismâ‘îlî literature, and reflect the basic framework of its religious system and interpretation of Islamic thought and practice. Among them are:

(i) The Rawshanâñ-i-nâma ("The book of enlightenment"), a poetic work on standard Ismâ‘îlî themes.

(ii) Wadq-i din ("The face of religion"), an exposition of the major doctrines and practices of Islam, with an interpretation of their inner significance, illustrating the use of the hermeneutic method, of ta’wil in Ismâ‘îlî thought.

(iii) Gushayish wa rahdyish ("Emancipation and respite"), a philosophical work that sets out a framework dealing, through questions and responses, with key Islamic ideas.

(iv) Kâşf al-‘-arin ft luyuth ("A banquet for the brethren"). A summary of basic principles and practices of the faith.

(v) Zâd al-musâfîrîn ("Sustenance for travellers"), surveys the philosophical positions of some of the ancients, including Plato and Aristotle, and argues against some of the views of early Muslim philosophers like Abû Bakr al-Râzî (Rhazes, d. 312/926).

(vi) Džâmî‘ al-‘-kámâtayn ("The sum of two works") in which Nasir seeks to synthesise positive religion with the resources of philosophy. His goal is to create harmony between the language of the Kur‘ân and the rational and logical tools of the intellectual sciences.

(vii) Sîsk fašî, a summary in six chapters, of the Ismâ‘îlî interpretation of Islamic tenets; it is also called the prose Rawshanâñ-i-nâma.

(viii) Sîkehr nanâ, a summary in six chapters, of the historical works of Ibn Ab! Zar. It was soon recognised that this chronicle was like

Nasir-i-Khusraw entered the legal branch of the Sharîfi govern-
ment’s service as a notary or superintendent of the state domains. He held or more important posts from time to time in this service. He was a Khânsâ‘î at first at al-Dâr al-Baydâ‘ (Casablanca) 1292-3/1875-6 and made two stays at Mâr̀lûkh, where he was employed in the financial administration of the imperial household. He then lived some time at al-
Dâjûdâ (Mazagan) where he was attached to the customs service. He next spent some time in Tangier and Fâs and towards the end of his life returned to his native town where he devoted himself to teaching. On his death he was buried in the cemetery at Sâlîf outside the Bâb Mâ’alîkta Gate. Al-Nâsirî was a minor civil servant who was also a man of letters and a historian. In addition to his historical work, which gained him a certain reputation even outside of Morocco, he left other works which would alone have probably sufficed to attract attention to him and secure him an honourable position among contemporary Maghribi men of letters. These are, in addition to the six opuscula detailed in Lévi-Provençal, Historiens des Chorfa (353, n. 1): 1. A commentary on the Shambakmaikiya, a poem by Ibn al-Wannân which he called Zahir al-ofân min hadîkat Ibn al-Wannân (literally at Fâs in 1314 a.h., 2 vols.); 2. A survey of the heresies and schisms in Islam entitled Tas’în al-
munna al-sunnîkh (The seven differences from the Sunnîs, Rabat ms., no. 66; cf. Lévi-
Provençal, Catalogue, i, 23); 3. A monograph on the family of the Nâsirîya to which he himself belonged: Tal‘at al-muḥsînî fi’l nasâl al-djâfârî (literally Fâs, 2 vols., n.d., new ed. 1320/1902; a French synopsis has been given by M. Bodin, La Zawia de Tamegrout, in Archives Berbères, 1918). This work, which the author finished in 1309/1891, is a good history of the zaywa of Tâmgûrt, with much interesting information, which compensates for all the discussions in which the historian tries to prove the authenticity of his family genealogy with the help of somewhat unconvincing arguments.

Ahmad al-Nâsirî’s great work is the Kidât al-Istiksa‘a li-‘l-shârîl dawal al-Maghrib al-a’skâ. Its publication was an event unparalleled in Maghribi historiography. The author produced not a linear chronicle but a general history of his country, one, moreover, printed in the Muslim Orient (Cairo 1312/1894, 4 vols.; 2nd ed. Casablanca 1954-6, 9 vols.). Welcomed by European orientalists on its publication, it was not long in attracting the attention of the historians of North Africa, for whose work it became a much consulted document, especially as a French translation in the Archives Marocaines soon made the last quarter—the history of the Alawid dynasty—accessible even to non-Arabists.

It was soon recognised that this chronicle was like all the other products of western Arab historiography: it was only a compilation, the most appreciable merit of which was to have collected in a continuous narrative, items of political history scattered about the chronicles or biographical collections written in the country. But it must be confessed that al-Nâsirî was the first of his compatriots to attempt to exhaust a subject of which his predecessors had only dealt with parts. But this was not his primary object: the author of the present article has shown elsewhere (Sharfa, 357-60) that the starting point in the compilation of the Kidât al-Istiksa‘a was a work of some length on the Marinid dynasty of Morocco, based mainly on the historical works of Ibn Abi Zâr and Ibn Khâlidîn, to which he added al-Khânsâ‘î’s Kitâb al-‘-akbîr Bânti Marîn. His residences in the different capitals of Morocco, having enabled him to get access to sources
for other dynasties also, he had the idea of composing a complete history of Morocco. He finished his work on 19 Dhu‘ al-Hijjah 1298/15 May 1881, before the end of the reign of the Alawid sultan Mawlay al-Hasan, to whom he dedicated it. But he was poorly recompensed for this act. On the death of this ruler, the author decided to have his chronicle printed in Cairo, after continuing it down to the year of accession of sultan Mawlay ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz.

The reader may be referred to Les historiens des Chorfa, an examination of the Arabic sources of the history of al-Nāṣirī, and for a list of works from which he adopted or quoted textually passages. Here we shall simply point out that the chronicler was the first Moroccan writer to use European as well as Arabic sources; he only learned of them by chance; these were the history of Mazagan (Ar. al-Djadida) under Portuguese rule entitled Memorias para historia da praça de Mazagao, by Luísa Maria do Couto da Albuquerque da Cunha, Lisbon 1864, and the Descripción historica de Marruecos y breve reseña de sus dinastías, by Manuel P. Castellanos, Santiago 1878, Ohiuela 1884, Tangier 1898.

In the arrangement of his chronicle al-Nāṣirī does not differ from the other historians of his country. But he sometimes gives evidence of a critical sense; we have a feeling that he is a historian by accident and a literary man by vocation. He sometimes gives evidence of considerable independence of spirit and of some breadth of view. As to his style, it is clear and chastened and only rarely resorts to metaphors and rhymed prose. The writer seems to be the Moroccan historian of his time who writes with most facility and elegance.

The first three volumes of the Cairo edition have been translated into French by A. Graule, G. S. Colin and I. Hamet, in AM, xxx (1923), 1-302, xxxi (1925), 1-238, xxxii (1927), 1-283, xxxiii (1934), 1-621; the fourth one was done by E. Fumey, Chronique de la dynastie ʿalouie au Maroc, in ibid., ix (1906), 1-399, x (1907), 1-424. An epitome of the work was made by Ahmad al-Raḥmān al-Tiwiwānī, under the title Tarḥī al-akāb min Ṭīrītīkā, Tétouan 1946/1927, and then epitomised and continued by al-Taḥāmī al-Wazzānī (1539/1940).

Bibliography: A general study of the life and works of al-Nāṣirī was made by E. Lévi-Provençal, Les historiens des Chorfa, Paris 1923, 350-68. This contains (355) judgements on the Ṭiwrānī, to which may be added R. Ricard, Les sources de Ṭiwrānī, in Héberges, xviii (1956), 201-2. Other references are limited; one may merely cite Ibn Ibrāhīm al-Marrākhūlī, Ḫulām, ii, 236-9; Brockelmann, S II, 888-9; Sarkis, Muṣṭ, 1040.

(E. LEVI-PROVENÇAL)

AL-NĀṢIRA, Modern Hebrew Naserat, Nazareth, the home of Jesus, a town of northern Palestine, since 1948 in Israel, situated in lat. 32° 42' N. and long. 35° 17' E. at a height of 505 m/1,600 ft. It lies in a depression sloping to the south surrounded by hills in a fertile district. While the hills to the north and northeast are not very high, in the northwest the Djebel al-Sīḥ rises to 1,600 feet above sea-level. The name of the town, which does not occur in the Old Testament, is found in the New and in the Greek fathers of the Church in the varying forms Nāṣāpa, Nāṣarēt and Nāṣāpū with ζ, but according to Jerome it had in Hebrew a sake, which is confirmed by the Arabic ʿarset and Arabic form. The Christian Arabic has ζ. All these forms as well as Naṣāρīn (Mark i. 24) have in the first syllable an ι obscured to ι in Talmudic. In Chris-
Nasir during World War One, being captured by the British in September 1918. During the... and contributed to the even-

... the Prophet consolidated the notion of his forgetting and contributed to the even-

... the Prophet controlled forgetting by means of which the divine

... since a divine book cannot contain con-

... too few and weak to do other than endure insult; the

... the unbelievers, while other verses incite to warfare

... was perplexed. Completing his prayer, the Prophet

... the Hadith, a later regulation has replaced an earlier

... explained, "God introduces such regulations as He

... explained, "God introduces such regulations as He

... has Furthermore left behind a history of the family

... to Abyssinia, he used to greet the Prophet on passing him at prayer and the Prophet would return his greeting. On his return, "Abd Allah did this, but the Prophet ignored him, and "Abd Allah was perplexed. Completing his prayer, the Prophet explained, "God introduces such regulations as He

... to party against the unbelievers. The former are linked to the

... many verses make testamentary provision for parents and nearest

... must be no talking." In this instance of naskh, the Prophet said that when we pray there must be no talking.

... the Hadith, a later regulation has replaced an earlier practice.

... the ruling in Kur'ân, II, 180, that the Muslim make testamentary provision for parents and nearest kin was thought to have been revoked on the revelation of IV, 10-11, whose rulings allot to the relatives specific shares in a deceased's estate. Many verses counsel patience in the face of the mockery of the unbelievers, while other verses incite to warfare against the unbelievers. The former are linked to the Meccan phase of the mission when the Muslims were too few and weak to do other than endure insult; the latter are linked to Medina where the Prophet had acquired the numbers and the strength to hit back at his enemies. The discrepancy between the two sets of verses indicates that different situations call for different regulations. This is an instance of naskh in the Kur'ân. Chronology is the key to the resolution of the difference, since a divine book cannot contain contradictions, IV, 82.

... the principal component of the general concept of naskh is "change", "replacement". To this was joined the notion of "withdrawal", "omission", but solely in relation to the operation of naskh upon the Kur'ân. The idea had originated in the exegesis. According to interpretation, LXXVII, 6-7, XIII, 39, XVII, 86, XXII, 52 and II, 106, the last two of which actually employ the term naskh, appear to suggest the possibility of Muhammad's forgetting revelations; the impossibility of his doing so, or divinely controlled forgetting by means of which the divine author would determine the final contents of the divine Book. The disputed exegeses were precipitated in appropriate anecdotes and the resulting references to "events" in the life of the Prophet consolidated the notion of his forgetting and contributed to the even-
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tual shaping of the theories of naskh. Of special impor-
tance were allegations of actual omissions from the
revelation such as those recording the "loss" of a
verse in praise of the B's Mal'ana [q. v. martyrs, the
Ibn 'Adam "verse" and reports on the alleged
originally longer versions of suras IX or XXXIII, said
to have been as long as sura II and to have been
the locus of the stoning "verse". Lists were compiled
of revelations verifiably received by Muhammad and
publicly recited during his lifetime until subsequently
withdrawn (nfh), with the result that when the divine
revelations were finally brought together into book-
form, there was collected into the mughaf [q. v.] only
what could still be recovered following the death of the
Prophet. The mughaf has from the outset been
incomplete relative to the revelation, but overall in
that we have all that God intended us to have.
Interpretation similarly supplied the impulse
behind and the vocabulary deployed in discussions on
naskh, or the replacement of regulations. Prominent in
this regard were the interpretations of Kurân, XVI,
101, and II, 106. Equation of the term asa, used in
both verses, with "a Kurân verse", facilitated the
claim that God had declared that "alteration",
"substitution", even "omission", would affect the
texts. The interpretation could be reinforced by pro-
duction of what appeared to be numerous instances of
actual change. Kurgan, VIII, 66, for example, was
held to have been revealed to reduce from ten to two
the number of unbelievers against whom the Muslim
was required in v. 65 to fight; LVIII, 13, had
apparently rescinded the order in the immediately
preceding verse to forward a fee in advance of an
audience with the Prophet. II, 180 and IV, 10-11,
have been mentioned; II, 142-4, in association with I,
13, showed that the theme of the historical change affecting the kible [q. v.; XXIV, 2, had replaced the measures introduced in IV, 15-16, to
deal with sexual impropriety. Instances of the naskh of
Kurân rules addeduced in the specialist works are
numbered in the hundreds. Sura IX, 5, for instance,
the so-called "sword-verse", alone was thought to
have replaced one hundred and twenty-four verses.
These were safeguarded that II, 106, the chief Kurân
proof-text, juxtaposed forgetting with naskh, inter-
preted in the light of XVI, 101, to mean tabdiil
"replacement", led to the formalisation of reported
forgetting as a type of naskh, the naskh of both wording
and ruling, where, however, naskh retains its XXII,
52, sense of "withdrawal", "suppression". Alleged
cases of clash of regulations derived from either
Kurân verses or badâgh, could, on the same pattern,
be referred to as the naskh of the ruling but not of the
wording. The formula is hybrid, since naskh carries
both the sense of "replacement", referring to the rul-
ing and "withdrawal", for the original wording has not
been withdrawn.
In addition to the naskh of the Kurân by the Kurân
and the naskh of the Hadith by the Hadith, examples of
which we have considered, the majority speak also of
the naskh of the Hadith by the Kurân and the naskh of
the Kurân by the Hadith. In the case of the change in
the kible, the Kurân states that God had appointed
the previous direction of prayer, without, however,
identifying it. Some, therefore, saw this as an instance of
the naskh of Kurân by Kurân, whereas, since the
Kurân lacks mention of the earlier direction, others
saw it as an instance of the naskh of the Hadith by the
Hadith by the Kurân. It was argued that there is no real conflict
between IV, 10-11, and II, 180. Inheritance differs
from testamentary provision and sura IV regulates
both in a single context. But, as a badâgh attributes to the
Prophet the words "There is to be no waiyya in
favour of an heir", many argued that here was an
undoubted example of the naskh of the Kurân by the
Sunna. The strongest opposition to both principles
that the Kurân could repeal the Hadith and that the
Hadith could replace the Kurân is the hall-mark of the
source theory developed by al-Shâfi'i (d. 204/819)
which revolutionised wasil al-fikr. He campaigned
tirelessly to justify use of the Sunna as the second
primary source alongside the Kurân against those
who would accord the Hadith no role in the derivation of
the shur'a on the argument that the degree of con-
flict in the Hadith, the inadequacies of the guarantee
against corruption, fraud or error afforded by the
zindâd rendered the Hadîth unfit for the sacred role
of declaring the divine intent underlying the Kurân's
declarations. These opponents being deaf to all but Kurân evidence, al-Shâfi'i referred them to IV, 65,
XXIII, 73, LII, 2-3, LIX, 7; to verses linking obe-
dience to the Prophet to obedience to God Himself,
III, 132, IV, 80; and to the series of verses which
speak of the Prophet's being granted, in addition to the
Book, the Ikhnâa, identified by al-Shâfi'i as the
Sunna. He drives home the point that, in the Kurân,
God imposed upon every Muslim the religious obliga-
tion to obey the Prophet as he obeyed God. The only
access to knowledge of the Prophet's commands being
through the Sunna, al-Shâfi'i could insist that God, in
His Kurân, did not intend for another by the Sunna
every Muslim unquestioning adherence to the Sunna. Simulta-
aneously, in a parallel confrontation with the Mâlikis
and the Hanafis, he sought by emphasising the wor-
ding of XVI, 101, "We substitute one asa for another
asa", and II, 106, "We naskh an asa", to impose the
view that the naskh of a Kurân verse was an
exclusively divine prerogative. As a corollary, he now
exploited "We shall bring one better than or similar to it",
of the same verse to promote his view that, as
nothing could be thought of as superior to or even
similar to the Sunna of the Prophet, his opponents'
regular procedure of ignoring badâgh from the Prophet
in favour of reports from Companions and others
showed their failure to appreciate the unique status
bestowed by God upon the Prophet and hence the
special role "of the Sunna of the Prophet. Nothing can
naskh that Sunna save only that Sunna.
He further exploited X, 15, "It is not for me to
alter it on my own initiative, I merely follow what is
revealed", to argue that Kurân and Sunna are never
in actual conflict. As both come from God, they
cannot conflict. The Sunna follows, that is, elucidates
the precise intent of the Kurân, XVI, 44. The Sunna
cannot naskh the Kurân. Only the Kurân can naskh
the Kurân and only the Sunna can naskh the Sunna.
Theological objections were raised to the theory of
naskh. Following development of the ta'âzi [q. v.] doc-
trine, it was argued that, being of divine authorship
and hence individually perfect, all Kurân verses
could be said to be similar, but no one could be said
to be superior to another. Naskh could not, therefore
be predicated of the Kurân. Nor, since the wording
was of undoubted human origin, could any hadâgh be
thought to be similar, let alone superior to any verse.
The naskh of the Kurân by the Sunna could not there-
fore be posited. The scholars easily evaded this dif-
ficulty, as is shown by al-Shâfi'i's and al-Tabari's
regular insistence that naskh is not a matter of wording
but of rulings. As the ruling of any asa could be said
to be similar or even superior to that of any other
asa, so also, the ruling of any wasi could be said to be
similar or even superior to that of any asa. Al-Shâfi'i's
theory of naskh is thereby shown to have been
short-lived.
As lengthy lists of instances of greater or lesser


incongruity between verses of the holy book had resulted from the efforts of the first exegetes, further theological considerations were urged which rendered necessary a clear distinction between the divine application of naskh and the evidence of deficient knowledge or of inadequate reflection suggested by a change of regulation. Merely human knowledge may develop and merely human decisions may be altered but that is inconceivable in the case of divine decisions. The Omniscient knew from all eternity all that would ever be revealed, but his pre-ordained plan would happen. That knowledge would render naskh unnecessary. This objection made essential a distinction between the divine knowledge and the divine will. Naskh is a consciously applied process, planned in advance and intended to be applied to the content of revelation until the process of revelation finally ceased on the death of the last prophet. Naskh appears to our deficient human knowledge to be change, tabdl$. In reality, it is the announcement by a prophet of the termination of the duration of a regulation and the commencement of the duration of another, whether the earlier regulation was announced by the same prophet or by another prophet. A second objection arose from the view that what is good is commanded and what is evil is forbidden. In prohibiting what had been permitted or in permitting what had been prohibited, naskh would be to declare good evil and evil good. Naskh cannot, therefore be posited as a divine activity. Being concerned with regulations, naskh theorising is hostile to the concept of inherent good or evil. The function of divine commands is to test human obedience. That explains why regulations may differ from religion to religion or from period to period. Since man will either be rewarded for obedience or punished for disobedience, God may command what He pleases and prohibit what He pleases. Dependent solely upon the divine will, regulation becomes wholly arbitrary and so may change at any moment. Only what God commands is good; only what He forbids is evil and, as regulation is linked to the divine will and not to the divine knowledge, objections based on the inconsiderability of change of the divine mind, or development of the divine knowledge, known as baddh$, inevitably fail. Naskh involves only commands which on first institution could have been declared temporary and are such as are indifferent capable of being regulated or of being unregulated. Excluded therefore, are the central tenets of the faith, but also all regulations of the Kur$an expressly stated to be temporary.

To discuss the relations between the two primary sources of the Fikh, the Kur$an and the Sunna of the Prophet, which, in his discussions on naskh, he had rigorously insulated one from the other, al-Shafii resorted to a technique which he referred to as naskh $ta'd$, particularisation, actually, alleged exclusion. The sura IV regulations on sexual impropriety has been mentioned. That had been replaced by the XXIV, 2, flogging penalty. The Fikh introduced a distinction between adultery and fornication, on which the Kur$an is silent, and assigned the sura XXIV flogging to the latter sin. For the sin of adultery, the Fikh decreed death by stoning, thus raising the critical question of its origin. Stoning was rejected by some Muslims, on the grounds that they could not find two penalties in the Book of God. The sura IV regulations had been flagged as temporary, "or until God appoint a process for these women". Deriving the distinction between fornication and adultery in the difference in tone between the harshness of IV, 15, and the mildness of IV, 16, the majority traced in XXIV, 2, the process promised in sura IV while they presumed that stoning derived from the Sunna, as documented, for example, in the 'Ubada hadith to the effect that the Prophet had said, "Take it from me! Take it from me! God has now appointed a process for females: the unmarried with the unmarried, one hundred lashes and twelve months' banishment; the married with the married, one hundred lashes and death by stoning". Further reports show the Prophet extending the dual penalties to males, while other reports, in which Muhammad applied the married penalty alone, were taken to indicate that he had alleviated this element of the penalties by declining to flag in addition to stoning. Confronting the problem, al-Shafii argued that the 'Ubada statement was the first revelation to follow sura IV and was thus its naskh. The other baddh in which the Prophet did not flag those whom he stoned were simultaneously the naskh of the 'Ubada report and the elucidation of XXIV, 2. The Prophet's conduct showed naskh$ta'd$, particularisation. Flogging is specific to those who are not stoned, those who are stoned being excluded from its provisions. Stoning exemplifies the naskh of the Sunna by the Sunna, although al-Shafii does state that the 'Ubada baddh was an instance of the naskh of the Kur$an.

The reply to those who rejected stoning since they could not find two penalties in the Book of God, as indicated by al-Shafii's teacher, Malik, was supplied in the statement attributed to 'Umar that a stoning verse had indeed been revealed to Muhammad which had been memorised by those in his company and recited as Kur$an in the ritual prayers. The Prophet, Abu Bakr and 'Umar had applied its provisions and it was merely the fear that he might be accused of adding to the Book of God that inhibited 'Umar from writing the verse into the mushaf. The majority, both before and after al-Shafii, were satisfied that stoning was one clear instance of the naskh of the Kur$an by the Sunna. Al-Shafii had denied the very possibility yet had failed to resolve the problem of the origin of the Fikh penalty, justifying Schacht's conclusion that, on this question, al-Shafii's theory of repeal breaks down.

Later scholars, under the powerful influence of al-Shafii's theory on the role of the Sunna in relation to the Kur$an and impressed by 'Umar's claim that a stoning verse had been revealed, formalised stoning as a third type of naskh: the withdrawal of the revealed wording but not of the ruling. It was on quite a separate matter, arising from the exegesis of IV, 23, the precise definition of the number of breast-feedings required to set up a permanent barrier to the marriage of males and females related through having shared a common wet-nurse, that al-Shafii committed himself to this third type of naskh. His normal assiduity to ascertain the Prophet's views on disputed legal matters led him to accept a baddh which, however, comes not from the Prophet, but from his widow. 'A'isha declared that God had revealed a Kur$an verse stating that the minimum number was five; subsequently a second verse was revealed, declaring that the minimum was five and that this second verse was still being publicly recited when the Prophet died. Malik had drily rejected this report as not being in conformity with the "practice". Al-Shafii embraced it and made it the basis of his Fikh. This second instance of naskh al-tildwa duna in 'ibad$man can fairly be attributed to al-Shafii's attitude.

The third and final instance of this type of naskh was contributed by the Hanafi who insisted, on the grounds of a reading attributed to 'Abd All$h b.
Mas'ud, that the fast mentioned in V, 89, should be of three consecutive days. This reading was, admitted, that of a single Companion, but, as the hadith from a single Companion was probative, his Kur'an information deserved the same treatment. The 'Abd Allah reading was still in circulation in the time of Abu Hanifa, who had adopted it in reaching his conclusion.

Neither igma' nor kiyds can repeal. As naskh concerns the documents of the Tradition, and as igma' and kiyds must be based on a document, it is the document which is the naskh. Besides, neither was resorted to until after the death of the Prophet and after the death of the Prophet, naskh is inconceivable, since naskh may be effected only at the hands of him by whom the revelation is mediated.


NASKHI [see KIYD].

NASNAS/NISNAS [see KIYD].

NAR (a.) 'vulture', one of the five deities said to date from the time of Noah and to have been found amongst the Himyaries and none of their poets mention them. The only pieces of evidence, apart from those in Ibn al-Kalbi, attesting the existence of a cult of the vulture amongst the Arabs, are found in the Babylonian Talmud Abada Zara (tr. Goldschmidt, ix, Berlin 1934, i/3, 468) and in the Doctrine of Addai (ed. and tr. Phililps, London 1876, 24).

One should note that the divinity's representation in animal form, lacking in Central Arabia, was fairly current in South Arabia, where Ilumkhum assumed the form of an ibex, bull, lion and sphinx: 'Athtar had the antelope and the bull's head as emblems, Sabhar (the dawn) that of the serpent, etc. (cf. G. Ryckmans, Les religions arabes présislamiques, 2nd ed. Louvain 1951 [ = Bibliothèque du Muséum, 25]; A. Grohmann, Gottsymbolen und Symbolbafe auf südarabischen Denkmälern, in Denkschriften der k.k. Acad. der Wiss. in Wien, phil.-hist. Kl., viii/1 (1914), pp. 104).


NAR (a.) masculine noun (pl. ansur, nisur, nisdr) denoting the vulture irrespective of species; the term is cognate with Akkadian nasur which is also encountered in the Hebrew name nasur (Turkish akbaba, Persian dâl, Berber tamadâd). From the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean, in the lands of Islam eight species of vulture are known, almost all of them resident and localised in mountainous regions and at the desert fringes. Four of these species are common there, and they are: (a) The Egyptian vulture (Neophron percnopterus); this is a scavenger and feeds on carrion. The male is called yarkhum and its valuable contribution to the cleaning of streets in towns and villages. In the age of the Pharaohs, this vulture, defiled and representing the sun, was the object of the greatest veneration; respect for the bird has been retained over the centuries and into the present day. In the 18th century, the English traveller T. Shaw relates (Voyages, ii, 91-2) that the Pasha of Egypt at that time donated two oxen every day to feed these vultures, beloved of the city peoples.

(b) The Griffon vulture (Gyps fulvus), with bright plumage and known as kisim, akil, khalij, in Kabylia, sajg, and in Persia kerkes. Moreover, the male is called yarkhum and is especially well-known to the Egyptians and is tolerated everywhere on account of its valuable contribution to the cleaning of streets in towns and villages. In the age of the Pharaohs, this vulture, defiled and representing the sun, was the object of the greatest veneration; respect for the bird has been retained over the centuries and into the present day. In the 18th century, the English traveller T. Shaw relates (Voyages, ii, 91-2) that the Pasha of Egypt at that time donated two oxen every day to feed these vultures, beloved of the city peoples.

(c) The Black vulture, Hooded vulture (Aegypius monachus) known as nasr al-djimûd, a satat. In the Maghrib, it is found only as a winter resident in Morocco.

(d) The Bearded vulture (Gypaetus barbatus) is known as the ossifagus of the Ancient world and, in Arabic, the kâir al-ijâm. It is also lent the names bulat, bulat, makkâliba, fara, abu dhusan, abu iljây, in Kabyle afâk (from the Latin fulvus) and in Persian hâmar. The four other species are much less common and very localised, especially in the Sudan. These are: (a) The Nubian vulture (Torgos tracheliotus nubicus) which is found only in Morocco, in southern Tunisia, in
Sinai and in the Sudan, where it is fairly common; it has the nicknames abu wuddn and abu sansala (for silisla). This is the largest of all the vultures and has a bald head and neck, with reddish skin; like the Black or Hooded vulture, it nests in isolated trees in the savannah.

(b) Ruppell’s vulture (Gyps ruppelli), which is native to the Sudan and an accidental visitor in Egypt and Sinai.

(c) The White-headed vulture (Trigonoceps occidentalis) and lammergeier, the Sudan, with the names nasr mansur and nasr kurnahendi.

(d) The White-backed vulture (Pseudogyps africanus) which is seen only in the Sudan; the sub-species bengalensis is found in Baluchistan and Pakistan.

The root n-s-r contains the notion of slashing, ripping to shreds and, in the context of raptores, tearing with stabs of the beak (minscar) the flesh of the prey which is to be eaten. In Arabic, vultures of all kinds are known, besides nasr, by the names šait, lammaša, šabn, haszol. The male is called darik, the female šanez, the chick hayzayn, nuqad, and the eggs rak. If the vulture has plentiful plumage, it is ghudaf or ahdb, and the old, reddish-coloured vulture is the madrah; the smaller species are named falatdn.

This is the largest of all the vultures and has silsila). The Arab-speaking naturalists, including al-Djahiz, al-Kazwini and al-Damiri, have with regard to the vulture faithfully repeated the accounts of Aristotle and Pliny, who noted that, for self-preservation, it nests in inaccessible cliffs and for this reason its eggs are very seldom found; hence adages such as abad niq bed al-anik, “more inaccessible than the eggs of the vulture” and aazz niq bed al-anik, “more precious than eggs of the vulture”. This voracious raptor (min šibh al-tayr) is dubbed “ignoble” (lašmān, lašmān) because it does not have talons and feeds on dead flesh as opposed to the “noble” raptores (ginsarš, kanaš), falcons and hawks, which hunt and catch their prey alive. However, the vulture is endowed with powerful eyesight which enables it to identify the carcasses of animals over great distances; al-Damiri, exaggerating somewhat, gives it a range of 400 parasangs (approx. 2,000 km!). This sharpness of vision has given rise to the erroneous belief that it is accompanied, in the vulture, by a sophisticated sense of smell which can detect smells of decomposition from a great distance; modern science has proved that its olfactory faculties are as limited as those of all other birds. Its sustained and gliding flight enables it to cover enormous expanses, such that it used to be said, among those with unbridled imagination, that in a single day it could join East to West. As Aristotle noted, the insatiable appetite of the vulture drives it to follow the armies of the Orient in quest of rubbish thrown out along the way and, ultimately, the carcasses of dead animals. Horror is evoked by mention of the sinister “Towers of Silence” or dašjkams, necropolises of the fire-worshipping Parsees, where corpses were offered to the greedy vultures. Later, it was the same lugubrious cortège of hungry carrion-eaters which accompanied the funeral caravans of the Šāhī’īs travelling to the burial-grounds of Karbala’. Thus it is hardly surprising that, in the minds of all peoples, the vulture is generally associated with macabre spectacles.

However, this sombre image which is currently associated with the vulture was not the major preoccupation of the Arabs, whose attitude to the bird was conditioned by awe at its legendary longevity. There was, for example, a story according to which King Solomon discovered, on a journey through Egypt, a splendid palace, utterly deserted and guarded by a lone vulture. Questioned by the king who could converse with animals, the raptor told him that he had been there for 700 years without ever seeing a human being. This longevity of the vulture, which is entirely mythical, is also found in the fabulous story of the Sage Lukmn (p. v.) who is mentioned in the Kur’an (XXXII, 11-12/12-13). This Sage had reared and kept until their death seven vultures in succession, each of them having lived eighty years; the first was called Amad and the last, named Lubad, died with his master who, according to some, was then 1,000 years old. This Lubad has become the theme of adages such as til al-abad ‘ilal Lubad “Lubad has not done with living” and abram min Lubad “much older than Lubad”, applied to anyone who has lived a very long time. In the same context, there is also the saying a-mar min al-nasr “longer-living than the vulture”. In short, Lukmann and his vulture Lubad evoked for the Arabs the same model of longevity as that evoked for Christians by Methuselah.

Through its enormous size, its terrifying appearance and aggressiveness which drives away all other carrion-eating birds, the vulture acquired the title of “Lord of the birds” (sayyil al-tayr), a title confirmed by a hadith of the Prophet Muhammad to whom the Angel Gabriel is supposed to have said (al-Kazwini, 4Ašgāh, ii, 290): “Every thing requires a lord; for humanity it is Adam, for his descendants it is you.... for birds it is the vulture...” It is this status conferred on the vulture which is ratified in the practical advice given in the series of Hadiths, Kafta wa-Dimm by Ibn Mukafla (p. v.) in these terms: “The best lord is he who resembles a vulture surrounded by carrion and not he who resembles carrion surrounded by vultures” (quoted in Hayawan, vi, 330).

Lord or not, the vulture can be the victim of its own greed for, once gorged, it can hardly fly and can only become airborne by making a laborious series of leaps; a child can then fell it with a blow from a stick. Furthermore, al-Djahiz denounces (Hayawan, vii, 38) the stupidity and awkwardness of the vulture, characteristics which it shares with the bustard (lubārā).

The habits of vultures were quite well known to the Ancients, but often erroneously interpreted. According to them, the two eggs or the single egg were laid on bare rock, and their incubation left to the heat of the sun; only a few plane-leaves were placed around them with the object, apparently, of protecting them from bats which were believed to be partial to eggs. This is clearly sheer fable, since the eggs are always laid on a thick bed of grass and leaves based on a solid foundation of branches, and they are incubated in turn by both male and female. Another fiction, related by al-Kazwini, with regard to laying, was that the male, when this was imminent, would travel as far as the East Indies to search in certain mountains for a stone called haḏḏar al-nasr “vulture’s stone” or haḏḏar al-šāh “eagle’s stone” and haḏḏar al-talq “stone of confinement”; al-Kazwini adds the name ahluš היתיס (?) or ahlušיתיס (?) which is possibly meant to correspond to the Greek ἀνθρωπίνη “pharmacy” or ἀντρωπίνη “childbirth”. On returning to the eyrie, the vulture would place this stone beside his mate, who would then lay with the minimum of discomfort. Among the Greeks, this stone was given as a talisman to pregnant women, supposedly to prevent them miscarrying. In fact, this was the “aetites”, a hollow nodule of
argillaceous oxide of iron surrounding a loose nucleus which is heard to rattle when it is shaken; this geological phenomenon suggested the notion of the "stone of confinement" (see Tahfa, no. 49). However, this still does not explain why the stone needed to be sought so far afield and why its benefits were confined exclusively to the eagle and the vulture.

According to al-Dhahib (Hayawan, v, 392, 398), the vulture carries in its plumage a small parasite called kamil al-nasr "vulture's house" and dadah in Persian which it drops in rocky areas and whose bite can be fatal for humans. This could be a reference to blood-sucking mites of the Acaridae family such as the Demanysus gallinace and the Arga persicus, or to lice such as the Lepisor robustus and the Goniodes colchici; all of these parasites are very dangerous, being the bearers of serious and sometimes fatal diseases.

An account of eastern legends concerning the vulture would not be complete without a mention of the improbable ascent into space of the despot Nimrod [see Namrod] who sought proof that God was indeed in Heaven, as stated by Abraham. As the story is told by al-Thalabi (5th/11th century) in the Kitab al-anbaya and by al-Damiiri, this sovereign ordered the construction of a large gondola fitted with a trap-door above and another in the floor; motive power for the ascent was provided by four requisitioned vultures, each tied by the feet to one side of the gondola. To incite them to greater effort by exploiting their greed, a tall mast fixed to the cabin was crowned with a bait of carrion. Nimrod took his place in the gondola accompanied by a page equipped with a bow and arrows; insatiable appetite impelled the vultures to accompany them these two proto-astronauts. The ascent was provided by four requisitioned vultures, the vulture, poured luke-warm into the ear, guards against deafness; mixed with honey, it is an effective treatment for all ocular complaints. The flesh of the vulture, its consumption forbidden under Islamic law, when boiled and mixed with salt, white cumin, honey, the sap of the Ceylon cornel tree (wars) and the rhododendron (yati), constitutes an excellent ointment against insect-stings and snake bites. The blood of the vulture when drunk as a potion reduces quartan fever. Finally, a vulture's egg, well-beaten, is supposedly an aphrodisiac when smeared on the sexual parts.

In botany, the name of the vulture is associated with four plants, as follows: (a) gnadh al-nasr "vulture's wing" for the Cardoon (Cynara cardunculus); (b) kama al-nasr "vulture's foot" for the Scopolender or Hartz's tongue (Scopelendrum vulgare); (c) the same name for the Water milfoil (Myriophyllum verticillatum); (b) zaf al-nasr "vulture's claw" for the Greek Catanahe: (Hymenonema Tournfortii or Catanahe Graces). On the other hand, the dialect term nasr or nisir denoting the Dog rose (Rosa canina) is a corruption of the Persian nisrin and has no connection with nisr. Arab astronomers placed the two attitudes of the vulture, flight and repose, in the names of two well-known stars, names which have been retained: (a) Altair (alpha Aquilae) derived from al-Nasr al-sajda "the Vulture flying", in the 17th Boreal constellation of the Eagle; (b) Vega (alpha Lyrae) derived from al-Nasr al-wash "the Vulture perched", in the 19th Boreal constellation of the Lyre.
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**NASR B. AHMAD** [see al-KHURZâBA'ARUZâZI].

**NASR B. AHMAD B. ISMâ'IL**, Sâmâdîn amir of Transoxania and Khurâsân (301-31/914-43), given after death the honorific of al-Âmir al-Sâdîqv ("the Fortunate").

Nasr was raised to the throne at the age of eight on the murder of his father by the Turkish al-Amir al-SaTld after his death the honorific of al-Âmir al-Sâdîqv ("Fortunate").

Nasr B. Ahmad al-Masâ'îlî, early Shi'i historian (though probably not, as Sezgin rightly observes, the first one) and traditionalist; his date of birth is uncertain, but he died in 212/827. He lived originally in Kufa but later moved to Baghdâd; amongst those from whom he heard traditions was Sufyân al-Tâhâwi [q.v.]. His own reputation as an akhbarî and muhaddith was, however, weak, and he was regarded by some Sunni authorities as a fârîq (ghâli) Shi'i. He is best known for his Kitâb Wa'kât Sîfîn (this has been reconstructed, from the passages cited from it in al-Tâbarî and Ibn 'Abî l-Dunyâyâ's Sharh Nahj al-balâgah, by 'Abî al-Salâm Muâh. Harûn, 2nd ed. Cairo 1381/1962-3), which apparently enshrines authentic contemporary information and which offers a Shi'i approach to the subject [see also ibid., ii, 202-4]. But he seems also to have written several other books whose titles alone are known to us, on other topics significant for the Shi'a, such as the Battle of the Camel and the killing of al-Husayn.

**Bibliography:** A.A. Duri, The rise of historical writing among the Arabs, Princeton 1983, 47-8, 144; Brockelmann, S I, 214; Sezgin, G S, i, 313. The Kitâb Wa'kât Sîfîn has been used extensively by, inter alia, M. Hinds, in his articles in al-Âkâbî, xxiv (1971), 3-31; IMFES, ii (1971), 346-67; and ibid., iii (1972), 450-69. (C.E. Bosworth)

**NASR B. NASUYÂR** AL-HULWÂNÎ, Abu l-Mu'âkilî, a blind Shi'i poet of the 3rd/9th century who owes the fact of his not having fallen into total obscurity to a mahjûr [q. v.] (of which there are two verses given in al-Mas'ûdî, Murûdî, § 3462) and a mâmiya, both composed in praise of the dâ'f Muhammad b. Zayd (c. 287/900 [q. v.]). Thirty-six verses of this last kasida (metre ramal, rhyme âmûn) have been preserved, solely by al-Mas'ûdî, it appears (Murûdî, § 3518), whilst the matla' (l-taklî bukhra...al-mihrâdân): Do not say "One piece of good news", but "two pieces of good news"; the face of someone whom I love and that of mihrâdân, cited in various circumstances, became more or less proverbial. As it happened, the dâ'f saw in the first words of the verse a bad augury and, irritated, threw the poet out, after however proposing himself modifying it in the following manner:

If you say one piece of good news, I have two of them ... (al-Askârî, Snâ'atnâm, 432). It is likewise criticised by Ibn Sharaf (Questions de critique littéraire, 88-89), who suggests simply reversing it:

The face of someone whom I love and that of mihrâdân, there is a very good piece of news, or what shall I say, two pieces of good news.

**In the Fatima** (i, 146), al-Thâlîbî attributes the verse to one Ibn Mu'âkilî (instead of Abu l-Mu'âkilî), whilst Salîh al-Ashqârî (the editor of Qâsars al-Nâma's al-Hafiz al-nâme, 28) and M. 'Awwad (the editor of Hillâl al-Sâbî's Râ'ûm dâr al-kiTlaqâ, 63) identify with al-Hasan b. al-Kâsim al-AIâwi [q. v.] the dâ'f whose name is not explicitly given in the text.

**Bibliography:** Given in the text. (Ch. Pellat)

**NASR B. SÂYYÂR** AL-LAYTÎF AL-KÂNA, the last
governor of Khurāsān under the Umayyads, d. 131/748.
Nasr's whole career seems to have been spent in Khurāsān and the East. In 86/705 he campaigned in the upper Oxus region under Sālāb, brother of the governor of Khurāsān Kuytayba b. Mūsliin [q.v.], and received a village there as reward. Then in 106/724 he was campaigning in Farghāna under Muslim b. Sā'īd al-Kilābī, and served as governor of Balkh for some years. Hence on the death of the governor of the East Asad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Kasrī [q.v.], the caliph Hākīm was advised to appoint as his successor Nasr, then 74 years old, and known for the "abstemiousness and wise" ('ṣāfī muḍārām ʿākīlī, having a Tamīmī wife and therefore able to count on the support of several of the main North Arab or Mūḍārī tribal groups in Khurāsān. Nasr now began what was to prove the last Umayyad period of power in Khurāsān, now separated administratively from ʿIrāq.
Nasr relied on the support of the old-established Arab āwāla settled in Khurāsān, but soon became involved in disputes with the Yemeni supporters of the former governor Asad al-Kasrī, with the armed rebellion of these groups at Marw (now the capital for the province in place of Balkh) in 126/744 under ʿDiyādī b. ʿAlī al-Kirmānī, chief of the Azd, who was demanding vengeance for the Muhallabīs [q.v.] whom the Umayyads had hunted down. More dangerous was the long-running defiance of the Umayyads on the part of al-Ḥārīth b. Suraydī [q.v.], before Nasr's arrival had been allied with the Kāhghān of the Western Turks or Tūrgēsh in Transoxania. Nasr's expedition against the Turkish region of Shāhī in 122/740, followed by a raid into Farghāna, seems to be connected with attempts to dislodge al-Ḥārīth, who nevertheless continued as an opposition force amongst the Arabs of Khurāsān till his death in 128/746 at the hands of ʿDiyādī's troops.
Nasr's attempts at redressing the grievances of the Arabs in Khurāsān and in healing tribal tensions included in 121/739 fiscal reform in the Marw region, where the local Persian landowners, the ḍikānīs, had been — it was alleged — using their social influence to discriminate against the Muslim settlers: now, all the local Persian landowners, the ʿAwfīs, ʿĀwbān and ʿArabīs in Khurasan and at healing tribal tensions in Khurasan. Nasr now began what was to prove the last Umayyad period of power in Khurāsān, now separated administratively from ʿIrāq.
Nasr relied on the support of the old-established Arab āwāla settled in Khurāsān, but soon became involved in disputes with the Yemeni supporters of the former governor Asad al-Kasrī, with the armed rebellion of these groups at Marw (now the capital for the province in place of Balkh) in 126/744 under ʿDiyādī b. ʿAlī al-Kirmānī, chief of the Azd, who was demanding vengeance for the Muhallabīs [q.v.] whom the Umayyads had hunted down. More dangerous was the long-running defiance of the Umayyads on the part of al-Ḥārīth b. Suraydī [q.v.], before Nasr's arrival had been allied with the Kāhghān of the Western Turks or Tūrgēsh in Transoxania. Nasr's expedition against the Turkish region of Shāhī in 122/740, followed by a raid into Farghāna, seems to be connected with attempts to dislodge al-Ḥārīth, who nevertheless continued as an opposition force amongst the Arabs of Khurāsān till his death in 128/746 at the hands of ʿDiyādī's troops.
Nasr's attempts at redressing the grievances of the Arabs in Khurāsān and at healing tribal tensions included in 121/739 fiscal reform in the Marw region, where the local Persian landowners, the ḍikānīs, had been — it was alleged — using their social influence to discriminate against the Muslim settlers: now, all the local Persian landowners, the ʿAwfīs, ʿĀwbān and ʿArabīs in Khurasan and at healing tribal tensions in Khurasan. Nasr now began what was to prove the last Umayyad period of power in Khurāsān, now separated administratively from ʿIrāq.
Nasr relied on the support of the old-established Arab āwāla settled in Khurāsān, but soon became involved in disputes with the Yemeni supporters of the former governor Asad al-Kasrī, with the armed rebellion of these groups at Marw (now the capital for the province in place of Balkh) in 126/744 under ʿDiyādī b. ʿAlī al-Kirmānī, chief of the Azd, who was demanding vengeance for the Muhallabīs [q.v.] whom the Umayyads had hunted down. More dangerous was the long-running defiance of the Umayyads on the part of al-Ḥārīth b. Suraydī [q.v.], before Nasr's arrival had been allied with the Kāhghān of the Western Turks or Tūrgēsh in Transoxania. Nasr's expedition against the Turkish region of Shāhī in 122/740, followed by a raid into Farghāna, seems to be connected with attempts to dislodge al-Ḥārīth, who nevertheless continued as an opposition force amongst the Arabs of Khurāsān till his death in 128/746 at the hands of ʿDiyādī's troops.
Nasr's attempts at redressing the grievances of the Arabs in Khurāsān and at healing tribal tensions included in 121/739 fiscal reform in the Marw region, where the local Persian landowners, the ḍikānīs, had been — it was alleged — using their social influence to discriminate against the Muslim settlers: now, all the local Persian landowners, the ʿAwfīs, ʿĀwbān and ʿArabīs in Khurasan and at healing tribal tensions in Khurasan. Nasr now began what was to prove the last Umayyad period of power in Khurāsān, now separated administratively from ʿIrāq.
Nasr relied on the support of the old-established Arab āwāla settled in Khurāsān, but soon became involved in disputes with the Yemeni supporters of the former governor Asad al-Kasrī, with the armed rebellion of these groups at Marw (now the capital for the province in place of Balkh) in 126/744 under ʿDiyādī b. ʿAlī al-Kirmānī, chief of the Azd, who was demanding vengeance for the Muhallabīs [q.v.] whom the Umayyads had hunted down. More dangerous was the long-running defiance of the Umayyads on the part of al-Ḥārīth b. Suraydī [q.v.], before Nasr's arrival had been allied with the Kāhghān of the Western Turks or Tūrgēsh in Transoxania. Nasr's expedition against the Turkish region of Shāhī in 122/740, followed by a raid into Farghāna, seems to be connected with attempts to dislodge al-Ḥārīth, who nevertheless continued as an opposition force amongst the Arabs of Khurāsān till his death in 128/746 at the hands of ʿDiyādī's troops.
Nasr's attempts at redressing the grievances of the Arabs in Khurāsān and at healing tribal tensions included in 121/739 fiscal reform in the Marw region, where the local Persian landowners, the ḍikānīs, had been — it was alleged — using their social influence to discriminate against the Muslim settlers: now, all the local Persian landowners, the ʿAwfīs, ʿĀwbān and ʿArabīs in Khurasan and at healing tribal tensions in Khurasan. Nasr now began what was to prove the last Umayyad period of power in Khurāsān, now separated administratively from ʿIrāq.
Nasr relied on the support of the old-established Arab āwāla settled in Khurāsān, but soon became involved in disputes with the Yemeni supporters of the former governor Asad al-Kasrī, with the armed rebellion of these groups at Marw (now the capital for the province in place of Balkh) in 126/744 under ʿDiyādī b. ʿAlī al-Kirmānī, chief of the Azd, who was demanding vengeance for the Muhallabīs [q.v.] whom the Umayyads had hunted down. More dangerous was the long-running defiance of the Umayyads on the part of al-Ḥārīth b. Suraydī [q.v.], before Nasr's arrival had been allied with the Kāhghān of the Western Turks or Tūrgēsh in Transoxania. Nasr's expedition against the Turkish region of Shāhī in 122/740, followed by a raid into Farghāna, seems to be connected with attempts to dislodge al-Ḥārīth, who nevertheless continued as an opposition force amongst the Arabs of Khurāsān till his death in 128/746 at the hands of ʿDiyādī's troops.
Nasr's attempts at redressing the grievances of the Arabs in Khurāsān and at healing tribal tensions included in 121/739 fiscal reform in the Marw region, where the local Persian landowners, the ḍikānīs, had been — it was alleged — using their social influence to discriminate against the Muslim settlers: now, all the local Persian landowners, the ʿAwfīs, ʿĀwbān and ʿArabīs in Khurasan and at healing tribal tensions in Khurasan. Nasr now began what was to prove the last Umayyad period of power in Khurāsān, now separated administratively from ʿIrāq.
Nasr relied on the support of the old-established Arab āwāla settled in Khurāsān, but soon became involved in disputes with the Yemeni supporters of the former governor Asad al-Kasrī, with the armed rebellion of these groups at Marw (now the capital for the province in place of Balkh) in 126/744 under ʿDiyādī b. ʿAlī al-Kirmānī, chief of the Azd, who was demanding vengeance for the Muhallabīs [q.v.] whom the Umayyads had hunted down. More dangerous was the long-running defiance of the Umayyads on the part of al-Ḥārīth b. Suraydī [q.v.], before Nasr's arrival had been allied with the Kāhghān of the Western Turks or Tūrgēsh in Transoxania. Nasr's expedition against the Turkish region of Shāhī in 122/740, followed by a raid into Farghāna, seems to be connected with attempts to dislodge al-Ḥārīth, who nevertheless continued as an opposition force amongst the Arabs of Khurāsān till his death in 128/746 at the hands of ʿDiyādī's troops.
Meier, loc. cit.). The Arabic verses became the subject of a special commentary (cf. Rieu, loc. cit.).

Until the present day, Naṣr Allāh’s translation is regarded as a model of elegant Persian style. It served as the basis for the metrical version composed by Kāfplī for the Saljūq sultan of Konya about 658/1260 and for a series of Turkish translations. It was not superseded by the celebrated Anrück-i Sahāhī,”‘The lights of Canopus’, written in the late 9th/15th century by Husayn Wā’iz al-Kāhīfī [q.v.], who claimed to have made a simplified version but really produced the opposite effect (see the comparisons between the two Persian versions by Browne and Arberry).

Already the earliest manuscripts contain the text in varying lengths. It is likely that the author himself brought his work out in different forms. The Tārdjumān has been printed several times since the middle of the 19th century. By far the best edition available now is the one published by Muṣṭāfa Muḥmūn (Tehran, 1345 [1967]).


(E. Berthels-J.T.P de Brujin)

Naṣr Al-Dawla, Abu Naṣr Ahmad b. Marwān, third and most important prince of the Marwānid dynasty [q.v.] of Diyar Bakr. He succeeded to the provincial sovereignty over the death of his elder brother, Muḥammad al-Dawla Abū Maṣūr Saṭīdī, in 401/1010-11, after a struggle with the latter’s murderer, and was in the same year formally recognised by the ʿAbbāsīd al-Kādir [q.v.], from whom at the same time he received his īsāb, and by the Sāljuq emir, Sultan al-Dawla, who served him in turn, namely Abu ‘1-Kasim al-Maghribī [q.v.], who served him in turn, he had been in league against the Georgian king, and to whom at the same period he received his lākab, whenever opportunity offered (see the letter addressed to Nasr al-Dawla by the Sāljuq Toghrīl Beg: Ibn al-Aṯīr.) Eight years later, Naṣr al-Dawla acceded to Toghrīl’s demand for recognition as suzerain; and this subservience, which was renewed in 446/1054-5, when Toghrīl made a triumphal tour through Adharbāyjān and Muslim Armenia, spared Diyar Bakr the experience of a Sāljuq visitation, In the following year, however, Toghrīl’s attention was drawn to the murder of a Kurdish chieftain by Naṣr al-Dawla’s son Sulaymān, his lieutenant in the Dizārī; and in 448/1056-7, when the sultan was obliged to visit al-Mawṣūl in order to oppose a combination of Shī‘ī leaders headed by al-Bāṣārī [q.v.], he forced an indemnity from Ibn al-Marwān by laying siege to Dizārī Ibn ‘Umar.

Naṣr al-Dawla was sagacious, or fortunate, in his choice of the waʿṣarīs who served him in turn, namely Abu ʿ1-Ḵāṣṣīs al-Maghribī [q.v.] (in office 415-28/1025-37) and Abū Naṣr Ibn Dībāl (afterwards entitled Faḵār al-Dawla) [see Ta.rdjumān-i Ḵāhī, Banū] (in office 430-3/1039-61). It was no doubt owing in part to their abilities that the remarkable tranquility enjoyed by Dībāl during his reign was turned to advantage, and resulted in an equally remarkable prosperity. This Naṣr al-Dawla fostered by a reduction of taxation and by renouncing the practice of
mulcting the rich in order to augment the revenues. Nevertheless, his court is said to have surpassed those of all his contemporaries in luxury, and many instances are quoted of his profusion and generosity. Mayyāfīrkin became during his reign a centre for men of learning, poets and ascetics, as also a refuge for political fugitives. Among the latter were the Būyid prince al-Malik al-Asīz [q. v.], who was ousted from the amirate in 436/1044-5 by his uncle Abū Kāhlīgīr [q. v.], and the infant heir of the 4Abāsīd al-Kāʾīm — afterwards al-Muṣṭarī [q. v.]— who was removed with his mother from Baghdad on the occasion of its occupation in 450/1058 by al-Basaṭīr.

Nasr al-Dawla is described as being robust, just, high-minded and methodical, and though much addicted to sensuality, he was strict in his observance of religious injunctions. He died, aged about eighty, on 24 Shawwāl 453/11 November 1061, leaving Fakhr al-Dawla Ibn Dhiḥrat still in office to secure the succession to his second son, Abū ʿI-Qāsim Nasr, Niẓām al-Dīn.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Athīr, ix, x; Ibn Khālijīn, Wafayāt al-aʿyān, tr. de Slane, i; Ibn Taǧībīrīlī, al-Nuḏğām al-zahrā, ed. Popper, ii, Ibn Khālīdīn, Kūṭb al-Ilavar, iv; H. F. Amedroz, The Mawārid dynasty of Mayyāfīrkin, in JRAS (1903), 123-54; C. E. Bosworth, in Camb. hist. of Iran, v, 24; and see Mawriyān wa Muḥāṣarīn (modern Turkish: Nasreddin Hoça) is the label of the most prominent protagonist of humorous prose narratives in the whole sphere of Turkish-Islamic influence, ranging from the Balkan area to the Turkic-speaking peoples of Central Asia. Nasr al-Dīn is a legendary character whose historical existence none of the various theories regarding his alleged lifetime has succeeded to prove beyond doubt. The character from the 10th/16th century onwards increasingly served as a point of crystallisation for an otherwise amorphous popular tradition of aphorisms, witicisms, jokes, jests, and anecdotes of various origins.

The period of Nasr al-Dīn’s supposed historical existence might have been fixed some time in the 7th/13th to the 8th/14th century, the region where he probably was active as a ḥākīm (from Turkish hâkim, designating a man of distinction, and definitely not a distortion of the name of the related Arabic jester Ḥājī [q. v.] as supposed by Basset) somewhere in southern-central Anatolia, maybe even in Ak Shehr [q.v.], where a mausoleum bearing his name is preserved. In an apparent contradiction, characteristic for any popular tradition such as the one focusing on Nasr al-Dīn, facts about the circumstances of his life become known in an increasingly detailed manner the more distance from his alleged lifetime one gets. This is all the more the case since, in late 20th century Turkey, Nasr al-Dīn, explicitly employed for touristic interests, is being promoted as an international ambassador of Turkish good-natured mentality and hospitality.

The earliest anecdotes about Nasr al-Dīn in a Turkic language are quoted in Lāmiḥī Čelebi’s (d. 939/1531) Latāfīf (ms. Istanbul, Ayasofya Kütüphanesi 4232, fols. 17b-18a, 31b, 34b, 35b-36a) and Ebu ‘l-Khayr-i Ruml’s (d. 885/1480) Salīluk-nāme (ed. Ş. H. Akahl. Istanbul 1988, 140-2, 181-2). While Lāmiḥī Čelebi mentions Nasr al-Dīn as a contempor ary of Şeyyād Hamza (8th/14th century), the decisive impact for subsequent popular tradition, and notably, later European learned discussions, derives from Ewliya Čelebi, who visited Nasr al-Dīn’s alleged tomb in Ak Shehr in the 17th century and quotes an anecdote in which Nasr al-Dīn is depicted together with the Mongol ruler Timūr (died 807/1405 [q. v.]). Any such attempts at historicising the character of Nasr al-Dīn are to be judged as speculative as the often-quoted date 386 in the inscription on Nasr al-Dīn’s tomb (ostensibly a posthumous joke to be read in reversed order as 683/1284) and even the charters of endowment (waqfyya) of the year 655/1257 and 665/1266 respectively, mentioning the appearance before the kāšif of a certain “Nasr al-Dīn Khodja”, which are quoted at the beginning of the 20th century by Körpiüzade Mehməd Fu’al (cf. Mawsam Nasr al-Dīn Hoça fıkraları, ed. Ā. Čanıkka, İstanbul 1980, 14 f.).

The early manuscript tradition of anecdotes on Nasr al-Dīn presents a comparatively small repertoe, which in subsequent centuries was continuously enlarged. The first printed Turkish collection (İstanbul 1253/1857) comprises 134, later lithograph and printed collections some 125 anecdotes. While in the late 19th century such writers as Čaylak Tewfik [q. v.], in Suppl.) pioneered the Nasr al-Dīn literature in modern Turkish, most recent Turkish publications rely on Bahāʾī (i.e. Weled Celebi [Izbudak]), who in 1323/1907 published his collection of almost 400 anecdotes, Lātīfāt-i Nasreddin Khodja vaḥmeti lâhī aleh, drawing on earlier prints as well as manuscripts and oral tradition. The printed collections in Northwest and Middle-Asiatic Turkic languages mostly derive from the first Tatar imprints (Lātīfāt Xuşa Nasreddin Āfandi, Kazan 1261/1845, reprinted more than 30 times), themselves constituting almost identical renderings from the Ottoman Turkish.

Originating in Turkish tradition, Nasr al-Dīn’s fame soon spread all over the regions of Ottoman dominion, the character meanwhile integrating narrative materials originally attached to other protagonists, such as Kārkīḵū [q. v.] or Bühlīl [q. v.], some of them anonymous or of local importance only, such as Ahmet Ağa (Crimean Tatar), Naovi (Ozbek) or Aldarkūs (Kirgiz). Nasr al-Dīn is known in Central Asia as Ependi or Apandi (from Turkish Efendi, here meant as term of respectful address), a term which by way of Uighur adaptations eventually resulted in the modern Afconditional of the Tatar Trickster. In the area of Persian influence, the character is designated as Mollā Nasr al-Dīn (first Persian printed edition 1299/1881). This applies to Persia, Afghanistan, and the Pashk language regions in the East as well as to Kurdish and most of the Caucasian languages, whereas the tales on Nasr al-Dīn in Tadjik tradition rather seem to be influenced by surrounding Turkic languages. In Azeri tradition, Nasr al-Dīn gained fame as the eponym of a renowned satirical magazine at the beginning of the 20th century. In the Balkan area, Nasr al-Dīn, besides being richly documented in the Greek (Nastadin), Albanian, Serbian and Croatian languages, still today in Bulgarian and Macedonian popular tradition serves as an antagonist of the national hero Čhitür Peştür (Ifer Pejo).

Previous research on the historical development of the stock of Nasr al-Dīn anecdotes (Basset; Horn; Christensen; Wesselski) has only succeeded in elucidating singular traits, at the same time thoroughly misunderstanding or ignoring others. Recent philological comparisons of the narrative repertoires of Djuha and Nasr al-Dīn have led to the following conclusions. Some, though relatively few, of the earliest versions of anecdotes that in later sources are told in the name of Nasr al-Dīn are to be traced to the mediaeval stock of tales on Djuha, whose con-
tents may be reconstructed from Arabic adab-literature (e.g. al-Abi [died 421/1030], *Nasr ad-durr*, v. ch. 17) contemporary to the mention of a Book of Anecdotes on Dhūjā (Kitāb Nawāid Dhūjā) in Ibn an-Nadīm’s *Al-Itwā.* However, the narrative tradition on Dhūjā and Nasr al-Dīn, as it is documented in manuscript collections of their tales, developed separately from each other until the 19th century; at any rate, a Turkish translation of the Arabic booklet never existed. It is not until the printed collections of the 19th century that a direct connection between the narrative repertoires on Dhūjā and Nasr al-Dīn becomes manifest. One of the first printed collections in Turkish—probably that of Būlāk 1256/1840 containing a repertoire slightly different from the edition Istanbul 1253/1837—was translated into Arabic (Būlāk 1280/1864 or earlier) while being considerably enlarged. The anonymous compiler added to the translation of the Turkish original some 100 jests adapted from mediaeval Arabic adab literature; these tales as a rule, notably in the original sources, were not told in the name of Dhūjā, Nasr al-Dīn’s Arab predecessor, but rather belong to the basic stock of jocular tales prevailing throughout entertaining adab literature since its beginning (cf. U. Marzolph, *Arabia ridens* Frankfurt 1992, 2 vols.). This Arabic translation, or rather adaptation, was in turn translated into Persian (1929: “Nasr al-Dīn’s Arab Jokes in the Persian Language,” once more being enlarged by coining tales taken from mediaeval (Arabic and Persian) literature on Nasr al-Dīn. Here again it is interesting to note that the compiler did not draw on the stock of anecdotes on Dhūjā (the Persian form of Dhūjā) as it is documented in the works of Anwarī (died ca. 566/1170), Dhīlāl al-Dīn Rūmī (died 672/1273), Ubayd-i Zākānī (died 772/1371) or in the later *Itwā* of Ali b. Husayn Ważr Khāgifī commonly known as Saft (d. 939/1532). The interchange of the additional repertoire thus introduced by the Arabic and Persian versions with subsequent Turkish tradition has not yet been scrutinised; but it is obvious that at the latest by the end of the 19th/beginning of the 20th century Nasr al-Dīn had gained such an amount of popularity in the whole region of the Ottoman Empire that the provenance of the narrative materials attached to him did not play a decisive role; on the contrary, it had become permissible to attach to the character any tale that might fit into the general frame outlined by popular perception. This may serve as an explanation for the fact that some of the more recent collections of tales on Nasr al-Dīn can present a remarkably large repertoire (e.g. Khartonov: 1238 items).

It is necessary to point out that the above conclusions with a necessary degree of certainty are only valid for printed or rather literate tradition, which is subject to distinctive mechanisms of selection and adaptation. On the other hand, oral tradition is subject to other criteria, which in the case of Nasr al-Dīn can only be a matter of speculation. Current research has so far to a minor extent only focused on orally-narrated tales about Nasr al-Dīn (cf., e.g. Küños), which presumably enjoy an overwhelming popularity in traditional but probably less in modern Near Eastern societies.

As for the scholarly pre-occupation with Nasr al-Dīn, his charming character seems to have had a tremendous and in fact devastating impact on most attempts at a detached analysis of Near Eastern humorous narratives. National Turkish research still mainly consists of futile attempts to argue beyond doubt for Nasr al-Dīn’s historical existence or to demonstrate the essential traits of his character by reconstructing the supposed original stock of anecdotes attached to him. On the other hand, most Western researchers have all too readily identified Near Eastern humour on a general level with Nasr al-Dīn, and—corresponding to contemporary propagating Turkish tradition—have succumbed to the temptation of reducing him to a charming, lovable, intrinsic but morally harmless philosopher. As for the historical evidence of the narrative repertoire linked with Nasr al-Dīn’s name, it is obvious that since the earliest known manuscripts this repertoire contained a considerable proportion of scatological, sexual sodomy, and otherwise explicitly provoking anecdotes.

From a point of view contemporary to the manuscript tradition, it may safely be assumed that these tales did not constitute a major offence; rather it is to be supposed that they represent humorous attitudes of a direct and outspoken kind, not yet submitting to restrictions by the requirements in content and form that later were established by refined literary developments. While it must remain doubtful whether the early collections represent anything that safely might be termed as “folk” literature, it seems most certain that this kind of crude anecdote still today enjoys a wide popularity and not only in rural areas of the Near East. Even though contemporary Turkish research—although trying to accommodate Nasr al-Dīn—such attempts as are practised by recent Turkish collections—by eliminating this part of the historical repertoire or denying its claim to originality, a strictly historical evaluation should bear in mind that moral standards are subject to frequent changes. Apart from the intentionally offensive portions, the repertoire of anecdotes on Nasr al-Dīn contains a large amount of tales otherwise documented in the international narrative tradition. For these tales the attachment to the character of Nasr al-Dīn is often but one station on the way they travel through times and regions, more than once securing their survival and wide dissemination throughout the Near East, the Balkan region and the Mediterranean.

NASR AL-DIN KHODJA — NASRIDS


NASRIDS, Ar. Barû Nasr, also known as Barû 'l-A'mhar, so called from the name of Muhammad b. Yûsuf Ibn Nasr Ibn al-Ahmur, founder of what was to be the last major Muslim dynasty in the Iberian Peninsula, ruling a kingdom in the far south of Spain from its capital city, Granada (Qurbanâ [q.v.]) and claiming as its ruling dynasty the house of the Nasrids leader 'Ubayd, a Companion of the Prophet. Although the dynasty was born on 26 Ramadan 629/14 August 1232, its association with Granada dates from mid-1454 until mid-1455). For Andalusian Islam the loss of the city passed into the hands of the dynasty's founder—Abd Allah Muhammad I—coming into true capital until their rule came formally to an end on 2 January 1492 with a public ceremony following an improvised capitulation on the previous day.

1. History.

For the period running from the latter part of the 8th/14th century until the loss of Granada to the Christians there are many aspects of Nasrid history on which, despite some good scholarly progress over the last fifty years, we are still ill informed. For this reason it is impossible to give a complete picture of Nasrid history. Although the following list of Nasrid rulers will, as regards the chronology of their rule, be found to differ in certain details from C. E. Bosworth's revised list contained in his Islamic dynasties (revised edition Edinburgh 1980, 18-19) and should be regarded as replacing it. From the list below it will be seen that after the death of Yusuf III there comes a confusing series of changes of monarch. For the period 1417-54, however, L. P. Harvey provides a most helpful schema in his Islamic Spain (see Bibl. below), 245. It should be noted that where only dates of the Christian era are given in the list, the reason is that the date A.H. is not to be found in any known Arabic source.

8. Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad V al-Qâhin bi 'llah: 755-60/1354-9 (reign interrupted by Isma'il II, then Muhammad VI) and 763-9/1362-91.
and so even greater cities would leave it with no solid base in the Guadalquivir, thus presaging the loss of Islam in 15th-century Spain.

Such was the nature of the times which witnessed the conception, birth and growth of a memorable dynasty that was to rule a kingdom which, in the final analysis, owed its existence to the adroit manoeuvres of Muhammad I b. Yusuf b. Nasr in response to the many threats posed by disintegrative manoeuvres of Muhammad (I) b. Yusuf b. Nasr. It was a game with many rules made and broken by various players ever ready for a change of partner.

The new dynasty came into being in Arjona (Argüena), a small frontier town south of the Guadalquivir, some 30 km to the north-west of the city of Jaén (Qayyān [q.v.]). It was there that in 629/1232 Muhammad b. Yusuf managed to establish himself as the effective ruler of a relatively small region including Jaén and extending south-eastwards as far as Guadix (Wādī Ash) to the north-east of Granada and as far east as Baeza (Bayyasa [q.v.]) on the north bank of the Guadalquivir.

Of vital importance to the establishment and consolidation of the Nasrid rule was the unwavering support of another Hispano-Arab family with Arjona connections, viz., the Tugubid Banū Aṣq̱ūliyā (or, in Castilian sources, Escayola). With their military assistance the nascent dynasty and its loyalty underpinned by multiple marriage ties with members of the Nasrid family, Muhammad b. Yusuf was able not only to make himself master of Arjona and later to accept the invitation of Granada’s notables to assume control of their city (634/1237), but also, after his loss of Arjona (642/1244) and then of Jaén (643/1246) to the Christians, to transform Granada into an enduring political entity.

To a proper understanding of the nature of that entity an appreciation of the religious side to its founder’s life is crucial. Early in his career Muhammad had come into prominence as a charismatic leader of frontiersmen, a man with a religious mission (da‘ī), displaying all the outward signs of the typical Muhammadan mystic and mysticism, immediately upon his accession in Granada, the image of an ascetic by avoiding the direct exercise of governmental power.

This, together with command of the army, he assigned to his right-hand man, ʿAbbās Ibn Aṣq̱ūliyā, the then head of his family. Whatever the exact nature and extent of the religious thinking that initially informed the faith and practice of Muhammad, it is clear that, once enounced in Granada, he embraced and indeed strictly enforced the doctrines of its Mālikī religious establishment. Moving gradually towards self-assertion and away from his undertaking to share his kingdom with the Banū Aṣq̱ūliyā, he made clear his intention to restrict power to the Nasrid family by naming, in 655/1257, his sons Muhammad and Yusuf as his heirs in direct succession to himself. Whether it is impracticable: it was a game with many rules made and broken by various players ever ready for a change of partner.
should a change of tactics so demand. It must suffice to note only some of the most salient points.

From the Marinids Muhammad II initially gained little to his liking. Aggrieved at their treating him as no more than the equal of his subjects, the Banū Ashkhālīla, he had left Algeciras in disgust, showing little zest for their joint dīḥād. He thus allowed so close a relationship to develop between the two allies that in 676/1278 the Banū Ashkhālīla handed Malaga to a Marinid governor. Little did they dream that early in 677/1279 it would revert to the Nasrids: a justifiable sense of insecurity, created by Muhammad’s intrigues with Abu al-Walīdī [q. e.] of Tlemcen and with Alfonso, had prompted a Marinid withdrawal to the Mağribī, and Muhammad had then struck a bargain with Malaga’s Marinid governor. With Malaga Granada had both gained access to the Mediterranean and greatly enhanced prospects of political and economic viability.

Anger at the machinations and treachery—suffered notably by Alfonso—whereby Muhammad II had achieved his ends in 1279 resulted in a tripartite offensive against him launched by Alfonso, Abū Yusuf and the Banū Ashkhālīla, the latter now with their main base in Guadix. The war, waged on northern and southern fronts, lasted from May 1280 to April 1281. Granada’s survival owed much to a rift between Alfonso and his heir Sancho, whose military support brought great relief to Muhammad.

In early April 1285 Granada faced a new major problem: responding to an Ashkhālīla call for help against Sancho IV (as he had become on Alfonso’s death in 1284), Abū Yusuf once more crossed the Straits for war. After a few months Sancho sought a truce and agreed to withdraw from the Granadan interior. To Granada the new Marinid ruler Abū Ya’qūb Yusuf, facing internal problems in the Mağribī, made peace with the Nasrid and abandoned all territorial claims apart from those to Algeciras, Tarifa and Guadix. In early 686/1288 came the end of the Banū Ashkhālīla: accepting Abū Ya’qūb’s offer of the governorate, in Morocco, of Ksar el-Kebir (al-Kasr al-Kabīr [q. e.]) and all that went with it, their leader and a large part of their forces moved with his clan and his troops and their families to Ksar, where they established a small dynasty, still remembered in the 20th century.

To gain some control of the Straits of Gibraltar and to weaken that of the Marinids as well as the strength of their position in Spain became Muhammad’s next main objective. This he thought to achieve by pitting the Castilians against the Marinids in Tarifa. To this end he embarked on a policy that was to culminate in an anti-Marinid alliance involving Granada, Castile, Aragon and Tlemcen. When in October 1292 Sancho, with Aragonese naval assistance, took Tarifa, Muhammad expected Sancho to observe one of the terms of an agreement he had made with him by delivering Tarifa to him. When Sancho did not, Muhammad sought and gained Marinid support for a new siege of Tarifa. In August 1294 the venture failed: Granada, with its main forces tied to operations elsewhere in Spain, had been of little help. Convinced of the futility of further involvement in Spain, Abū Ya’qūb withdrew all his forces, and in 694/1295 ceded to Muhammad all Marinid strongholds in the Peninsula. It was now Muhammad’s aim to occupy all vacant positions. In Ronda and neighbouring western areas, however, his past policy of concentration in Algeciras there, well away from Granada, rebounded adversely upon him: for a year a rebellious enclave, born of local resentment at suffering under Mağribī soldiery and led by the Banu ‘Hakim of Ronda, denied him access. Access, when it finally came, came on Ronda’s terms (Djumādā I 695/January 1296): inter aha, no kinsman of the Nasrid would thenceforth reside in the area and no Mağribī troops would be billeted on the local population.

Following Sancho’s death in April 1295 and the accession of his son Ferdinand (IV), a mere boy, divisions within Castile and more especially between Castile and Aragon had attracted a Granadan offensive on the northern marches. Among Muhammad’s successes the most notable were the capture of Quesada (Kaydāta) at the end of 1295 and of Alcaudete (al-Kabdhāk) in June 1300. At the time of his death on 8 Sha‘bān 701/8 April 1302 he had negotiated a treaty with Aragon recognising Granada’s right to Tarifa and other places and was preparing for a new campaign against Castile.

3. Muhammad III, by all accounts a sadist suspected of patricide, inherited a situation of military advantage which he failed to develop. His preference was for a peace which, however favourable to Granada in certain important respects, imposed upon him a three-year term of vassalage from 1303 and in 1304 drew him, as the vassal of Castile, into a Castilian-Aragonese accord. As Castile and Aragon grew closer in their new relationship, so the outlook for Granada worsened. By 1308 the two Christian powers felt able to spell out in the treaty of Alcalá de Henares the way in which the Kingdom of Granada should be divided between them.

For the Marinids Muhammad III cared nothing. In 1303 he had, to their chagrin, isolated them from his dealings with Castile, and in May 1306 his troops managed to seize Ceuta, not for return to the Marinids, against whom its masters, the Banu ’Aṣāfi [q. e. in Suppl.], had rebelled, but for annexation by himself. Deporting the ‘Azafdīs to Granada, he proclaimed himself lord of Ceuta in 1307. He had achieved his aim to control a commanding position in the Straits, but, in doing so, he had laid the foundations of his downfall. Neither the Marinids, once more under pressure from Aragon and Tlemcen, nor the Castilians and Aragonese, once reconciled and bent on achieving the ends spelt out at Alcalá de Henares, could accept a Nasrid Ceuta: they would all stand shoulder to shoulder in an anti-Granadan tripartite alliance. The threat was too great for the Granadans to stomach: forced to abdicate, Muhammad went into retirement in Almufiecar, and his chief minister, Ibn al-Hakim, a member of the erstwhile ruling family of anti-Mağribī Ronda, was assassinated (March, 1309) as much, no doubt, for his influence on policy as for his affluence and extravagant living.

4. Nasr, at the age of twenty-two, came to rule a kingdom in an unprecedentedly parlous position as it straddled the Straits of Gibraltar at war with the Castilian-Aragonese axis, on the one hand, and the Marinid-Aragonese alliance, on the other. With no hope of official aid from Tlemcen, now at peace with Fez, Granada faced a lonely fight for survival. Fortunately as it turned out for Granada, the Ceutans themselves soon exchanged Nasrid for Marinid rule (10 Sa‘āda 709/20 July 1309). Ceuta regained, Fez no longer needed Aragon and was now ready to consider Nasr’s proposals for peace and amity, the need for which became pressing with Castile’s conquest of Gibraltar in early September 1309. By mid-month all was settled: Algeciras and Ronda and their dependencies would go to the Marinids in exchange for
assistance. Thereafter Granada's future began to look brighter, not least because of the late and ill-coordinated start that Castile and Aragon had made in the land and sea offensive against Algeciras and Almeria. In mid-November 1309 an important Castilian contingent left the besiegers of Algeciras, and, in Shawwāl 709/January 1310, the siege ended as Ferdinand IV, eager to be rid of a now heavy burden, readily accepted Nasr's offer to become his tributary and at the same time return certain frontier strongholds earlier taken from Castile. As for Almeria, Christian delay had enabled it to stockpile for an expected siege, that materiased in mid-August 1309 with the arrival of Aragonese seaborne forces. Dependent on seaborne supplies, which began to fail as soon as autumnal weather prevented eastward movement of their merchantmen, the Aragonese moved into winter at the mercy of the weather at sea with no prospect of effective Castilian aid on land. By the end of December the siege was over: a truce had been called, and in January 1310 the Aragonese left as best they could, never to return to war in Granadan territory. Nasr could be said to have served Granada well: his gain in containing the Reconquest far outweighed his losses, for, territorially, the only major Christian gain had been Gibraltar. With Ferdinand's death in September 1312 the Castilian offensive ended, and, not long afterwards, the siege of Alcaudete upon its falling to Castile. On 21 Shawwāl 713/8 February 1314 Nasr, who, for reasons not wholly clear, had become unpopular and been dethroned by his kinsman Isma'īl, son of the governor of Málaga, left Granada for Guadix, where he was permitted to rule as governor. 5. Isma'īl I assumed power as Nasr was planning to regain it by invoking his rights as the tributary of Castile. In due course a sizeable Castilian force made for Guadix and in Safar 716/ April-May 1316 engaged intercepting Muslim troops led by the able Mirnīd commander, ʿUthmān b. Abī ʿUllā. The ensuing battle, fiercely fought near Alcútin at Wādī Fortuna, was perhaps—there is a conflict of evidence—narrowly won by the Christians, for they were subse quently unable to maintain the operations without closer to Granada. But one gain at least accrued to Ismaʿīl: Nasr was never again able to embark on such a venture as that which had so signally failed.

In the Straits Granada began to regain strength thanks to the naval cooperation of the ʿAzzāf governor of Ceuta, Yahyā b. Abī Tālib. Be that as it may, in 1319 Castile launched an all-out attack on Granada. Beating a path right through to the Vega, the army of the Infantes Don Pedro and Don Juan, regents for the young Alfonso XI, finally reached the city walls. A short siege gave way to the so-called Battle of the Vega, in which, largely thanks to the Mirnīd ʿUtmān, Castile suffered a crushing defeat and both Infantes perished (26 June 1319). Now leaderless, Castile agreed to an eight-year peace, signed 18 June 1323.

With Nasr no longer any possible threat (he died in 722/1322) and the Castilian fleet in disarray and dissenion, Ismaʿīl set about consolidating his position on the frontiers. In 724/1324 he recovered Baza, and, in 725/1325, Orce, Hueclas, Galera and Martos, but then on 27 Radjab 725/6 July 1325, following a quarrel with his cousin, Muḥammad b. Ismaʿīl, governor of Algeciras, he was assassinated.

In Muḥammad IV, the eldest of Ismaʿīl’s four sons, acceded as a minor under the tutelage of his father’s powerful vizier, Ibn al-Mahruq, who was soon in bitter conflict with ʿUthmān b. Abī ʿUllā. Their divisive rivalry ended only with the vizier’s assassination on the king’s orders in Ramadan 729/June 1330.

In 1327 Alfonso XI, now of age, had begun an offensive so encouraging for Castile that Muhammad IV had applied, successfully, for Marīnīd reinforcements. Now fearful of a growth of Maghribī forces in Spain, Castile and Aragon had together with Navarre, Bohemia, England and France planned a huge crusade against Granada. Blighted by Christian disunity, the crusading force had, in spring 1329, left Castile and Aragon to start their own campaigns and to no stomach for the fight, Aragon contributed little to it and indeed had to go on the defensive. Fighting alone, Castile won several northern strongholds as well as Tēba, west of Antequera (August 1330). Yet again Marīnīd aid was sought and gained. Gibraltar was then recovered from Castile. Thereupon Alfonso XI immediately signed a truce (August 1333), as Aragon had done a month before. On his way home from Gibraltar Marīnīd was assassinated on 25 August 1333 by Abū Thābit and Ibrāhīm, sons of ʿUthmān b. Abī ʿUllā, either because of too friendly a relationship with the Marīnīd sultan in Fez or too cordial a trucial meeting with Alfonso.

7. Yusuf I, the younger of two brothers of Muhammad IV, was proclaimed king by the loyalist Kīdwayn, a future Nasrid minister of consequence. His first official act was to expel, along with all other Banū Abī ʿUllā, Abū Thābit, who, on ʿUthmān’s death, had succeeded him as commander of the Maghribī volunteers (shaykh al-ghāṣīd), and to replace him with a senior Marīnīd, Yahyā b. ʿUmar b. Rāḥūb. Early in Yusuf’s reign truces made with Castile gave way to a tripartite peace treaty between Castile, Granada and Fez (1334), and in 1336 Pedro IV of Aragon agreed to extend the term of Alfonso IV’s peace with Granada. Neither Alfonso XI of Castile, anxious eventually to close Andalusia’s doors on the Marīnīds, nor Abū ʿI-Ḥasan of Fez, eager to keep them open for Marīnīd expansion, had long-term peaceful intentions. Each was developing his fleet, the one with Catalan aid, the other with help from the Hafsīds of Riddān. Finally, in April 1340 the Muslim fleet in the bay of Algeciras. Heady with success, Abū ʿI-Ḥasan, accompanied by all his entourage, led a massive army into a siege of Tarifa. The subsequent battle of the Salado (7 Dhuʾ al-Muḥarram 1 741/30 October 1340) was a Muslim disaster. Alfonso, supported by his brother-in-law, Alfonso IV, the king of Portugal, and using the heavily armoured cavalry charge that Muslim light horse would, in more open terrain, have easily outmanoeuvred, smashed through to victory. Fearing repercussions at home, Abū ʿI-Ḥasan beat a hasty retreat to Morocco via Algeciras, and Yusuf fled to Granada. Whereas the Salado rout curbed Marīnīd enthusiasm for expansion into Spain, it spurred Alfonso into frontier action which gained for him Alcālā de Benzaide (now Alcālā la Real), Priego and Benaméjí. Then, in August 1342 his siege of Algeciras, his major goal, began. Forces from all over Europe, even England, rallied behind him in what was one of the very earliest major operations (predating Crécy, 1346) in which effective use was made of cannon—not by the Castilians, as often thought, but by the Muslims. As the siege dragged on Alfonso faced problems, notably from the withdrawal of foreign contingents and the attitudes of the Genoese on whose ships he depended. But sheer determination sustained him until he could win peace on his own.
terms. When at last Granadan troops, plunging into action from nearby Gibraltar, failed to raise the siege, Yusuf exchanged Algeciras for a 10-year truce (12 Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da 744/27 March 1344), favourable terms for the evacuation of its Marinid garrison, and inhabitants, and tribute to Castile. In 1349 Alfonso broke the truce with an attempt to take Gibraltar, but, like many of his troops, he died of the Black Death (March 1350). His son, Pedro I, gladly reached an accord with Yusuf, whose subsequent good relations with Castile and a readiness to harbour Marinid rebel prisoners gradually soured Granada’s friendship with Fez. But Yusuf’s days were numbered: on 1 Shawwal 755/19 October 1354 a lunatic stabbed him to death in the Great Mosque in Granada. An able ruler and diplomat, trusted by his subjects, Yusuf had achieved far more than his setbacks would suggest. Through his refusal to put his kingdom’s heartlands at risk he had preserved them intact, and under his wing Granada had moved well along the road leading to literary and architectural brilliance.

8. (1). Muhammad V, Yusuf’s eldest son, began his rule at sixteen under the benign tutelage of his father’s wise and able hadjib [q.v.]. Ridwan, in whose service was the gifted young Ibn al-Khatib [q.v.], Granada’s main objective was a general peace, and Muhammad, agreeing to pay tribute to Pedro I, soon established good relations with Castile. With Aragon Granada’s main objective was a general peace, and Muhammad V fled Granada in panic and in Dhumadā 756/March 1362 foolishly threw himself on the mercy of Pedro I of Castile, who had him done to death at Tablada, not far from Seville, on 2 Radjab 763/25 April 1362.

8. (2). Muhammad V began his second reign on 20 Dhumadā II 763/16 March 1362. He was to rule uninterruptedly for almost thirty years, during which time deft avoidance of war, wherever possible and expedient, gave Granada the longest stretch of peace in its history. Initial prospects for peace were not bright. In Castile Pedro I was at war with rebels led by his half-brother, Enrique of Trastamara, supported by Pedro IV of Aragon. Loyal to Castile, Muhammad V sent in cavalry which duly participated in the conquest of Teruel (1363). But success was short-lived, and Pedro had his way on the Aragon frontier, and thus on in Seville (1364). Then, with mercenary companies recruited in France and led by Bertrand du Guesclin, Enrique penetrated Spain via Catalonia and was proclaimed Enrique II of Castile on 16 March 1366. For Pedro I Granadan support proved no asset: branded a “Moor-lover” and no longer welcome even in Seville, he fled his country. As for Muhammad, fear of an imminent attack on Almeria and possible invasion of his shores by Christian navies drove him to seek help from North Africa. Despite a positive response from Fez and Temcen—the latter with a large input of money, troops and supplies—Christian success on land and sea and Muslim unrest in Almeria made it increasingly clear that peace would be in Granada’s best interests. Accordingly Muhammad V obtained a truce from Enrique, an agreement which gained for Granada a lengthy peace at its Shawkāl 765/19 October 1365; he then went on to conclude a peace treaty with Aragon (Radjab 768/March 1367). Later in 1367 Pedro I returned to Castile, aided by England’s Black Prince, and Muhammad, having reversed his allegiance, joined forces with Castile, sacking Jaen, taking Priego and pillaging Ubeda and Baeza. But, failing to take Cordova in the spring of 1368, he returned to Granada. By the end of March 1369 Pedro I was dead. Enrique II, his conqueror and assassin, was back, but too preoccupied internally to prevent Muhammad from taking, first, such strategic frontier positions as Cambil, Haver and Rute, and then the prized Algeciras (Dhu ‘l-Hijja 770/July 1369). With no military response from Enrique, Muhammad, already party, along with Aragon and the Marinid Maghrib, to a tripartite truce, decided to make peace with him. On 31 May 1370 an eight-year truce was agreed and, in 1375, renewed. From 1370 onwards the diplomatically astute Muhammad negotiated a series of treaties and agreements of various kinds which gained for Granada a lengthy peace with its Christian neighbours that was only seriously threatened on the death of Enrique II (1379) when hostilities broke out between Granada and Castile. These were short-lived in Enrique’s son and successor, Juan I of Castile, at war with England and Portugal, opted for peace with a truce that he renewed in 1390. Among the various facets of Muhammad V’s
policy for Granada two are especially noteworthy: first, his dismantling of Algeciras's massive defences; second, his introduction, in 1372, of direct Nasrid command of the Maghrib, until then always commanded by a royal Marinid. This goal was aimed at assertion of his independence of Fez—over which in fact he was soon to gain something of a political upper hand—but the first may also be seen as a move, in Granada’s best interests, to make the Straits a less attractive international battleground (see Harvey, 216-17). It remained only to recover Gibraltar from the Martindids, and this goal was achieved in 1374. Among those necessarily prominent on the Nasrid-Marind stage was the renowned Ibn al-Khatib [q.v.], Muhammad’s chief minister, who, being pro-Marind, gradually came to fear for his safety and fled his country in 77/1371-2, eventually finding asylum in Fas. There, through the machinations of his successor and former protégé, Ibn Zamrak [q.v.], he was tried for heresy by a Granadan tribunal and later murdered in prison (776/1375).

When Muhammad V died on 10 Safar 793/16 January 1391, he was at the height of his power. For Granada he had achieved relative stability, which had enabled it to prosper. Under him art and literature flourished, and it is to him that we owe much of what we admire in the Alhambra today. His Nasr’s V’s eldest son, was at first dominated by his father’s freedman-minister Khalid, who had the ruler’s brothers Sa’d, Muhammad and Nasr imprisoned and executed. Ibn Zamrak was imprisoned in Almeria. On being told that Khalid was to imprison him Yusuf had him slaughtered in his presence. Externally the Christian kingdoms were no threat, but Yusuf, who died on 16 Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da 794/3 October 1392, had opened the door to internal instability.

12. Muhammad VII, Yusuf II’s younger son, owed his throne to a palace plot to which he was a party, the elder son, Yusuf, being consigned to prison in Salobreña. Ibn Zamrak, whom Yusuf II had restored to office, was soon dismissed and, in the summer of 1393, dispatched. For events in the reign of Muhammad VII and his successors, Muslim testimony, without the detailed and often controlling witness of Ibn al-Khatib and Ibn Khalidun [q.v.], is relatively sparse, and the best has to be made of the evidence of sources that are largely Christian, shedding little or no light on Muslim motives for Granadan actions.

The need to avoid war, felt by Muhammad V, was certainly not felt by his grandson. Thinking to profit from strife at the court of Enrique III of Castile (1390-1406), he began his reign with a not wholly successful raid on Caravaca in the region of Lorca (1392), thereby opening an era of frontier warfare. Though mainly aimed at seizing cattle and harvests, raids from both sides, inspiring with their heroics the famous courtly Castilian border ballads (romances fronterizas), became the order of the day. In April 1394 a populist crusade against Granada, led by one Martin Yañez de la Barbuda, ended in disaster with consequences that could have been grave had Enrique not had other problems and Muhammad not agreed to keep the peace. But Muhammad’s word could not be his bond; many of his frontiersmen acted on impulse, and the raids went on. By 1404 a stronger Enrique was eager to move against Granada in concert with Aragon, which did not however, share his enthusiasm. In 1405 Muhammad made the first move, which, though a débâcle on the eastern front, won him, much to Castle’s dismay, Ayamonte, near Ronda in the west. Only after long negotiations, which Castile saw as a device to enable Granada to prepare for further action, was a truce agreed. The action, when it came, was aimed at Quesada and Jaén. The Castilian massacre that followed at the battle of Collejares (October 1406) stung Enrique into adopting a policy designed to gain popular support and sound financial backing for a campaign against Granada. That policy did not end, as it might once have done, with his death in December 1406: it was taken up by his brother Fernando and his widow Katherine of Lancaster, to whom Enrique left the vast fortune he had amassed. Money voted by the Cortes, the regents moved swiftly into action late in 1407. There was to be no quick and easy victory for either side, and a truce negotiated in April 1408 afforded both sides a welcome respite. In May Muhammad died. Already a deterioration in Granada’s position vis-à-vis Castile was becoming predictable. As Granada’s military capacity, no longer underpinned by an organised Maghribi component, faced decline, that of Castile gained ground with a growth of manpower after recovery from the ravages of the Black Death. Combined with increasing strength and advancing superiority in the use and deployment of artillery, the example of Fernando’s pertinacity and disinclination for compromise augured ill for Granada’s future.

13. Yusuf II’s younger brother’s prisoner in Salobreña, sought and won from Castile a truce, which, when extended, ran till 1 April 1410. Only four days later Zahara, a stronghold won by Fernando in 1407, was attacked by Granada and sacked. Bent on revenge, Fernando decided to drive into the Muslim heartland to try for himself not a mere fortress but Antequera, a populous town set in a highly fertile agricultural region. The town could, under heavy siege, and Muslim efforts to negotiate a peace came to nothing. In arguments over vassalage and tribute, which Granada had not paid since the 1370s, neither side would yield. Thus a bitter struggle between besiegers and besieged went on, ending only when a means of access had been gained in a surprise attack by a Castilian assault force on 16 September 1410. Female degringed to a peace, and on 10 November a truce was finally signed. Fernando’s victory, which earned him the honorific d de Antequera (‘he of Antequera’), came as a severe blow to Granada. Others may well have had in due course had not Fernando, on becoming king of Aragon in 1412, had new preoccupations. For the Nasrids the truce of 1410 opened a relatively long period of comparative peace between Granada and her neighbours that was to last till 1428. Yusuf died on 9 November 1417, the year after the death of his old enemy, Fernando, and the year before that of the regent Katherine of Lancaster, to whom Granada had been making gifts in place of tribute.

C. The Nasrid kingdom from 810/1417 to its fall in 897/1492. The history of this period is such a tangle that only skeletal treatment of it can be attempted here. Fortunately, not too much need be told of the sad story of Granada as a house divided against itself since a fair picture of its internal history, which from 1419 is clearly inseparable from that of the politically powerful and ruthlessly ambitious Banu ‘l-Sarrāj (best known to Europe as the ‘Abencerages’, ‘Abencérages’, etc.) may be gained from the article Ibn al-Sarrāj [q.v. in Supplement]. In 1419 Muhammad, Castile’s 1417-8, the Nasrid’s eight-year old son and successor, was ousted by the Sarrāj candidate, Muhammad IX, who in 1427 had fled the country through Granadan fury at his failure to secure the Encyclopaedia of Islam, VII
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extension of a truce with Castile. With the aid of the anti-Sarradj leader, Ridwan Bannigash (Banegas/Venegas), Muhammad VIII returned, but late in 1429 dissatisfaction with his handling of Castile led to Muhammad IX's return. The second of the latter's four reigns was short: in 1431, after a show of force at the so-called battle of La Higuereula, Castile imposed on Granada, at Ridwan's suggestion, Yusuf IV, a short-lived puppet with no real support. In 1432 Muhammad IX returned for his third and longest reign, which was interrupted by the confused reigns of Muhammad XIII (1445 and 1446-7) and Yusuf V (1445-6). His fourth and last reign he chose, in an attempt to end internal strife, to share with Muhammad XI (1451-3), son of Muhammad VIII, whom he had had executed in 1431. Granada's loss from the Nasrids' feuds was a source of gain for Castile which it readily exploited if able to do so and if free from internal divisions or clashes with Aragon. Juan II of Castile (d. 1454) was not, nor could have been, a Fernando 'of Antequera', but he was a big thorn in Granada's side, bent on trying, by whatever means, to keep the Nasrids divided; to avoid long truces if possible; to subject Granada to fealty and tribute and so deny it its cherished hope of peace with independence; to use whatever military capacity it had to erode the frontier of the kingdom through operations aimed at reducing to wasteland the carefully cultivated, but highly vulnerable, countryside that richly sustained them. During the 1430s Granada did win some victories, but the very size and increasing strength of Castile was beginning to tell and might well have prevailed but for an internal crisis in 1439 which gained for Granada a three-year truce. A divided Castile emboldened the Nasrids, and the 1440s were militarily successful years for them. In 1447 they recovered most of what they had lost to Fernando 'of Antequera' in the east. In 1449 they even devastated Cieza, north-west of Murcia, while in the west their raiders almost got as far as Seville. That same year Juan II, finding Navarre allied with Granada, sought a truce, which Muhammad IX granted. A divided Castile emboldened Yusuf V, then ensconced in Malaga. By 1451 Granada was planning a full-scale invasion of the kingdom of Murcia. In 1450 it had actively aligned itself with the Murcian rebel Alonso Fajardo, who was later, as the danger of invasion loomed, to sink his differences with his many Christian enemies. All closed ranks and in 1452 inflicted a heavy defeat on advancing Granadans at the battle of Alparcones, not far from Lorca. On the death of Muhammad IX, Castile was too preoccupied with internal crises to secure the succession of its preferred candidate, Yusuf V, and Muhammad XI might have succeeded him without more ado but for the Banu 'l-Sarradj and Juan II's successor, Enrique IV, who together backed Yusuf III's middle-aged nephew Sa'd (1455-64). From Archidona Sa'd ruled an area westward towards Ronda, while from the Alhambra Muhammad XI ruled Granada, Malaga and Almeria until too costly a truce with Castile lost him Granada and his throne to Sa'd in 1453. During that year Yusuf V, who, in August a weak and betrayed Gibraltar had surrendered to the feuding Castilian leaders of the Medina Sidonia (Guzmán) and the Cadiz (Ponce de León) factions; in September Archidona had fallen; by November Yusuf V had occupied Malaga and Sa'd's lands to the west and then Granada itself. Sa'd's subsequent recovery of his capital and the death of Yusuf V in 1453 availed him little; in August 1464 his son Abu 'l-Hasan 'Ali in concert with the Banu 'l-Sarradj, overthrew him and had him imprisoned. Abu 'l-Hasan began his reign by strengthening Granada's economy and military capacity, and in 1470 he was well able to suppress a rising by his brother, Muhammad, in Malaga and to extirpate its prime movers, the Banu 'l-Sarradj, some of whom escaped death only by fleeing to Castilian protectors. Yet, nothing that Abu 'l-Hasan did or did not do could do more than defer the fall of the Granadan kingdom, which in fact owed its survival for a little over twenty years longer as much to Castile's own problems during the 1470s as to Granada's tenacity and sporadic heroic stands. For Granada's long-term future the events of 1479 boded ill: on Juan IP's death the crown of Aragon passed to Fernando (V), husband of Isabel of Castile, whose throne, contested since her accession late in 1474, then came to rest on more secure foundations with the Treaty of Alcáçobas (4 September 1479), which ended civil war in Castile, ratified its peace with Portugal and brought about the pacification of the Extremadura. Fernando and Isabel, "the Catholic Monarchs" could now focus all their attention on Granada and the Reconquest. In February 1482 the taking of the supposedly impregnable Alhama, commanding the main route from Granada to Malaga and Ronda, was the first major step on the road to final Christian victory. Abu 'l-Hasan's valiant efforts to recover it between February and July failed, but in mid-July his rout of forces before Lucena dashed any Castilian hopes of an easy passage. At this point, however, he fell prey to a palace plot, hatched by the leader of the Banu 'l-Sarradj faction and the powerful Yusuf Ibn Kumáha (Abencemoxia), to replace him with his son Abu 'Abd Allah (Boabdil, i.e. Muhammad XII). Unable to regain Granada, he left with his brother Muhammad b. Sa'd (M. al-Zaghal) for Malaga, which he made his capital. The kingdom was now divided around Granada and Almeria in the east and Ronda and Malaga in the west. In March 1483 Castilian invaders were soundly beaten in an area east of Malaga. Prompted perhaps by his father's triumph, Boabdil rashly struck at Lucena deep in Castile. In the ensuing retreat he lost first-class officers, and he himself was captured. He thus enabled Abu 'l-Hasan to return to Granada. There, for some, the latter ruled as lawful king, for others not, and, when physically incapacitated by a stroke early in 1485, he was replaced by Muhammad al-Zaghal and taken to Almúnicar, where he died. Al-Zaghal could be described as Muhammad XIII, for he had made himself king in succession to his brother (Nahda (see Bibli.), 13: situad 'ala 'l-umāl b'dhada', and in October 1483 most of the Granadan fāta had, by ūjār, denied Boabdil's right to the throne. Moreover, in 1486 Boabdil himself did acknowledge him, however insincerely or temporarily, as king. Be that as it may, for their own reasons, Boabdil was the Catholic
## GENEALOGICAL TABLE OF THE NASRIDS
(Dates in parentheses are those of reigns)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Son</th>
<th>Reigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad I</td>
<td>Yusuf</td>
<td>(1237-73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad</td>
<td>Yusuf</td>
<td>(1273-1302)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad</td>
<td>Nasr</td>
<td>(1302-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad III</td>
<td>Yusuf</td>
<td>(1314-25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad IV</td>
<td>Yusuf</td>
<td>(1325-33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad V</td>
<td>Muhammad VI</td>
<td>(1354-9/1362-91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad VII</td>
<td>Yusuf</td>
<td>(1359-60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad VIII</td>
<td>Yusuf</td>
<td>(1333-54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad IX</td>
<td>Muhammad X</td>
<td>(1354-9/1362-91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad XI</td>
<td>Muhammad XII</td>
<td>(1392-1408)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad XIII</td>
<td>(1408-17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Son</th>
<th>Reigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad</td>
<td>Sa'id</td>
<td>(1454/5-62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad VIII</td>
<td>Yusuf</td>
<td>(1417-19/427-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad IX</td>
<td>Muhammad X</td>
<td>(1419-27/450-452/27-452)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad XI</td>
<td>Muhammad XII</td>
<td>(1445-67/1445/467-453/4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### After R. Arié, L’Espagne musulmane au temps des Nasrides

Monarchs’ king, and he it was who formally surrendered Granada to them on 2 January 1492. By that time the kingdom of Granada had become but a shadow of its former self. One town after another, large and small had fallen, sometimes not so easily, into Christian hands, e.g. Cofín, Carthusa, Ronda, Marbella (1485): Loja, Salar, Ilora, Moclín, Colomera, Montefrío (1486); Vélez-Málaga, Málaga—hard won (1487); Vera (1488); Baza, Purchena, Almería, Almufecar, Salobreña, Guadix (1489). After surrendering Almería and Guadix in return for a tiny semi-autonomous principality in the Alpujarras, al-Zaghal had sold all his lands in 1490 and sailed for Orán in the Maghrib. Under the Capitulations of Granada, Boabdil had rights as a Mudejar [q.v.], and, having left his old capital for his country estates, stayed on a while before leaving for the Maghrib. In the last decade of Nasrid rule is so involved and in some respects enigmatic that it is not covered here in any detail. The main causes of its extinction, however, may be adumbrated. To begin with, the Catholic Monarchs’ ability to tackle the problem of internal dissension and to find judicious ways of uniting most of their subjects in pursuit of a common cause was not matched by the Nasrids, who failed abjectly to resolve family quarrels and to shed factional strife. Even outside palace circles, a wholly united front could not be guaranteed since the interests of, for instance, merchants, traders, cultivators and the influential fukahid did not always coincide. But most damaging of all was the split between Boabdil and al-Zaghal, which in 1486 made Granada itself the scene of bloody, bitter fighting. Of the two, Boabdil was the more valuable to Castile, for, though a vacillator, he was a more ready collaborator. Al-Zaghal was by far the better soldier, the more successful leader and the staunch defender of Islam’s interests until—perhaps despairing of Boabdil—he gave up and left the latter to his own devices. Politically and otherwise, Castile exploited all perceptible divisions within the Nasrid camp. Militarily, it moved gradually into a position of superiority through its ability to keep an army in the field and to deploy its artillery with increasing efficiency. It also ensured, as far as possible, that its forces continued the war of
attrition aimed at undermining the economy and morale of the enemy by systematic devastation of extra murus cultivated land. Heroism, of which the last years of Nasrid rule witnessed some striking examples was no substitute for military reinforcements of the kind that the Maghrib had so effectively supplied in time past, but could no longer supply because of its own decadence and weakness. When, in response an appeal for aid in 1487, Mamlük Egypt—no naval match for Christian Spain—had nothing more to offer than diplomatic intervention and goodwill, it was only a matter of time before the Nasrid kingdom fell.

Bibliography: The indispensable standard work, covering not only political history, but also institutions and social, economic, cultural and other aspects of life under the Nasrids is R. Arié, L'Espagne musulmane au temps des Nasrides (1232-1492). Reimpression suivie d'une postface et d'une mise à jour par l'auteur, Paris 1990, which adds 49 pp. to the 1973 impression (see my review, JSS, xx (1975), 278-81), containing a complementary bibliography, addenda and errata; L.P. Harvey, Islamic Spain 1250-1500, Chicago and London, 1990, dealing with Mudéjar [q.e.] as well as Nasrid history, offers some new insights into the latter (though in the matter of dates it should be used with caution). Between them the very full bibliographies of Arié and Harvey have made comprehensive coverage of the Nasrid period ones show Almohad features: concrete and pointed arcades on brick pillars, and pointed brick walls, arcades on brick pillars, and pointed brick walls, arcades on brick pillars, and pointed ...
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remains in the Alhambra and Granada, such as Muhammad Ill's Partal palace, Yusuf I's kalahurra djadida (Cautiva) in a matter of time before the Nasrid kingdom fell. Of kalahurras (so-called by Ibn Baṭṭūṭa and in the poetry of Ibn al-Djayyāb and Ibn Zamrak), the largest in al-Andalus was built at Gibraltar (between 1333 and 1349) by the Marinid sultan Abu 'l-Ḥasan, according to Ibn Baṭṭūṭa. This impression Yusuf I, who erected his own al-kalahurra al-djaddada in the Alhambra. Kasabas might have an inner precinct enveloped by an outer one (Malaga) or connected to an outer one by towers (Granada), or a main precinct reached by crossing others that do not envelop it (Almeria; Gibraltar). The Malaga one adapted the 11th century fortress and has a complex entrance between walls, towers and gates, leading into the inner precinct. Within the kasabas of Malaga and Almeria were military quarters with bammāms, wells and prisons/silos; important kasabas had palaces for the sovereigns (Alhambra, Malaga, Cauda). Towerhouses (jilī'a) on hills and vantage points reported the movements of enemy troops by land or sea.

Religious architecture. Remains of this are few. First period ones show Almohad features: concrete and brick walls, arcades on brick pillars, and pointed horseshoe arches. Of the Alhambra mosques of Muhammad III and Ismā'īl I, only the ground plans remain. The three Alhambra oratories of the second and third periods have rectangular ground plans. Yusuf I inaugurated the madrasa of Granada, whose portico entrance was similar to the funduk al-djadi and (see below), with a courtyard of Marinid type and a highly-restored oratory having a square plan ascending to an octagonal lantern. The only surviving mosque pabila (the hermitage of St. Sebastian) by the river Genil, the Kasba, a square plan, a vault of complex arches leaving the centre free and a covering roof.

Civic architecture. Muhammad II built the arsenal of Malaga, which Muhammad V enlarged. The only remaining Nasrid funduk, al-Djadi, is Yusuf I's Corral del Carbón, with a square plan, central courtyard and three storeys with galleries on pillars leading to the guest rooms; its projecting iwan entrance shows clear oriental Islamic influence. The Granada mārsītān or hospital was built by Muhammad V in 1365-7 after successful military campaigns and partially survives on its southern and eastern sides; it was structurally similar to the funduk and had a central pool with two large seated lions as water-spouts (now re-sited in the Alhambra). Nasrid houses varied with social class. The excavated military and artisan quarters of the Alhambra and the Malaga kasaba show small, irregular houses with bent entrances, neighbouring latrines and stables, and a courtyard giving on to the rooms. More luxurious houses had two stores, as in the Casa de los Girones (Granada), with its richly painted stucco decoration. The numerous Nasrid hammāms have lost their access and bāṣi al-maṣlakā and it is mainly the steam rooms and furnaces which survive (Granada; Baza; Ronda; Gibraltar; Alhama).

Palace architecture. This mainly survives in the Alhambra and Granada, such as Muhammad III's Partal palace, Yusuf I's kalahurra djaddada (Cautiva) in...
The Alhambra and his reconstruction of the Comares palace in 1530, completed by Muhammad V; the latter ruler’s Riyâd or Lions palace; etc. On these, see GardaS Monuments. B.

Decoration and aesthetics. The divân al-înhâb or chambers also directed architecture and decoration, and four of its poet-viziers who have left beautiful epigraphed poems and Kurânic texts on the palace walls are known to us: Ibn al-Djayyâb, Ibn al-Khatîb [q.v.], Ibns Zamrâk [q.v.] and Ibn Fûrnâk (whose epigraphed texts are lost). Nasrîs Kûfî writing evolved its own geometric compositions, often combined with floral-geometric designs. Coloured ceramic tiling was used for large geometric compositions, and colouring was an essential element in Nasrid decoration and architecture, often employing red, blue and green with a white, silver or gold foreground.


NASRIDS — NASSADS

Other meanings of the term are supplied by Lane, Dozy and the Arabic dictionaries.


AL-NASSÂDÎ (A.) “weaver, textile worker”, synonymous with bāḫûz, and including sedentary weavers of the towns and villages and also those of the pastoralists and Bedouins. These were usually freemen, but sometimes slaves. Nâsâsâd was a less derogatory term than nassî but on the whole the status of the weaver was low in Islamic society, an attitude crystallised in a saying attributed to ‘Alî b. Abi Tîtîb, “Walking with a weaver (nassâd) on the road increases a man’s livelihood; talking to him is inauspicious, and visiting his workshop stupefies a person” (al-Râqîbî al-îsfahânî, Muḥâdîr âl-uladâb, Beirut 1961, ii, 459-60). This low status was associated with a relatively meagre income and was affirmed by kafî’a “equivalence in status” [q.v.], denying the weaver the right to marry outside his own social level. Hence social mobility was low within this trade, a fact observable till the mid-20th century in a traditionally-organised centre of production like Fâs in Morocco (see H. M. Miner. Traditional mobility among the weavers of Fâs, in: Trans. of the Amer. Philological Soc., lxix [1938], 103-20).

We find al-Nâsâsî often used as a nisba [q.v.]. Al-îsamâ’î (Anâb, facs. fol. 559a-b, ed. Haydarâbâd, xiii, 8-14) cites several traditionists and Sûfis with this affiliation, including Abû Hamza Mûjdâmâ’ al-îaymî of Kûfû, Abû Muhammad of Bâṣra, a maâlûl of Bilâl b. Abû Burda b. Abû Mûsâ al-îshâ’î (d. ca. 120/738), Abû ‘îsâa Khârîy b. Abî Abd Allâh, known as Khâ必需 (d. 722/1324), and Abû Sa’îd al-Hâlka in Baghdad, etc. It is, indeed, not improbable that there was a connection between their status as craftsmen and Sûfis.

The weaver’s product was usually exempt from taxations (fârsâh, mukûs). When the Bûyûdîs of Bâdîgûd imposed taxes on silken cloth (kâirî [q.v.], tîrim) and on fine cotton cloth of the ‘atâ’dîbî variety, artisan weavers against this measure led to their abolition in 390/999. In the 6th/12th century the Sâldûqûs imposed some mukûs on textiles.


NASSADS, the common European form of the name given to the light wooden warships built in Nassau or Hohenau (Lower Austria), the “Nassauers” or “Hohenauers”, Magyar nassâdî, pl. nassâdok, Slav. nasaô, which were used on the Danube.

They were usually manned by Serbian seamen who were called martolos [q.v.] (from the Magyar martoló, martoló, lit. “rover”). According to a Florentine account, this Danube flotilla in 1475 consisted of 330 ships manned by 10,000 “nassadists” armed with lances, shields, crossbow or bow and arrow, more
rarely with muskets. The larger ships had also cannon. About 1522 the commander of the Danube fleet was Radč Božić, who reorganised it at Peterwardein (cf. Jireček, Geschichte der Serben, i/1, 258). Through want of money, the Serbian seamen then deserted to the Turks (ibid., 262), who after the fall of Belgrade seized the Danube fleet and developed it into a powerful arm. About 1530 the Danube fleet consisted of 800 nassis and was commanded by the voivode Kăsim (cf. J. von Hammer, GOR, iii, 85).


(F. Babinger)

**NASSER** [see *ABB AL-NĀṢIR, in Suppl.]

**NASTA’LIK** [see *KHATT*]

**NASTŪRIYYUN, NASĀTIRA (a.), sing. Nasṭārī, the Nestorian Christians.** The term derives from Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, whose Christological doctrine was condemned by the council of Ephesus in 431. But the reasons for the separation of Nestorian Christianity ("Nestorism") from the Byzantine Church and the West Syrian patriarchate of Antioch were political (the conflict between the Roman and the Persian empires) rather than doctrinal. The term "Nestorians" is also usually rejected (especially in modern times) by the East Syrians themselves. In this article the traditional designation will be used for the sake of convenience.

Already a council in Seleucia-Ctesiphon [see *AL-MADĀʾI*] in 410 defined the organisation of the independent East Syrian Church in six metropolitan provinces, under the supremacy of the catholichs residing in the capital of the Sāsānīd empire: 1. Babylon = Bēth Armāyā (centre: Seleucia-Ctesiphon, with the bishop of Kaṅkar as acting catholoch in times of vacancy); 2. Susiana = Bēth Ḥūzayā (centre: Bēth Laphāt = Gondeshapur [g. q.]); 3. Northern Mesopotamia = Bēth Arbāhāyā (centre: Niṣibis); 4. Mesene = Mayšāyān (centre: Perīk d. Mayšāyān = Bassa [g. q.]); 5. Adiabene = Hedhayāyāb (centre: Arbil); 6. Garmaea = Bēth Garmay (centre: Karka d. Bēth Selōkh = Kīrkūk [g. q.]). The number of metropolitan provinces was subsequently increased: 7. Persis (5th cent.) and 8. Marw (6th cent.).

From Marw, Nestorian missionary monks followed the trade routes to Central Asia and China, where additional ecclesiastical centres were established. Evidence of one of the most remarkable missionary enterprises in history is found on a marble pillar erected in Shianfu in the Chinese province of Shensi (781). The bilingual Chinese-Syriac inscription relates the arrival of the first Syriac missionary Alupen in 635. Three years later the Chinese emperor—according to the stele—invited his subjects to embrace the new religion and ensured the free propagation of Christianity in his empire. The heyday of Nestorianism in China lasted two centuries. By about 1200 Chinese Nestorianism seems to have vanished. From an early date there were also East Syrian communities in India (especially on the Malabar Coast, which was connected with Western Asia by maritime trade routes.

Along the trade routes to India Nestorian traders and missionaries had also settled among the Arabs in the Persian Gulf (e.g. Katar and al-Bahrayn), and in South Arabia (e.g. Nadjran, Sanʿa2 and Mārib). Though the early history of South Arabian Nestorianism is due to political reasons—was primarily influenced by Byzantine missionary activity and competing Monophysitism, the Persian conquest in 597 brought about a Nestorian dominance. North of the Arabian Peninsula, the Arab population in the buffer state of the Lakhmīd [g. q.] kingdom—with al-Hira [g. q.] as its capital—had belonged to the East Syrian (Nestorian) Church for centuries. But it was only their last king, al-Nuṣayr (580-602 [g. q.]), who was officially baptised into the Nestorian Church.

Comparatively tolerated by the Sāsānīd emperors, the Christians were from time to time subjected to severe persecutions, e.g. under Shāpūr II (309-79), Yazdagird I (399-420) and Bahram V (420-38). The vacancy in the office of the catholichs 608-28 was the consequence of a persecution initiated by Khūsraw II (591-628). Initially, therefore, the Nestorians in Mesopotamia seem to have welcomed the Arab conquerors as liberators from Sāsānīd persecutions. In addition, the new Islamic religion was in principle tolerant towards Christians (including Nestorians) as members of the People of the Book (ahl al-kitāb [g. q.]). Muhammad himself is supposed to have signed a treaty with Sayyid, king of Nadjran, and Abu l-Hārith, king of Barī, in 629, which guaranteed the Christians a protected status [see *ahl al-dhimma*] in return for the payment of the ḏiyya [g. q.], from which priests and monks were to be exempted. It is the first of a series of similar treaties regulating the relations between Christians and their Muslim rulers. The most famous of these covenants is attributed to the second caliph ʿUmar ("the covenant of ʿUmar ([q. v.]).)

Though the early history of Nestorianism in India is distinguished by a number of rare and occasional evidences (unhistorical documents of more recent date, legitimising certain rights or restrictions. It is clear, though, that the Prophet himself had a positive attitude towards Nestorians. In his religious views he was strongly influenced by the Nestorian missionaries who met in Yemen and on the trade route between Yemen and Irāk (cf. T. Andrae). One of these Nestorians was Kuss b. Sāʿīda [g. q.] of Nadjran whom Muhammad is supposed to have heard preaching in Ukāz.

Though the relationship between the Arab-Muslim invaders of Irāk and the Nestorian inhabitants was mutually positive at first, conversions to Islam (already the catholichs Ḵūbayb III [649-59] found it difficult to prevent the Arab tribes of the Persian Gulf (from adopting Islam) and political pressure on the Nestorians weakened the Nestorian Church and caused internal dissension. While the Umayyads in Syria encouraged the appointment of Christian (usually Melkite) officials and therefore treated the Christians well, provocations caused trouble in Mesopotamia. The ambitious governor al-Ḥaddāb b. Ṭūs [g. q.], who during the internal affairs of the Nestorian Church and encouraged rivalry within the hierarchy. Such rivalry continued even later on during the ʿAbbāsid period, and occasionally gave rise to double appointments of bishops by rival catholicos. No doubt dissension within the Church was a contributory cause of the increasing number of conversions to Islam. Another cause was the persecutions which broke out from time to time. Especially under the ʿAbbāsid caliphs Ḥārūn al-Raʾṣād (g. q.) (170-93/786-809) and al-Mutawakkil (g. q.) (232-47/847-61) were the restrictions imposed on the Christians, according to the covenant of ʿUmar, rigidly applied.

In between periods of persecution, and especially
after the establishment of the 'Abbāsids caliphate in 132/750, relations between the catholicate and the caliph's court were close. Before the end of the 8th century the catholicos had moved their centre from Seleucia-Ctesiphon to Baghdad. Many Church leaders, such as the catholicos Timothy I (780-823), were highly thought of in the caliphal court. As a result, the Nestorian catholicos became the official representative of all the Christians within the 'Abbāsids caliphate. During the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries Nestorian government officials played an important part in the 'Abbāsids administration. The employment of Christian secretaries [see KATIB], especially in Syria, had been widespread during the first Islamic century, the conquerors having initially left the pre-Islamic systems of administration intact. But even after the Arabisation of these earlier administrative systems Christian clerks were widely employed not only in Syria and Egypt but also in 'Iraq—at least after the 'Abbāsid revolution. In 'Iraq there were Nestorian monasteries [see DAYR] which provided the 'Abbāsids empire with competent officials. Some of these officials attained high positions and could even be appointed viziers, in which case they normally had to convert to Islam. The most famous of these 'Iraqi monasteries was Dayr Kunnā [q.v.] with the school of Mar Mārī. Here, such success- ful viziers as Abu Bishr Matta b. Yunus (d. 940) [see [q.v.]] of the Banu 'l-Djarrāh family began their careers. Here, too, future Nestorian catholicos like Israel (960-2) and Ishū'yāh b. Hizkiyāl (1020-5) were teachers. As a member of the teaching staff at Dayr Kunnā the famous Nestorian logician Abū Bīgh Matta b. Yūnus (d. 940), one of Yahyā b. 'Adī's (d. 974) teachers, may be mentioned too.

And so, finally, let us try to elucidate the reasons why relations between the Nestorian Church and the Muslim rulers were often so good may be the outstanding rôle which the Nestorians played in the field of medicine, science and philosophy. There were famous Nestorian schools of learning in Edessa, Nisibis and Seleucia-Ctesiphon. Many Greek philosophical and medical works by Aristotle [see ARISTELUS], and his commentators, and by Ptolemy [see BATLAMIUS], Hippocrates [see BUKRAT], Galen [see GALEN], etc., were soon translated into Syriac. Further to the east, Gondeshapur was famous especially as a medical centre. The Nestorian Bukhštīghū [q.v.] family produced prominent physicians for generations. They provided the leadership at the medical school at Gondeshapur and served as court physicians to the caliph in Baghdad from 148/765. While the early translations from Greek into Syriac and from Syriac into Arabic were of a literal type, the translations produced by the school of Hunayn b. Ishāk (d. 873)—leader of the academy or Bayt al-hikma [q.v.] founded in Baghdad by the caliph al-Ma'mūn—were more polished. Besides, translations into Arabic became more and more common, whether through a Syriac intermediary or directly from Greek. In this academy Hunayn's son Ishāk and nephew Hubayyah were also active. Often enough the translations were provided with commentaries. In a third phase of the translation movement, revisions of older versions were made, textual criticism was applied, and the interest was more purely philosophical than earlier. In this phase Nestorian scholars of the Aristotelian school in Baghdad such as Abū Bīgh Matta b. Yūnus (d. 940) and 'Abd Allāh b. al-Tayyib (d. 1043) took part.

Besides their prominence as translators, philosophers, scientists and practitioners in the fields of medicine, pharmacy, banking, etc., the Nestorians during the 'Abbāsids caliphate produced an enormous religious and ecclesiastical literature—in Syria as well as in Arabic. Though Arabic was adopted fairly early, the Nestorians (and the Jacobites, or West Syrians) never abandoned Syriac as a literary medium. This should be compared to the situation among the Copts in Egypt. Here, Arabic on a wide scale was introduced only in the 4th/10th century, but soon more or less replaced Coptic, which was thereafter restricted to liturgical and philological contexts. Within the enormous corpus of Nestorian literature there were important two traditions: the history of Christian-Muslim dialogue and the situation of the Nestorian Church during the 'Abbāsids caliphate. The catholicos Timothy I (780-823) was not only a collector of canonical materials and a translator of Aristotle but also engaged in a theological dialogue with the caliph al-Mahdi (158-69/775-85) dealing with most of the classic points of discussion: Christology, the Trinity, moral and ritual differences between Christians, Muslims and Jews, the Prophethood of Muhammad, the tahrīf [see AL-INSĪJ] of the Scriptures, the veneration of the Cross, etc. Though originally in Syriac, Timothy's apology is better known in its Arabic versions. Another Nestorian writer from the first 'Abbāsids century, writing in Syria, is Theodore bar Köni. His Scholion or compen- dium of the theology of the Nestorians was also translated into Arabic. Besides, translations into Arabic became more and more common, whether through a Syriac intermediary or directly from Greek. In this academy Hunayn's son Ishāk and nephew Hubayyah were also active. Often enough the translations were provided with commentaries. In a third phase of the translation movement, revisions of older versions were made, textual criticism was applied, and the interest was more purely philosophical than earlier. In this phase Nestorian scholars of the Aristotelian school in Baghdad such as Abū Bīgh Matta b. Yūnus (d. 940) and 'Abd Allāh b. al-Tayyib (d. 1043) took part.

Besides their prominence as translators, philosophers, scientists and practitioners in the fields of medicine, pharmacy, banking, etc., the Nestorians during the 'Abbāsids caliphate produced an enormous religious and ecclesiastical literature—in Syria as well as in Arabic. Though Arabic was adopted fairly early, the Nestorians (and the Jacobites, or West Syrians) never abandoned Syriac as a literary medium. This should be compared to the situation among the Copts in Egypt. Here, Arabic on a wide scale was introduced only in the 4th/10th century, but soon more or less replaced Coptic, which was thereafter restricted to liturgical and philological contexts. Within the enormous corpus of Nestorian literature there were important two traditions: the history of Christian-Muslim dialogue and the situation of the Nestorian Church during the 'Abbāsids caliphate. The catholicos Timothy I (780-823) was not only a collector of canonical materials and a translator of Aristotle but also engaged in a theological dialogue with the caliph al-Mahdi (158-69/775-85) dealing with most of the classic points of discussion: Christology, the Trinity, moral and ritual differences between Christians, Muslims and Jews, the Prophethood of Muhammad, the tahrīf [see AL-INSĪJ] of the Scriptures, the veneration of the Cross, etc. Though originally in Syriac, Timothy's apology is better known in its Arabic versions. Another Nestorian writer from the first 'Abbāsids century, writing in Syria, is Theodore bar Köni. His Scholion or compen- dium of the theology of the Nestorians was also translated into Arabic. Besides, translations into Arabic became more and more common, whether through a Syriac intermediary or directly from Greek. In this academy Hunayn's son Ishāk and nephew Hubayyah were also active. Often enough the translations were provided with commentaries. In a third phase of the translation movement, revisions of older versions were made, textual criticism was applied, and the interest was more purely philosophical than earlier. In this phase Nestorian scholars of the Aristotelian school in Baghdad such as Abū Bīgh Matta b. Yūnus (d. 940) and 'Abd Allāh b. al-Tayyib (d. 1043) took part.
of a later generation having touched up an original story. The historical section in the Kitab al-Maghāl is only a small part of the entire work, which is a compiled encyclopedia—a Nestorian counterpart to al-Mu'tammar b. al-'Assāl's Mağmūl wa-l-dīn (13th cent.) in the Arabic literature of the Copts. A similar, but far less comprehensive, theological compendium was written by ʿAbdīllāh (d. 1318), the last of the great Nestorian writers.

Though the ʿAbbāsids caliphate officially lasted until 656/1258, the effective rulers 334-447/945-1055 were the ʿShīʾi Buyids [see BUWAYHIDS]. This fact hardly aggravated the situation for the Nestorians. As was the case in Fāṭimid Egypt, the ʿShīʾi Buyids were rather more tolerant than the Sunnīs towards the Christians. When the Sunnī Sālṭān Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn al-Ayyubī invaded Persia in 1168, the Nestorians were written by ʿAbdīllāh (d. 1318), the last of the great Nestorian writers.

The historical section in the Kitab al-Maghāl is only a small part of the entire work, which is a compiled encyclopedia—a Nestorian counterpart to al-Mu'tammar b. al-'Assāl's Mağmūl wa-l-dīn (13th cent.) in the Arabic literature of the Copts. A similar, but far less comprehensive, theological compendium was written by ʿAbdīllāh (d. 1318), the last of the great Nestorian writers.

Though the ʿAbbāsids caliphate officially lasted until 656/1258, the effective rulers 334-447/945-1055 were the ʿShīʾi Buyids [see BUWAYHIDS]. This fact hardly aggravated the situation for the Nestorians. As was the case in Fāṭimid Egypt, the ʿShīʾi Buyids were rather more tolerant than the Sunnīs towards the Christians. When the Sunnī Sālṭān Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn al-Ayyubī invaded Persia in 1168, the Nestorians were written by ʿAbdīllāh (d. 1318), the last of the great Nestorian writers.

The historical section in the Kitab al-Maghāl is only a small part of the entire work, which is a compiled encyclopedia—a Nestorian counterpart to al-Mu'tammar b. al-'Assāl's Mağmūl wa-l-dīn (13th cent.) in the Arabic literature of the Copts. A similar, but far less comprehensive, theological compendium was written by ʿAbdīllāh (d. 1318), the last of the great Nestorian writers.

Though the ʿAbbāsids caliphate officially lasted until 656/1258, the effective rulers 334-447/945-1055 were the ʿShīʾi Buyids [see BUWAYHIDS]. This fact hardly aggravated the situation for the Nestorians. As was the case in Fāṭimid Egypt, the ʿShīʾi Buyids were rather more tolerant than the Sunnīs towards the Christians. When the Sunnī Sālṭān Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn al-Ayyubī invaded Persia in 1168, the Nestorians were written by ʿAbdīllāh (d. 1318), the last of the great Nestorian writers.
NASTURIYYUN — NASUH PASHA


NASUH PASHA (d. 1023/1614), an Ottoman grand vizier, was of Christian descent and was born either in Gümüldüğine [q. v. in Suppl.] (the modern Komotini, Thrace, Greece) or in Drama. According to some sources (e.g. Baudier and Grimestone, in Knolles, History of the Turks), he was the son of a Greek priest; according to others (e.g. Našima, Ta'si'ah, 283, armour d'guns, of Albanian origin).

He came early in life to Istanbul, spent two years in the old Seray as a teherdar (halbardier) and left it as a Nofaugh. Through the favour of the sultan's confidant Mehmed Agça, he rapidly attained high office. In quick succession, he became voivode of Zile (Anatolia), master of the horse and governor of Fulek (Hungary). He married the daughter of the Kurdish Mir Seref and thereby obtained riches as great as his power, which every one was now beginning to fear. His ambition and arrogance, his venality and cruelty, knew no bounds and he was even said to be aiming at the throne. In 1015/1606, he was to conduct the campaign against Persia, as the son-in-law of Mir Seref and on account of his local knowledge, with the rank of third vizier and septenarius, but his attention was claimed by the trouble in Anatolia which was affecting the whole of Asia Minor; through Turkish treachery he lost a battle, and it was only in the autumn of 1017/1608 that his troops joined the army of the grand vizier, who received him very coolly (cf. J. von Hammer, GOR, iv, 412-13). In 1011/1602 Nâşûh Pasha had been appointed governor of Siwas, the next year of Aleppo and in 1015/1606, of Diyarbakr. His goal was the grand viziership. He did not hesitate to ask the sultan to give him the imperial seal and the post of commander-in-chief in return for a sum of 40,000 ducats and the maintenance of the army at his own expense. Ahmed I handed on the offer to the grand vizier, who summoned Nâşûh Pasha to him and fined him that sum as a punishment (cf. von Hammer, GOR, iv, 327, 472). When in 1016/1607 Ahmed I, the Croat Kuyudju Murâd Pasha, died at the age of over 90, Nâşûh Pasha became his successor (22 August 1611). In the following year he married 'Ağı Şiva, the three-year old daughter of Sultan Ahmed I (February 1612). His arrogance now knew no bounds; all his opponents were ruthlessly disposed of. His personal qualities dazzled everyone: "Of imposing appearance and eloquent, never was heard talk or action, but at the same time passionate, impetuous, quite incapable of kindly conduct and flattering words and always intent on humbling the other viziers" (von Hammer, GOR, iv, 472). As human life was nothing to him but wealth everything, he accumulated vast treasures. Sycophants and astrologers nourished in him the delusion that he was born to rule. The number of his enemies increased from day to day as a result of his intrigues and his ruthlessness. When on Friday, 13 Ramadan 1023/17 October 1614, he was to accompany the sultan to the mosque, suspecting no good, he said he was ill. The beşständi başı sent to him had him strangled by his own garden guards. His body was buried on the Oğ Meydân. His estate, which fell to the coffers of the state, was enormous: pearls, jewels, carpets, cloth and bullion without number (cf. von Hammer, GOR, iv, 474-5, quoting Mezeray, ii, 195).

Nâşûh Pasha left several sons, one of whom, Hu-seyn Pasha (d. 1053/643; cf. von Hammer, GOR, v, 260 and Hâşfî Kâtifâ, Feghîhân, ii, 226), had a son named Mehmed. The latter wrote a history of the Ottoman dynasty, Ağa-Teşnîde, and it was from the death of Murâd IV in 1048/1639 to 1081/1670, the original ms. of which is in Dresden (cf. F. Babinger, GOW, 211).

Bibliography: The historians Našima and Peçvêci, utilised by von Hammer, GOR, iv, 319, 384, 412, 446, 448, 463, 471, 475, also O. Sapiecia, Nuevo tratado de Turquia, Madrid 1622, fol. 21b: De la vida y muerte de Nâşûh Pasha (by a slave in Murâd's camp); Hâşfî Kâtifâ, Feghîhân, i, 361 ff.; Edward Grimestone, in Knolles, The General History of the Turks; Michel Baudier, Inventaire de l'histoire générale des Turcs, 4th ed, Paris 1612, 796 ff.; Copie d'une lettre écrite de Constantinople à un Gentilhomme Francois, contenant la traduction de Baschá
Nassouf, sa mort estrange, et des grandes richesses qui lui on este trouuees, Paris 1615, 8 pp. 8° (rare pamphlet); N. Barozzi and G. Berchet, Relazioni degli om- bachiastiche Venet. Turch. i, 259; Hurnuzazi, Suppl., i, 142-3; Hans Jakob Amann, Reise ins Globre Land, ed. A. F. Ammann, Zurich 1919-21, 44, 107-8, 119, 125, 127-130. — On an Arabic work dealing with Nasuh Pasha’s governorship in Aleppo, cf. F. Babinger, GOW, 211, n. — Sources of secondary value are Siqilli-i ’sudamii, iv, 556, and Hadilapat al- wuzara, 59 ff. (with many errors). — On the rumour that Nasuh Pasha had made an arrange- ment with the Persians and that the discovery of this treachery caused his death, cf. the contemporary stories mentioned by von Hammer, GOW, iv, 474, n., as well as the Paris pamphlet of 1615. See also IA art. Nasuh Pasha (M. Tayyib Gökblügin).

NA'T (A.), "qualification", a technical term of Arabic grammar used to designate a qualifying adjective and its function as an epithet. It is synony- 
mous with sija and wasf, which Sibawayh uses more frequently than na’i itself.

Al-Zamakhshari defines qualification as being that of the noun which indicates one of the states of the essence (dhat), used to distinguish two homonyms (musharak [q.v.]), to particularise (tadhrib) something unknown or to clarify (tawdih) something known; but the quality can also simply be used for praise (zard), blame (dhamm) or confirmation (ta’kid).

One can qualify by means of a derived noun (mushakk) of the process (masdar): agent (fa’i), that acted upon (ma’u’u), a qualification assimilated (mushabba), the agent, or by means of the process itself; one can also qualify something unknown by means of a verbal or nominal phrase (‘umla) or by cir- cumanstential expression (zarj).

The qualification may be applicable to the thing qualified (man’i, mausuf) or to anything which has a connection with it (min sababihi). It agrees with a specific with what is qualified in number (sing., dual or pl.), in determination (definite or indefinite) and genre (m. or f.).

The personal pronoun (mašmar) can neither be qualified nor qualify; a proper noun (’alam) cannot qualify but can be qualified; the demonstrative pro- noun (muhham) can only be qualified by a noun deter- mined by the article.

From the aspect of desinential inflexion (i’rād), the qualifying na’t is one of the five nouns dependent (i’assab) on other nouns for their inflection. It must normally accompany what is qualified, but, in certain cases where it is understood, it can replace what is qualified.


NATANZ, a small town of western Persia (lat. 33° 20' N., long. 51° 57' E., altitude 1,372 m/4,500 feet) on the lower, southeastern slopes of the Küh-i Kargas mountains and just off the modern Tehran—Kum—Kâshân—Yazd road.

The early Islamic geographers do not mention it, but Yâkût, Mu’jam, v, 292, describes it as a small town, administratively dependent on Isfahan and in the province of Džâb [q.v.], and situated 20 farshaks to the north of Isfahan; and Mustawfî (8th/14th cen- tury) describes it as protected by the nearby fortresses of Wâghâk. This may be the fortress of Natanz mentioned by Ibn al-Athir, ed. Beirut, ix, 495-6, year 433/1041-2, as the focus of disputes between the Kâkuyid ruler of Isfahan Abû Masûr Farâmarz and his rivals for power after the death of his father ‘Alâ al-Dawla Muhammad b. Dughmânziyâr [see Kâkûyids]. The town is thus in fact an old one, possessing remains of a Sâsânian fire temple, and the chief of the most important mediaeval Islamic buildings, including a Fri- 
day mosque of the Bâyûd period and the tomb of Shâhryar ‘Abd al-Sâmad al-ISFÂHÁNI from 707/1307-8. Al-Sâmâni, K. al-Ansâb, ed. Haydarâbâd, xii, 131-6. — mentions a famous adib in both Arabic and Persian, Abû ‘Abd Allâh Husayn b. Ibrâhîm al-Nâzârî, q.v. 195. — The modern town is situated in the jehristân or district of Kâshân, and is the chief of a bakhsh or sub-district of the same name; the town and its village dependencies had a populâtion of ca. 12,000 in 1960.

Bibliography: Le Strange,lands, 209; Schwarz, Iran, 655; A. Godard, Natanz (Province de Kâshân), in Aghâ-i feh i-fran, i (1936), 73-106; Razmârâ, Farhang-i dguhrâf-yi Iran, iii, 303-4; Hasan Narâkî, Aghâ-i tâ’zkî-yi i’zzad-sülâyî-yi Kâshân wa Natanz, Tehran 1348 šh./1970; Sylvia A. Matheson, Persia, an ar- chaeological guide, London 1972, 172; Sheila S. Blair, The octagonal pavilion at Natanz: a re-examination of early Islamic architecture in Iran, in Muqarnas, i (1983), 69-94; idem, The Ilkhanid shrine complex at Natanz, Iran, Cambridge, Mass. 1986.

NATÎDJÁ (A.), the usual name for the conclu- sion resulting from the combination of the two premises (mukaddimâr) in the syllogism (kiyât). It cor- 
responds to the Stoic epôtôdâ; this word in the works of Galen known to the Arabs is applied to the various discharges from the body but also means, as with the Stoics, the conclusion. Aristotle used the words ontopoîsêa that which concludes or completes the syllogism.

In place of the usual natîdja we also find ridf or râdî (= deduction).

(T. DE BOER)

NAṬIŠK [see sâbîyya].

AL-NAṬIŠK BI ’L-HÂRÎK, the honorific given by the Abbâsid caliph al-A’min [q.v.] to his son Mûsâ in 194/809, when he designated him as heir presum- ptive in place of al-Mâ’mûn [q.v.], whereas their father Hârûn al-Râshîd had specified that the inheritance of the caliphate should pass to al-Mâ’mûn and had taken the precaution of sending a circular letter on this subject to all the provinces and of attaching to the kiyât of the Ka’ba a copy of this, for the tearing-down of which al-Fadl b. al-Râbî [q.v.] sent a hâjib. It was in effect this vizier of al-A’min’s who led the caliph into taking this measure which was to unleash a fratricidal war between Hârûn’s two sons. Mûsâ was the son of an umm walad [q.v.] called Nazm, who was al-A’min’s favourite, and if he had ascended the throne, he would have been the first caliph not to be of Abbâsid blood on both paternal and maternal sides. At the time of his nomination, his very tender years drew criticisms from hostile poets, like a certain ’Ali b. Abî Tâbî (sic) who was a partisan of al-Mâ’mûn’s (see al-Mâ’ûdî, Murâd, vi, 438-9 = § 2645, but cf. al-Tabari, iii, 804).

Bibliography: The historians of the Abbâsid period speak of al-A’min’s measure (sub anno 194). See especially, Tabari, iii, 795-6; Ibn al-Tâktâkâ, Fâhrist, ed. Derenburg, 239-2, tr. Whitting, 211-12; Djâhîshyârî, Wûzara, 290, 292; Mas’ûdî, Murâd index, Ibn Kutayba, Wûzara, 384; Ibn Taghribîrî, Nudjami, St. 145; Makdisî, Bedût, vi, 105. See also the Bibli. to the arts. AL-AMIN-AL- 
AM-MAMUN. (CH. PELLAT)

NATION [see UMMA].
NAUPLION (Class. Gk. Nauplia, A. Anaboli, Bibl. to Bawrak. (A. DIETRICH) lists "Argho" and "Anaboli" among the few Moreote settlements to sustain the Avar-Roman/Byzantine/Frankish), i.e. Tkish. Ic Kal crags, the western Akronauplia (Hellenistic/Phocian) for increased prices. For the lucrative sodium trade, while in 1032 the town's Byzantine strategus defeated a fleet of African Muslims [see IFRIKIYA] in the Adriatic (cf. JOAS, ii, 52 f.). In the mid-12th century al-Drissi [q.v.] lists "Argho" and "Anaboli" among the 13 chief Moreote cities and praises their countryside (Nuzhat al-mushtdk, Fr. tr. Jaubert, i, 125; JOAS, ii, 54). After 1212 Villehardouin divided the town into the western Castello di Greci and the eastern C. di Franchi, and soon ceded it to the de la Roche family, who, together with the Fourcherolles, de Brienne and d'Englihen houses, dominated its history in the last quarter of the 13th century (1212-1389; Lamprynides, 39-53; Pitcher, viii, 428, 447-8); the Turkish attacks actually continued in the Ottoman period (mid-15th to the 16th century: Sathas, Turkish-dominated Greece, 39 ff.; Vakalopoulos, iii, 122-3; Krantonelle, "His. of Vassallate", 346-54, 56 ff. and passim). In 1388-9 the d'Englihen family ceded the town to Venice, but the latter was able to establish its control only in 1394, after a brief capture by the Florentine Acciaiuolis and the despot of Mystras [see MEZISTRE in Suppl.] (cf. Zakythenos, Despotat, 132-3; Miller-Lampros, ii, 12-13; Cessi, in NAIV, xxx, 82; Setton, Catalan domination, 190 ff.; idem, in Hist. Crusader States, 436-46, 446-48; Pitcher, maps XIII, XIV, XVI; Schreiner, Kreischen, i, 337 f.; E. Zacheriadiou, Trade and Crusade, Venice 1983, 98-9; JOAS, ii, 60).

2. The Venetian and Turkish periods (1389-1822)

The long first Venetian rule (1389-1540: Lamprynides, 54-92; Pitcher, maps XIII, XIV, XVI; Panagiotopoulou, Populations, 21 ff. and maps) is the best known, with extensive commercial activity, profitable treaties with the Monteghe Ogullari [q.v.] (in 1403 and 1407: Zacheriadiou, 102, 231, 237) and the Ottomans (in 1419 and 1479; cf. Setton, Popacy, ii, 8, 514), a population growing, no doubt associated with extensive Albanian settlements since the late 14th century (cf. Zakythenos, i, 543 [add. C. Maltezou]; Vakalopoulos, ii, 32; iii, 37, 51, 89; Ploumides, Venetian-dominated lands, 41) and also with large numbers of refugees following the fall of Morea (1460-1) and Eghriboz [q.v.] (1470) (Vakalopoulos, ii, 75 f.). The 1529-30 census records ca. 13,300 inhabitants. Important reconstructions (Akrionaulpia) and fortifications (Castello di Toro [ca. 1400]; coastal walls [1501-5]; "Five Brothers" gunnery in the north-western section) took place (cf. Bon, More, 491 ff., 676 f.) in 1460-1. The archbishop Camillo de' Pannocchi built the Castello (Scoglio) di Santo Teodoro or C. Pasquino (after the procurese's name), renamed Bouztiri by the Turks after the little island in the Argolic bay. Nauplion
withstood four major Ottoman attacks by Ya'kub Beg in 1396-7, in 1426-7, by Mahmud Pasha in 1463—in the course of which Argos was conquered (cf. Sa'deddin, Tacit-i-tevarih, i, 94; Vakalopoulos, 1988, 26 ff.; Vakalopoulos, iii, 19; Panagiotopoulos, 108 f.)—and between 1500-2, when it was valiantly defended by Greeks, Italians and Albanian stradioti (on the Turkish raids, see Schreiner, ii, 360-1, 433-4, 507, 532 ff., 541; FOAS, ii, 61, 65; Sathas, 11 ff., 61, 63 f.; Cogo, in NAV, xvii, 366, 390 ff.; Miller-Lampros, ii, 235; Pitzer, maps X, XVI; Vakalopoulos, iii, 76, 78; Setton, Popnics, iii, 248-9, 516, 521 ff.; Uzuncarsih, ii, 218-19). With the 1503 treaty, it remained in Venetian hands and refortifications were carried out in the harbour of the lower town. In 1537 the Morea sandzak beg, Kâşım Pasha, began a three-year siege of the town, which ended with the surrender of the proveditore Contarini on 21 November 1540, to be so soon followed by the surrender of Monemvasia [see MENEKSHE] (cf. Von Hammer, Histore, v, 283 ff., 316 f.; Miller-Lampros, ii, 252 ff.; Zinkeisen, ii, 803; Sathas, 119 ff., 125 f.; Amantos, Relations, 168; Schreiner, ii, 580-1; Vakalopoulos, iii, 30 map, 152-3, 159 ff.; Pitzer, 115; Runciman, Misra, 118 ff.). Several Naupliote scholars fled to the Malvasia", i.e. Monemvasia) became the capital of 2

Vakalopoulos, ii, 396; iv, 45-6), while a modest programme of Muslim religious building (e.g. Süleyman Vâlid or Fethiyye dâimi on Akronauplla) was effected, according to Ewliya Celebi [q.v.], who visited Argos and Nauplion in mid-1668 and left an important account of the town’s fortifications, many inhabitants, mosques and about 200 Muslim households (cf. Konstakos, in Nauplion, xvi, [1980-81], 239, 279-83, with mod. Gk. trans-comm.). Until the 1574 Morea reorganisation into two sandzaks (Balyababra/Patrás and Meziestre/Mystras), Nauplion was seat of the sandzak-beg. In 1688 Morosini, in the course of his Moreote campaign, heavily bombarded the town, forcing its governor, Mustafâ Paşa, to capitulate on 20-1 August (Sathas, 347 ff.; Vakalopoulos, iv, 19 ff.; Uzun-çarlığı, iii/1, 1983, 479 f.; cf. Von Hammer, xii, 224 f.).

The second Venetian rule (1686-1715: Lamprynides, 110-56) commenced with five proveditori, soon replaced by Morosini (1692), whose sudden death (December 1694: Sathas, 400-1; Vakalopoulos, iv, 32-3, 37) was followed by new struggles with the sultane, temporarily patched up by the Carlowitz Treaty (1699) [see KARLOPCA], which allowed Venice to refortify the town with extensive fortifications of the imposing Palamedh (T. Planota) rock (1711-14), renovations of Akronauplla and Bourti (Bon, More, 493, pls. 132-3) and constructions of the Forta di Sagredo, massive barricades, churches and fountains to replenish St. Mark’s fleets (between 1701-15). "Napoli di Romania" (as opposed to "Napoli di Malavasia", i.e. Monemvasia) became the capital of Provincia di Romania (including Corinth, Argos, Tripolitsa, Tzaczonia, Porto Porto and Thermesi) and seat of the proveditore generale di Regno di Morea (Sathas, 364-5; Vakalopoulos, iv, 52-3; Panagiotopoulos, 161, 163, 164 ff., 176: records 2,551 families; ibid., 132-3, 148-9, 184, 187-8, 199, 291, 313, with details on the towns and villages of the territorio di Napoli di Romania and on the population according to the censuses of 1700 [9,685, i.e. diminished on account of the 1687 and 1690 plague] and 1711 [6,548]). Commerce continued to thrive, and famous visitors like the proveditore generale Corner (1690), Corronelli (1687) and B. Randolf (1688) lavishly praise Nauplion as the fairest and the most populous city of the Orient, with its safe port and celebrated fortifications; the Venetian era closes with the 1714-15 land-and-sea siege by massive forces led by the vezir "Ali Pasha, the ser"asker Dawâd Pasha and a 50-strong fleet under Dijânim Khodja; the proveditore Delphino had only 1,747 defenders and the treacherous Palamedh castellano, De la Salle, who betrayed the fortress to the Turks, was immediately murdered by the enragèd Naupliotes; the capitulation (9 July 1715) was followed by extensive slaughter and lootin (Sathas, 443 ff.; Vakalopoulos, iv, 77-8; Runciman, 127-8).

The second Turkish rule (1715-1822: Lamprynides, 115-97), ratified by the Passarowitz Treaty of 1715 (cf. Uzuncarsih, iv, 1982, 104 ff., 107, and PASAROĞLU), was harsher, with no privileges, extensive confiscations by the newly settled aghas, church persecutions (cf. Gritsopoulos, Pasion, xvii, 118 ff.) and a dwindling commercial activity of the locals (Sakkaliarou, Peloponassos, 118 f.). The sultan himself [see AHMAD III] visited the town (Sathas, 446 f.), where more Muslim buildings were erected (e.g. Vouteletiri dâimi, 2 men tesfjas and several baths and fountains: cf. Uzuncarsih, ii/2, 1983, 305). Until 1770, with the transferal of the Morea Pasha’s seat to Tripolitsa, Nauplion was capital of the Morea vilâyet (Sakkaliarou, 99-100, 255 ff.); its participation in the 1770 uprising (Gritsopoulos, Orlofiksa, pasmim; Uzuncarsih, iv/1, 397-8), caused the massive extermination of the local Albanians by the kapudan-pasha Hasan, who in 1779 pushed them from Palameda into perdition (Sathas, 527-8; Uzuncarsih, iv/1, 434-5). Hencelowerward the locality was called "Arvanitii". The destruction, population, intensified by the 1790 plague (Leake, Travels, ii, 359), is recorded by Pouqueville (7,000 in 1799 and 11,780 in 1816), who also gives details on the town’s trade and products (cheese, cotton, silk, wool, hides), fortifications, buildings and Christian-Muslim population (Voyage en Moree, i, 233, 356, 501; iv, 342 ff.; v, 215, 233; vi, 263 ff.; cf. Sakellariou, 216 ff., 266, 270, 284).

In the early stages of the Greek War for Liberation, the Greeks, assisted by the clergy, repeatedly besieged Nauplion between April 1821 and late 1822 (Lamprynides, 196-243; Vakalopoulos, v, 734 ff.; vi, 207-8, 263 ff.; temporary succour by Mâhmûd Paşa in mid-1822 prolonged the surrender of "Ali Paşa of Nauplion to the Greek Klept chief Koloktronës until 30 November, following the fall of Palamedh to Staikopoulos. Liberated Nauplion was to become the first capital of the modern Kingdom of Greece from 8 January 1823 until the transferal to Athens by the decree of 18 September 1834.

Bibliography: Mostly given in the article; for older references and titles of modern works, see MORA, NAVARINO and MEZISTRE in Suppl. On the pre-1839 period, see A. Savvides, Nauplion in the Byzantine and Frankish periods [forthcoming]; the most detailed monograph is M. Lamprynides, Nauplia from antiquity to modern times [in Greek], Nauplia 1975 (till the late 19th century). Other contributions: G. Cogo, La guerra di Venezia contro i Turchi, in
The nomenclature for water-raising machines is very variable, and often the only way of knowing what machine is being referred to is from the context; for example, if a machine is driven by running water it is almost certain to be a noria. To avoid confusion, the Syrian usage will be followed, in which the nāʿūra is always the current-driven wheel and the sākiya [q.v.] is the geared machine driven by an animal [see māz].

3. Hydraulic machines

The noria can be constructed of timber or metal. In Eastern Europe, timber was used, not only for the framework, but also for the containers for raising the water. In the Middle Ages, the construction of most norias in the Islamic world probably followed the pattern of the well-known wheels at Hamat on the Euphrates, whilst the earliest mention we have is in al-Baladhuri, (population in 1971, 2,258), and situated behind the southern headland of Navarino Bay, a deepwater channel, as capital of Pylia eparchia (=province) of Messenia nomos (=diocese). Locally called Neoastron (“new fortress”) after the 16th century Turkish fortifications, it should not be confused with the 13th century Frankish Palaiokastor (“old fortress”), known to the Franks as Port-de-Jonc, still commanding the northern channel to the harbour and lying deserted to the southwest of Homeric Pylos, on the Koryphasion promontory. Sheltered by Sphakteria island, Navarino harbour was considered amongst the safest of the Morea ports till the 14th century, and the name Navarino existed before then; most probably, its origin may be (Bulgaro-) Slavonic. In Byzantine times, there is a single mention of Pylos in connection with raids of the Cretan Arabs [see ιρύδα] on the western Morea ca. 872-3; this area was included in the late 9th century in the Peloponnesos “theme” (refs. in A. Savvides, Of Pylos-Nafplio-Zenklon in the Byzantine period, in Byzantia, xvi [1992]).

The earliest mention of the Greek form Avarinos appears in a 12th century ecclesiastical Notitia ("Pylos, nunc vocatur Abarus"), in a Palaiologan imperial chrysobull of 1293 and in the Greek version of the Morea chronicle (see below), whilst the earliest mention of the Arabic name is in the Nuzhat al-mughāf of al-Idrīsī [q.v.], tr. Jaubert, i, 124, where the town of Irūda is referred to as “a commodious port” (see R. J. Lifie, Handel und Politik, 101-1204, Amsterdam 1984, 203; Savvides, in JOAS, ii [1990], 53).

1. The pre-Ottoman period to 1500. Information on Navarino increases after the 1204-5 Frankish

The banks of a canal in the Bašra area. As Abū Burda [see al-Aswār, Abū Burda] died in 103/721-2 or 104/722-3 aged over eighty, the event probably took place about 20 years earlier. Al-Muqaddasi mentions large nāʿūra wheels in the Nilt valley of Egypt at Ahwāz (411) and on the river Kūr in Fārs (444). There is no doubt that they were in widespread use in Islam. T. F. Glick has plotted the locations of norias in the Iberian peninsula, see his Irrigation and society in medieval Valencia, Cambridge, Mass. 1970, 178-9. It spread into other parts of Europe and eventually to the New World (G. M. Foster, Culture and cald, Chicago 1960, 63, 69 n. 9). Even today the noria is found to be effective in many parts of the world, given the right hydraulic conditions. The well-known noria at Murcia, for example, was still in use in 1990.

Bibliography (in addition to works cited in the article): E. Wiedemann and F. Hausser, Über Vorrichtungen zum Heben von Wasser in der islamischen Welt, in Jahrbuch des Vereins Deutscher Ingenieure, viii (1918), 121-34; G. S. Colin, La noria marocaine et les machines hydrauliques dans le monde arabe, in Hesperis, xvi (1932), 22-60; idem, L'origine des norias de Fès, ibid., xvi (1933), 156-7; T. Schieler, Roman and Islamic water-lifting wheels, Odense 1973, deals mainly with the sākiya, but norias are discussed on 37-9; D. R. Hill, A history of engineering in Classical and Medieval times, Cambridge 1984, 142-54.

NAVARINO (A. Irūda, T. Anavarin), a seaport of the southwestern Morea [see mora] or Peloponnesos, in Messenia, associated with modern Pylos town, which was built between 1828 and 1832 (population in 1971, 2,258), and situated behind the southern headland of Navarino Bay, a deepwater channel as capital of Pylia eparcheia (=province) of Messenia nomos (=diocese). Locally called Neoastron (“new fortress”) after the 16th century Turkish fortifications, it should not be confused with the 13th century Frankish Palaiokastor (“old fortress”), known to the Franks as Port-de-Jonc, still commanding the northern channel to the harbour and lying deserted to the southwest of Homeric Pylos, on the Koryphasion promontory.

Skelto is a small island, Navarino harbour was considered amongst the safest of the Morea ports in post-mediaeval Italian portulans, and is closely connected with various important mediaeval and modern events. The etymology of the name is uncertain: it may be a survival of Avar rule in the Morea in the early Dark Ages; it has been identified with the Navarrese, although these did not appear in the Morea till the 14th century, and the name Navarino existed before then; most probably, its origin may be (Bulgaro-) Slavonic. In Byzantine times, there is a single mention of Pylos in connection with raids of the Cretan Arabs [see ιρύδα] on the western Morea ca. 872-3; this area was included in the late 9th century in the Peloponnesos “theme” (refs. in A. Savvides, Of Pylos-Nafplio-Zenklon in the Byzantine period, in Byzantia, xvi [1992]).

The earliest mention of the Greek form Avarinos appears in a 12th century ecclesiastical Notitia ("Pylos, nunc vocatur Abarus"), in a Palaiologan imperial chrysobull of 1293 and in the Greek version of the Morea chronicle (see below), whilst the earliest mention of the Arabic name is in the Nuzhat al-mughāf of al-Idrīsī [q.v.], tr. Jaubert, i, 124, where the town of Irūda is referred to as “a commodious port” (see R. J. Lifie, Handel und Politik, 101-1204, Amsterdam 1984, 203; Savvides, in JOAS, ii [1990], 53).

1. The pre-Ottoman period to 1500. Information on Navarino increases after the 1204-5 Frankish
conquest of southern Greece. In the 13th and 14th centuries, the Frankish fortress of Palaiokastro or Por-de-Jonc became the seat of various Latin estates, which were often affected by Latin fratricidal strife, especially in the Veneto-Genoese naval clash of 1354 which ended in the Republic’s defeat. Around this time, Albanian settlers established themselves in the area, whilst in 1381-2 a company of Navarrese, Gascons and Italians appeared. In 1417 the Venetians seized the harbour and the Frankish fortress and in 1423 became lawful owners by purchase from a Genoese baron; eventually, in 1479, Navarino was acknowledged by the Ottoman Turks as Venetian, and it then developed into an economic and commercial centre. It had suffered from Turkish raids since 1423, and in summer 1460 Mehmed II [q.v.] had laid waste the countryside around Navarino, so that by later that year only Navarino and such other Venetian possessions as Modon, Koron, Nauplia [q.v.], Argos, Monemvasia [see MENEKSHE] and Maina had remained in Christian hands.

2. The Ottoman conquest: the Turkish and Venetian periods (1500-1828). The annexation in A.M. 7008-9 (= A.D. 1500-1) by Bāyāzīd II [q.v.], shortly after the fall of Modon and Koron, has been recorded in, among other places, thirteen Greek short chronicles (here called Ayarinos, Anavarmos, Novariinos [q.v.], and Kyparissios). During the Venetian periods (1500-1828), the area's social and economic life is described by Pouqueville and Leake (refs. in Sakellariou, s.v.), while from the late 18th century the French also played an important role in the town's development (Pouqueville, vi, 264; Sakellariou, 128; Vakalopoulos, iv, 389 map, 391 ff.). By the terms of the treaty, the Turks left for Chania (Crete) with 130 Greeks), the Russians on 10 April 1770 forced the fortress (Neokastro), no longer strongly fortified but still amply provided with munitions and artillery, to capitulate (see P. Kontogiannes, The Greeks during the First Russo-Turkish War of Catherine II [in Greek], repr. Athens 1989, 136 ff, 183 ff; cf. D. Themele-Katephore, Foreign also played an important role in the town's development (Pouqueville, vi, 264; Sakellariou, 128; Vakalopoulos, iv, 153, 225 ff, 231 ff, with charts and index: s.v.). The daily stubborn defence by the Ottoman garrison and the Muslim civilian population (Pouqueville, vi, 72, lists 600 Turks and 130 Greeks), the Russians on 10 April 1770 forced the fortress (Neokastro), no longer strongly fortified but still amply provided with munitions and artillery, to capitulate (see P. Kontogiannes, The Greeks during the First Russo-Turkish War of Catherine II [in Greek], repr. Athens 1989, 136 ff, 183 ff; Sakellariou, 177 ff; Vakalopoulos, iv, 389 map, 391 ff.). By the terms of the treaty, the Turks left for Chania (Crete) leaving behind them a number of Christian women, whom they had imprisoned in their harems. The Russians immediately refortified the fortress, making it their principal base for their Moreote operations, but soon they were forced to evacuate it: on 1 June 1770 Aleksei Orlov sailed away with the Russian ships and on the next day the Turks occupied the well-protected fortress, which was in part burnt and destroyed (Sakellariou, 190 ff; Simopoulos, Foreign travellers, ii, 1985, 368, 593, 679-80; details on the 1770 Greek uprising and its consequences in T. Gritsopoulos, Ta Orolófska, Athens 1967).

In the last decades of Ottoman rule, the Turkish family of Bekir Agha of Navarino played a prominent part. Soon after the outbreak of the Liberation War, the Greeks laid siege to Navarino on 29 March 1821, where the Turks of Arkadia (Kyparissia) had also taken refuge. Between 17-7 August the Turks surrendered and the Greeks, despite all agreements, massacred them mercilessly (Striebeck, Tagebuch, 35 ff, 92 ff; Lieber, Tagebuch, 20-1; cf. Vakalopoulos, v, 350, 780, 785; vi, 49 ff; 106 ff; The information of the German philhellene Striebeck on certain historical facts in Neokastro in 1821-2 [in Greek], in Pelopon., xvi, 57 ff; The Greek troops of 1821 [in Greek], repr. Thessalonica 1991, 22-3, 44, 160; see also J. Philemon, Essay on the Greek Resolution [in Greek], Athens 1859-61, esp. i, 112; iii, 61, 114-15). In the spring of 1825, however, Ibrahim Pasha [q.v.] of
Egypt invested the area; in spite of a heroic Greek defence, Palaiokastro and Neokastro were occupied on 29 April and 11 May respectively (Vakalopoulos, vi, 695, 762, 900; vii, 96, 110; Greek tr., 193). What has given Navarino its special place in history is the naval battle fought on 20 October 1827 in its harbour, the "last great battle of the age of sail" (R. Clogg, A short hist. of modern Greece, Cambridge 1986, 65), between the combined fleets of England, France and Russia under the British vice-admiral Sir Edward Codrington and of Turkey, Egypt and Tunisia under Tahir Pasha. The Muslim forces were destroyed, with three-quarters of their vessels sunk and about 6,000 Turks killed compared with only about 1,000 among the European allies (details in C. Woodhouse, The battle of Navarino, London 1965 and updated Greek tr., Athens 1977; Modern Greece: a short history, London 1977, 147 ff.; cf. Vakalopoulos, vii, 830 ff.). Ibrahim was cut off on the Moreote mainland from his supplies until the spring of 1828; finally, in the autumn of 1828, Ibrahim withdrew to Egypt and the French troops under General Maison relieved the Egyptian-Turkish garrison. In ca. 1832 A Reumont (Reisschilderungen und Umrisse, 83 ff.) gives an important description of Navarino under French occupation: a town and a fort; the building activities continued in the foundation of modern Pylos (Vakalopoulos, viii, 260); new road connections with Methone were constructed in 1830 (Themele-Katephore, 168). Following the Tourkokratia, Navarino-Pilos was elevated to an important administrative unit within the newly-founded Kingdom of Greece (see beginning of the article and Stadtmüller, 156 map.; S. Loukatos, Politikonarchia ton Koron, Modon kai Niokastro ton 1830 [in Greek], in Pelopon., xv [1984], 209 ff.; E. Frangaki-M. Wagstaff, Settlement pattern changes in the Morean Peloponnese c. A.D. 1700-1830, in Byz. and Med. Greek Stud., xi [1987], 177 map, 178 table).


(N. Bees-[A. Savvides])

NAVARRA (Eng. and Fr.: Navarre), a province of northern Spain, whose capital, Pamplona, abandoned its allegiance to the Muslims in 128/798 and made itself into a semi-independent kingdom. Its history, at the time of Muslim domination, becomes intermingled with that of Pamplona [see BANBALUNA] and with that of the majority of its inhabitants, the Basques of Vasconia [see BAISKUNISH].

**ED.**

**LAS NAVAS DE TOLOSA** [see AL-ÁKAB].

**NAVIGATION** [see MILAH].

**NAW** [see ANWA].

**NAW BAHAR, a pre-Islamic sacred site and monastery at Baltik [p. e.] in what is now northern Afghanistan, destroyed by the Arab invaders, but famed in early Islamic history as the place of origin of the Barmaki family of officials and viziers in early Abbasid times, the eponym Barmak having been the head or abbot (pamuda) of Naw Bahar. See on the shrine, almost certainly a Buddhist one, AL-BARAMIKA.

**1. Origins; to the Bibli. there should be added Le Strange, Lands, 421-2; Barthold, An historical geography of Iran, Princeton 1984, 14-15; R.W. Bulliet, Naw Bahar and the survival of Iranian Buddhism, in Iran, JBIPS, XIV (1976), 140-5, emphasising the existence of several other Naw Bahârs in the northeastern Iranian region.**

**AL-NAWÂDJI, SHAMS AL-DIN MUHAMMAD B. HASAN B. 'ALÎ B. 'UThMAN AL-KAHIRI, an Arab scholar, poet and man of letters, born in Cairo in 788/1386 and died there in 859/1455, a typical representative of the post-classical period.**

Of his many teachers we may mention the authority on kisâ'îat al-Djâzari (751-832/1350-1429; cf. Brockelmann, iii, 257-8, no. 6) and al-Damiri [p. e.]; he mentions the latter in the preface to his stylistics (Paris ms., de Slane, no. 4453); among his literary friends were Ibn Hidjdja al-Hamawi [p. e.].
whom he later directed his polemic al-Hudjdjafi sarikat Ibn Hidjdja (Leiden ms., no. 509). His official position was teacher of hadith in several of the madrasas of Cairo; he was closely connected with Sufi circles. In addition to several journeys in Egypt, he twice made the hadj.

As was the custom with scholars of the time, he wrote a number of commentaries and glosses on well-known textbooks and several works on rhetoric and poetics. As a poet he made his way by panegyrics on high officials and many Maecenases richly rewarded him. In obedience to the taste of his patrons, he compiled anthologies of poems on subjects which hadith and madrasa instruction belittled, bearing names of his time; as usual, some of these are on the borders of belles-lettres and erotica. The majority of these anthologies still exist only in manuscript (see Brockelmann, loc. cit.); as usual, some of these are on the borders of belles-lettres and erotica. The majority of these anthologies still exist only in manuscript (see Brockelmann, loc. cit.); as usual, some of these are on the borders of belles-lettres and erotica. The majority of these anthologies still exist only in manuscript (see Brockelmann, loc. cit.); as usual, some of these are on the borders of belles-lettres and erotica. The majority of these anthologies still exist only in manuscript (see Brockelmann, loc. cit.); as usual, some of these are on the borders of belles-lettres and erotica. The majority of these anthologies still exist only in manuscript (see Brockelmann, loc. cit.); as usual, some of these are on the borders of belles-lettres and erotica. The majority of these anthologies still exist only in manuscript (see Brockelmann, loc. cit.); as usual, some of these are on the borders of belles-lettres and erotica. The majority of these anthologies still exist only in manuscript (see Brockelmann, loc. cit.); as usual, some of these are on the borders of belles-lettres and erotica. The majority of these anthologies still exist only in manuscript (see Brockelmann, loc. cit.); as usual, some of these are on the borders of belles-lettres and erotica. The majority of these anthologies still exist only in manuscript (see Brockelmann, loc. cit.); as usual, some of these are on the borders of belles-lettres and erotica. The majority of these anthologies still exist only in manuscript (see Brockelmann, loc. cit.); as usual, some of these are on the borders of belles-lettres and erotica. The majority of these anthologies still exist only in manuscript (see Brockelmann, loc. cit.); as usual, some of these are on the borders of belles-lettres and erotica. The majority of these anthologies still exist only in manuscript (see Brockelmann, loc. cit.); as usual, some of these are on the borders of belles-lettres and erotica. The majority of these anthologies still exist only in manuscript (see Brockelmann, loc. cit.); as usual, some of these are on the borders of belles-lettres and erotica. The majority of these anthologies still exist only in manuscript (see Brockelmann, loc. cit.); as usual, some of these are on the borders of belles-lettres and erotica. The majority of these anthologies still exist only in manuscript (see Brockelmann, loc. cit.); as usual, some of these are on the borders of belles-lettres and erotica. The majority of these anthologies still exist only in manuscript (see Brockelmann, loc. cit.); as usual, some of these are on the borders of belles-lettres and erotica. The majority of these anthologies still exist only in manuscript (see Brockelmann, loc. cit.); as usual, some of these are on the borders of belles-lettres and erotica. The majority of these anthologies still exist only in manuscript (see Brockelmann, loc. cit.); as usual, some of these are on the borders of belles-lettres and erotica. The majority of these anthologies still exist only in manuscript (see Brockelmann, loc. cit.); as usual, some of these are on the borders of belles-lettres and erotica. The majority of these anthologies still exist only in manuscript (see Brockelmann, loc. cit.); as usual, some of these are on the borders of belles-lettres and erotica. The majority of these anthologies still exist only in manuscript (see Brockelmann, loc. cit.); as usual, some of these are on the borders of belles-lettres and erotica. The majority of these anthologies still exist only in manuscript (see Brockelmann, loc. cit.); as usual, some of these are on the borders of belles-lettres and erotica. The majority of these anthologies still exist only in manuscript (see Brockelmann, loc. cit.); as usual, some of these are on the borders of be...
1309. — On the exposition of the usul al-din by his colleague Muhammad b. Sulayman Hasab Allah entitled al-Rijal al-badi'a, he wrote the commentary al-Thimdr, Cairo 1299, and asked him to free the people of Syria from the war taxes imposed upon them and to protect the teachers in the madrasas from a reduction in their income. This was in vain, however, and Baybars expelled al-Nawawi from Damascus when he alone refused to sign a fatwa approving the legality of these actions. (This action of al-Nawawi's is commemorated in the popular romance Sult al-Zahr of Baybars, Cairo 1326, xli, 38 ff. in which the sultan, cursed by al-Nawawi, becomes blind for a time.) He died unmarried in his father's house in Nawa on Wednesday, 24 Radjab 676/22 Dec. 1277. His tomb is still held in honour there.

Al-Nawawi has retained his high reputation to the present day. He had an exceptional knowledge of Tradition and adopted even stricter standards than later Islam; for example, he admits only five works on Tradition as canonical, while he expressly puts the Sunan of Ibn Maja on a level with the Musnad of Ahmad b. Hanbal (cf. Sharh Musim, i, 5; AREF, 3). In spite of his fondness for Muslim, he gives a higher place to al-Bukhari (Tadhqiq, 550). He wrote the principal commentary on Muslim's Sahih (Cairo 1283); as an introduction to this work, he transmits the text and a sketch of the science of Tradition. He gives not only observations on the inads and a grammatical explanation of the traditions, but he also comments on them, mainly from the theological and legal aspect, quoting when necessary not only the founders of the principal schools but also the older jurists like al-Awza'i, 'Abd, etc. He also includes marginal headings (targumes) and often mentions his frequently annotated Kitab al-Arba' in which the sultan, cursed by al-Nawawi, becomes blind for a time.) He lived very frugally and even declined a salary. His biographical and grammatical studies are still held in honour there.
on the Risāla of al-Kūshyarī and transmitted it— we owe works like the Kitāb al-Adhkar on the prayers, finished in Córdoba in 920 (Cairo 1351 and Bringardier eds.), the Risāla al-tālibīn (finished in 670/1271-2; Mecca 1302, 1312, Eng. tr. Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, London 1975) and the incomplete Būstān al-’ṣirāfīfī ṭi ’l-ṣūḥa wa ’l-tassawuf. For his complete works, see Brockelman, I, 496-501, S 1, 680-6.


NAWBA (A.), in the art-music of the Islamic Middle East and North Africa, a complex form made up of a number of individual pieces arranged in a particular order over the use of nawba related to the military and ceremonial ensemble, see NAKHRARA-KHANA AND MEHTER.

The term nawba appears already in the Kitāb al-Aghānī of Aḥī ’l-Parāqī al-Isbāhānī (284-356/897-967 [q.v.]), but in its non-technical meaning of “turn”. It refers either to the practice, established at the latest by the beginning of the 2nd/8th century, of having a given musician perform regularly at court on a particular day of the week, or to several musicians taking turns to sing during a single madhī. However, for all their references to features of etiquette, missing from the many accounts in the Kitāb al-Aghānī of musical madhīs at the ʿAbbāsīd court is any indication of the existence of a large-scale conventional sequence of songs, let alone of any complex cyclical form. The choice not to sing two songs next to each other by various and sometimes unpredictable factors, and the patron would often demand to have a particularly pleasing item repeated several times (see Sawa, Music performance practice, 115-16, 166-70).

The notion of a preferred or most effective order of events is, however, attested by the end of the 4th/10th century. The singer is advised in the Kamāl Adhāl al-ʿagānī of al-Ḥasan al-Kātib (late 4th/10th or early 5th/11th century) and in the Hāṣīj ʿl-funun of Ibn al-Ṭahābān (d. after 449/1057) to begin with slow and serious songs and to conclude with faster and more frivolous ones: such a plan, it is urged, will accord with the changing mood (and increasing inebriation) of the audience. Given this broad framework, it might be expected that more specifically musical considerations would lead to the development of particular conventional groupings either of individual songs or of types of song (involving some pattern of unity or contrast relating to modal, rhythmic or formal parameters). But these two works, despite their concern with the practicalities of music making, fail to indicate the existence of any such compound structure, and the term nawba does not occur in them. It does, however, appear shortly after, in the phrase nawbaṭ-i muḥtārīn (v. 210), the Kāhibat-nāma (1832/1082-3) of Kay Kašī [q.v.], where we encounter the first tentative association with formal organisation, even if it is clear from the context that we are still dealing with nothing more precise than the general trajectory or changing character of the various pieces that make up a complete performance, moving again from slow to fast, from idiocy compulsively to the contrary.

A similar overall design, but rather more explicit in its articulation, is to be found in Spain. Al-Makkarī (986-1041/1578-1632) quotes Ibn Hāyyān (377-469/987-8/1676 [q.v.]) to the effect that the conventional order was to begin with naḥḥād [q.v.], followed by basīt, both of these being slow, and conclude with the faster muḥraḍāt and al-ṣāqīdī. The particular pairing of naḥḥād and basīt is mentioned already (Aghānī, v, 427) in relation to Isḥāk al-Mawṣī (150-235/767-850 [q.v.]) and the sequence as a whole is closely related to the format discussed by al-Ḥasan al-Kātib. For him naḥḥād and basīt constitute successive stages within a single piece, but one occurring at the beginning of a performance, while ṣāqīdī is specified as one of the lighter, quicker rhythms that are saved till the end. If this suggests that there were still similar concepts of large-scale (but loosely structured) organisation in both East and West in the 5th/11th century, the testimony of al-Tifashi (580-651/1184-1253) shows that two centuries later there were two well-established but distinct complex forms, both called nawba. That in the West began again with a naḥḥād, but followed now by saʿat, muḥraḍāt and ṣāqīdī. The first two seem to have been confined to the opening, with the latter feature, the inclusion in the first and omission from the second of an initial section called ʿishthāl; the last two relate to strophic verse/song forms.

The Eastern nawba, in contrast, consisted for al-Tifashi of five pieces: kawel, ghazal, tarānā, samānā and kawel (-1) digār. There is, however, no mention of it in the treatises of Sāfī al-Dīn al-ʿUrmawī (d. 695/1294), and given that he does refer to other forms it may not yet have become as important as the prominence accorded it by later theorists would suggest. Nor, indeed, is it singled out for emphasis in the next work to cite it, the so-called Shurah Maṣūlah Mubārak Ṣubāt bar aṭdār (777/1375) (which lists, incidentally, only three movements: kawel, ghazal and tarānā), so that it is not until the beginning of the 9th/15th century, in the treatises of Sīdī Kādyr al-Marāghī, that it comes to the fore. (In an interesting autobiographical anecdote, he relates how he won a wager to compose one whole nawba each day for a month.) The cyclical implication in al-Tifashi’s account of the final return to the initial song type suggests that the slow to fast trajectory had either been abandoned or had never been relevant to the Eastern nawba, and confirmation of this is given in ʿAbd al-Ḥādī al-Marāghī’s description of what seems to have been its normative form during the 8th/14th and early 9th/15th centuries. All of the now canonic four movements (kawel, ghazal, tarānā and firīndāt) are unified not only by identity of melodic mode but also by being restricted to a small number of rhythmic cycles. What distinguishes them is not, therefore, a progressive change of character, nor particular features of formal structure, but rather the language and type of the verse: the kawel set Arabic verse, the ghazal Persian, the tarānā a ruḥātī, the firīndāt again Arabic verse. The Eastern nawba (or, in full, nawba mulūtab/nawba-i mulūtab) cannot, therefore, be seen as a crystallisation of an earlier larger-scale format, but is rather just one (even if the only compound) form among many, and in a larger performance context it was probably assigned to the initial, slower block of pieces.

Some idea of the later history of the nawba can be gleaned from song-text collections of the late 9th/15th and 10th/16th centuries. It is clear, for example, that
the theorists’ specification of a ruba’i for the tarana had been abandoned in practice: normally just one line (and usually, indeed, the same line) was set. They also show any ‘Abd al-Kadir al-Maraghi’s attempt to add a fifth movement (mustaţţazâd) which would repeat material from the previous four had not proved successful: no other composer tried to emulate him. But of far greater significance is the fact that they reveal how the na’uba itself, despite the high prestige it had earlier enjoyed, was rapidly falling out of favour. Already by itself, despite the high prestige it had earlier
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coined to the Western form as specified by al-Tifashi down to the present. Unfortunately, this must remain supposition: the word may surface in 12th/18th century sources such as al-Hâlî, but there is no documentary evidence to show any of the stages of what must have been a complex evolution leading to the present form, which has many more components than its 7th/13th century antecedent and retains none of its formal terminology. In current Moroccan practice, for example, the na’uba consists broadly of a number of introductory pieces largely serving the purpose of modal exposition (an instrumental prelude, mîshâlâyîa, followed by the choral na’âdb tab’ al-nâghma and a brief instrumental na’âdah), and then an instrumental prelude, mîtal, leading to five core groups of vocal pieces (7un’s) selected from a wide repertoire of more than 1,000 songs in, successively, the rhythmic cycles basî, kâ’tim wa-nisf, bâtâ‘thi, daîâh and kâddâm. Within each of these groups the tempo gradually accelerates, so that we may detect here an echo or even, possibly, a direct
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In current Moroccan practice, for example, the na’uba is still current and there must, therefore, be a reasonable possibility of continuity from the Western form as specified by al-Tifashi down to the present. Unfortunately, this must remain supposition: the word may surface in 12th/18th century sources such as al-Hâlî, but there is no documentary evidence to show any of the stages of what must have been a complex evolution leading to the present form, which has many more components than its 7th/13th century antecedent and retains none of its formal terminology. In current Moroccan practice, for example, the na’uba consists broadly of a number of introductory pieces largely serving the purpose of modal exposition (an instrumental prelude, mîshâlâyîa, followed by the choral na’âdb tab’ al-nâghma and a brief instrumental na’âdah), and then an instrumental prelude, mîtal, leading to five core groups of vocal pieces (7un’s) selected from a wide repertoire of more than 1,000 songs in, successively, the rhythmic cycles basî, kâ’tim wa-nisf, bâtâ‘thi, daîâh and kâddâm. Within each of these groups the tempo gradually accelerates, so that we may detect here an echo or even, possibly, a direct
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primary fact of being conventional assemblages of individual pieces considered to form a complex whole. Whereas the na’uba consisted of four specific and highly uniform vocal compositions by a single composer, the fasîl in its classical form can be defined as a variable selection of pieces, usually by different composers, fitting into a series of prescribed slots organised in such a way as to emphasise, within the overall unity of mode, contrast and variety. It thus alternates between instrumental and vocal, unmeasured and measured, and juxtaposes vocal pieces using contrasting rhythmic cycles.

In the Maghrib, on the other hand, the term na’uba is still current and there must, therefore, be a reasonable possibility of continuity from the Western form as specified by al-Tifashi down to the present. Unfortunately, this must remain supposition: the word may surface in 12th/18th century sources such as al-Hâlî, but there is no documentary evidence to show any of the stages of what must have been a complex evolution leading to the present form, which has many more components than its 7th/13th century antecedent and retains none of its formal terminology. In current Moroccan practice, for example, the na’uba consists broadly of a number of introductory pieces largely serving the purpose of modal exposition (an instrumental prelude, mîshâlâyîa, followed by the choral na’âdb tab’ al-nâghma and a brief instrumental na’âdah), and then an instrumental prelude, mîtal, leading to five core groups of vocal pieces (7un’s) selected from a wide repertoire of more than 1,000 songs in, successively, the rhythmic cycles basî, kâ’tim wa-nisf, bâtâ‘thi, daîâh and kâddâm. Within each of these groups the tempo gradually accelerates, so that we may detect here an echo or even, possibly, a direct
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In the Maghrib, on the other hand, the term na’uba is still current and there must, therefore, be a reasonable possibility of continuity from the Western form as specified by al-Tifashi down to the present. Unfortunately, this must remain supposition: the word may surface in 12th/18th century sources such as al-Hâlî, but there is no documentary evidence to show any of the stages of what must have been a complex evolution leading to the present form, which has many more components than its 7th/13th century antecedent and retains none of its formal terminology. In current Moroccan practice, for example, the na’uba consists broadly of a number of introductory pieces largely serving the purpose of modal exposition (an instrumental prelude, mîshâlâyîa, followed by the choral na’âdb tab’ al-nâghma and a brief instrumental na’âdah), and then an instrumental prelude, mîtal, leading to five core groups of vocal pieces (7un’s) selected from a wide repertoire of more than 1,000 songs in, successively, the rhythmic cycles basî, kâ’tim wa-nisf, bâtâ‘thi, daîâh and kâddâm. Within each of these groups the tempo gradually accelerates, so that we may detect here an echo or even, possibly, a direct
The **K. al-Á'r**? wa 'l-diyyáni, as Madelung has shown (Abú Ísá al-Warráj), made use of Abú Ísá al-Warrák's (d. 247/861) K. *Árifátí maḥdúd al-Á'imám and/or K. *Makálik* for knowledge of dualistic religions, the Manichaeans, Marcionites and the Barzanesians. Al-Nawbakhtí's reports on these topics were used in turn by Abú Al-Dhájjár b. Shahrastání and Ibn Al-Murtádá.

Al-Nawbakhtí's polemical works include a refutation of extremist Shi'ites (see Ritter, 27; Íkbál, 135-6; a refutation of Abú Al-Dhájjár b. Shahrastání's refutation of astrologers; and physical proofs from Aristotle refuting those who claim that the sphere is living and rational. His philosophic interests are also expressed in his epitome of Aristotle's *De Generazione et Corruptione* and by a work on atomism.

Al-Nawbakhtí is best known for his book on Shi'ite sects, *Fírak al-Sáhir* (K. *fihí maḥdúd fírak afkl al-a'imám wa-úsámi'ah ...*), which was edited by H. Ritter (Istanbul 1931). The work was subsequently edited (but apparently based on Ritter) by Muhammad Sádik al-Brár al-Ullm (Nadjaf 1355/1936).


The book is divided into three sections: an exposition of the Imámite (on which Al-Nawbakhtí wrote one or two independent works) as well as Shi'ite sects. A question exists whether the *Fírak al-Sáhir* is the work of Al-Nawbakhtí or rather derived from the K. *Makálik* wa 'l-fírak of his contemporary, Sayid b. Abú Alláh al-Á'shá' al-Kummi (d. 299/911) (ed. Makhtír, Tehran 1964), as many parallels exist (see the list of most of them in Íkbál, 144-54) between the *Fírak* and the Al-Kummi's book. The explanation that commends itself is that Al-Kummi used Al-Nawbakhtí's work and added sources of his own (see Madelung, *Bemerkungen*).

Madelung suggests that Al-Nawbakhtí used Hishám b. Al-Hakám's K. *Árifátí al-nás fí 'l-a'imám* for the first part of his book, a source used also by al-Á'áshá' al-Kummi (d. 299/911) (ed. Mácrl, Tehran 1964), as many parallels exist (see the list of most of them in Íkbál, 144-54) between the *Fírak* and the Al-Kummi's book. The explanation that commends itself is that Al-Kummi used Al-Nawbakhtí's work and added sources of his own (see Madelung, *Bemerkungen*).

Al-Nawbakhtí's polemical works include a refutation of extremist Shi'ites (see Ritter, 27; Íkbál, 135-6; a refutation of Abú Al-Dhájjár b. Shahrastání's refutation of astrologers; and physical proofs from Aristotle refuting those who claim that the sphere is living and rational. His philosophic interests are also expressed in his epitome of Aristotle's *De Generazione et Corruptione* and by a work on atomism.

Al-Nawbakhtí is best known for his book on Shi'ite sects, *Fírak al-Sáhir* (K. *fihí maḥdúd fírak afkl al-a'imám wa-úsámi'ah ...*), which was edited by H. Ritter (Istanbul 1931). The work was subsequently edited (but apparently based on Ritter) by Muhammad Sádik al-Brár al-Ullm (Nadjaf 1355/1936).


The book is divided into three sections: an exposition of the Imámite (on which Al-Nawbakhtí wrote one or two independent works) as well as Shi'ite sects. A question exists whether the *Fírak al-Sáhir* is the work of Al-Nawbakhtí or rather derived from the K. *Makálik* wa 'l-fírak of his contemporary, Sayid b. Abú Alláh al-Á'shá' al-Kummi (d. 299/911) (ed. Makhtír, Tehran 1964), as many parallels exist (see the list of most of them in Íkbál, 144-54) between the *Fírak* and the Al-Kummi's book. The explanation that commends itself is that Al-Kummi used Al-Nawbakhtí's work and added sources of his own (see Madelung, *Bemerkungen*).

Madelung suggests that Al-Nawbakhtí used Hishám b. Al-Hakám's K. *Árifátí al-nás fí 'l-a'imám* for the first part of his book, a source used also by al-Á'áshá' al-Kummi (d. 299/911) (ed. Mácrl, Tehran 1964), as many parallels exist (see the list of most of them in Íkbál, 144-54) between the *Fírak* and the Al-Kummi's book. The explanation that commends itself is that Al-Kummi used Al-Nawbakhtí's work and added sources of his own (see Madelung, *Bemerkungen*).
flourishing, with fine markets and a good running water supply. It flourished under the Shabânkâra Kursâns of Abû Sa'd in the 9th/11th century, but was rebuilt by the Saljûq Muhammad b. Malik-Shâh's governor of Fârs and Kirmân, the Atabeg Câwûl Sâkâw (d. 510/1116) (Ibn al-Balkhî, tr. Le Strange, Description of the province of Fârs in Persia, London 1912, 57-8). It then fell into ruins, which were identified by the Russian traveller C. K. al-Âkhbâr, p. 437, 446, 463 and index; al-Bâlâhurî, Anābî, IVB, 100, 104, 109; Mu'ârab al-Zubayrât, Nasâ' Kurâysh, 30-1, 86; Ibn al-Kalbî, Câskel, Tab. 7, Register, II, 111; al-Tabarî, Li'dî, 27, etc.).

One gets the impression that all the persons bearing the nisba of al-Nawfalî are indeed the descendants of Babba, but there are certain homonymities and gaps in continuity which hinder research here. The oldest member of this family of ruwâd must have been (I) Sulaymân b. 'Abd Allâh b. Hâjîrî, whose name figures in some inâbât, but the transmitter thus named, who is cited several times by al-Tabârî (ii, 446, 1885, iii, 347), is probably not the son, for, whilst belonging to the same line, he was living at a later time; al-Mâs'ûdî (Mudâwî, vii, 218-19 = § 2902) mentions him in fact in the story of an occurrence which is said to have taken place at the court of the 'Abbasîd caliph al-Mu'tasîm (218-27833-42 (q.v.)) and in which he is represented as rather necissaries. At Basra, al-Mâs'ûdî mentions in total six members of the family, and these have been put together in a genealogical table (index of the ed. of Ch. Pellat, s.v. al-Nawfalî), but it is likely that this table is incomplete. It is certainly right to add a brother of Sulaymân, (II) 'Isâ b. 'Abd Allâh, cited in an inâbât by Abu 'l-Fârâdî al-Isfahâlî (Mukhtâlî, 155). The following one is a nephew of 'Isâ, (III) Muhammad b. Sulaymân, who, in al-Djâhîz's K. al-Hayawân (iii, 16) retails a dialogue between a Medinan and a Kûfîan concerning the love which their respective homelands bear for the Prophet. This nâwi is also an authority for al-Mâs'ûdî (Mudâwî, vi, 36-9 = § 2267) and, in greater detail, for al-Tabârî (iii, 451-5) regarding relations between the two regions. At Basra, al-Mâs'ûdî has also an authority for the Kûfîan al-Hayawân (136-58754-75 (q.v.)) whom he accompanied in 158/775 and at whose death he was present. It is his son (the no. VI above) who is the transmitter of this story.

There then come Muhammad's brother, (IV) 'Ali b. Sulaymân, then his son, (V) 'Istâf b. Muhammad cited in the Ahrârî (v, 183, 409-10 = §§ 1948, 2161) concerning a tradition about al-Sayyid al-Hîmyarî and about a khabar regarding Sulaymân b. 'Abd al-Malik (69-9715-17 (q.v.)). The best-known member of the family is nevertheless (VI) Abu 'l-Hasan 'Ali b. Muhammad, son of no. III above whom al-Mâs'ûdî (Mudâwî, i, 11 = § 8) and al-Sakhwî, the_Roshûtâl, A history of Muslim histoty, London 186, 506) counts the number of historians. The first, who cites him several times (v, 4, 41, 177, 183, 185, 187, 198, vi, 36 = §§ 1762, 1795, 1942, 1948, 1950, 1951, 2267) attributes to him a K. al-Akhbâr, which must have been utilised by later authors (probably by al-Tabârî, who mentions this nâwi at least 25 times (until the year 173-789) and borrows from him lengthy accounts, likewise Abu 'l-Fârâdî, Makâtîl, 85, 155, 338, 427). To judge by the nature of the traditions transmitted
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by this aristocratic family, it is probable that it showed some sympathy for the Alids.

Now this latter consideration might justly identify this 'Ali b. Muhammad with a Nawfali of absolutely identical name, with the same kunya and ism, who is, in regard to the founder in Morocco of the Idrisid dynasty, Idris I (d. 175/792 [?]), a source for kunya absolutely identical name, with the same and
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Given in the article. Sezgin, GAS, i, 312, devotes a notice to 'Ali b. Muhammad (no. VI) but makes no allusion to al-Nawfali's source.

**NAWRIYYA** (A.), from naur 'flower', a term which, like zahr, designates poetry devoted to the description of flowers; it is practically impossible to separate it, as a genre, from the rawdiyya or rabi‘yya (descriptions of gardens or of the spring, respectively).

Already in the middle of the 5th/11th century, Abu 'l-Husayn al-Himyari (d. 440/1048) sets forth these genres together; he divides his al-Badi‘ fi wasaf al-rabi‘ into (1) poems on the spring, without descriptions of flowers; (2) poems in which two or more flowers; and (3) poems on one flower in particular. The appearance of this kind of poetry is closely connected with contacts with ancient Persia and the progressive urbanisation of the Arabs after the conquests. The process is already discernible in the pre-Islamic period (poems at the court of al-Hira [q.v.]). but does not attain the status of a separate genre before the 'Abbásid period. At the outset, the 'Abbásid poets followed, in the kashīda, the pre-Islamic tradition of describing the floral decoration of taverns in Bacchic scenes, but in the specific khāmariyya [q.v.], the gardens which are mentioned in order to be described. Abu Nuwās [q.v.] generally inserts these descriptions after the theme of the afkār, the normal starting-point for his khāmariyyā; he describes a restricted number of flowers, which he compares to parts of the body (rose = cheek, narcissus = eyes) or to precious stones, which are in fact the most common images in later poetry. Abu Tamlak [q.v.] was the first to replace, in his poem, the nasīb by a description of spring and its flowers, as an imperfect reflection of the maqādīla, and this enjoyed an extraordinary success, not only among the Arab panegyrists but also among the Persian, Turkish and Jewish poets. In Ibn al-Rūmī [q.v.], the description of gardens and flowers becomes an independent poem. The poems are generally abstract, whereas in this later's 'dīqān, either descriptions of spring or of a garden, where nature is depicted as an animate being which praises God by its beauty; or else the description of one or two flowers, generally the narcissus and rose, which, in a famous poem, are the object of a munāṣara [q.v.] in which Ibn al-Rūmī judges in favour of the narcissus (and which was later, at the opening of the 5th/11th century, to give rise to a series of replicas by authors in al-Andalus, in both prose and verse, collected together by al-Himyari). Up to al-Sanawban [d. 334/945 [q.v.]), one is not conscious of floral poetry as being a genre outside that of naqṣ. This particular poet is considered as the main representative, and indeed the creator of this genre, through the abundance of naqṣīyyāt in his dīqān, which take the form of short poems (kīta‘) as well as lengthy kāsidas, and because his descriptions of nature are present in all the poetic genres.

In al-Andalus, this genre was especially appreciated, to the point that practically all Andalusian poetry may be considered as floral poetry. The reasons which are given for justifying this clear preference (exhuberance of nature, the abundance and variety of flowers in al-Andalus) seem to disregard the fragmentary character of the poetic corpus from al-Andalus. Already in al-Himyari’s work, the greater part of the kīta‘ are fragments of the floral prelude of panegyrica, in the manner of Abu Tammān. The most remarkable poets are Ibn Khāsdjā [q.v.], called al-Džannān, and his nephew Ibn al-Zāıkāk [q.v.].

The describing of flowers lends itself to the use of a recherché language and of conceits, which led to naqṣīyyāt entering at a very early date the books on ma‘ṣīna. Among the important comparisons (tashbihāt), as well as in analogies in general.
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NAWRUZ (v.), New (Year’s) Day.

In the Islamic heartlands. The word is frequent represented in Arabic works in the form Nawruz, which appears in Arabic literature as early as the verse of al-Akhtal [q.v.] (see al-Djawaliki, Mu’arrab, ed. A.M. Shākir, Tehran 1966; al-Mu’arrab, Nayruz, day of the Persian solar year and is not represented in al-Mas’udi, Ta’rikh, ii, 408). It was the first day of the Persian solar year and is not represented in the Muslim lunar year (al-Mas’udi, Muridj, iii, 416-17 = §§ 1301-2). In Achaemenid times, the date of Nawruz was collected. The two different dates correspond with the position of the sun was omitted in the false calendar date rather than to the correct traditional one, because it permitted them to collect their dues earlier (al-Makrizi, Nairuzi. Madrid, 1931-1933; A. Mez, Renaissance des Islams, 400-1; Lane (tr.), Thousand and one nights, ii, 496-7; Carra de Vaux, Notice sur un calendrier turc, in Studies presented to E.G. Browne, Cambridge 1922, 106-7; A.V.W. Jackson, Persia past and present, New York 1906, 99-100; G.E. von Grunebaum, Muhammadan festivals, repr. London 1976, 53-6.

Bibliography: In addition to the references given in the text, see Biruni, Chronology, 190-200, etc.; ʻUmar Khayyām, Nairuz-nāma, ed. M. Minovi, Tehran 1312/1933; A. Mez, Renaissance des Islams, 400-1; Lane (tr.), Thousand and one nights, ii, 496-7; Carra de Vaux, Notice sur un calendrier turc, in Studies presented to E.G. Browne, Cambridge 1922, 106-7; A.V.W. Jackson, Persia past and present, New York 1906, 99-100; G.E. von Grunebaum, Muhammadan festivals, repr. London 1976, 53-6.

In addition to the references given in the text, see Biruni, Chronology, 190-200, etc.; A.M. Shakir, Tehran 1966; al-Mu’arrab, Nayruz. From the time of harvest and was celebrated by popular rejoicings, but it also marked the date when the false calendar date rather than to the correct traditional one, because it permitted them to collect their dues earlier (al-Makrizi, Khbij, ed. Wiet, iv, 263-4). By the time of the caliph al-Mutawakkil the date of collection of ēbrādī had advanced by almost two months, and in 243/858 he fixed the date of Nawruz as 17 Hazirān, which approximately also the old time (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 1448; al-Biruni, Chronology, 36-7). The reform had no lasting effect and the caliph al-Mu’tadid was compelled again to move the date which was fixed as 11 Hazirān (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 2143). Later again, in the Saldjuk sultan Malikshah’s reform of the calendar [see DJALALI], the Persian astronomers proclaimed the vernal equinox as Nawruz (Ibn al-Asigh, x, 34; 467 A.H.), and the first day of the new era fell on 10 Ramadān 471/15 March 1079.

Nawruz was celebrated also in Syria, and was adopted in Egypt, as elsewhere, and has been retained by the Copts as the New Year’s Day (al-Makrizi, Khbij, iv, 241-2), but it now falls on 10 or 11 September, see Lane, Manners and customs of the modern Egyptians, ch. xxvi “Periodical public festivals, etc.”; G.E. von Grunebaum, Muhammadan festivals, New York 1951, 54-5.

Popular festivities have marked Nawruz wherever it has been celebrated. In Sāsānīd Persia the kings held a great feast, and it was customary for presents to be made to them while the people who gathered to make merry in the streets sprinkled each other with water and lit fires. Both in ʻIrāk and Egypt, these customs persisted in Muslim times (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 2163; al-Muṣʿūdi, Muridj, vii, 277 = § 2965; al-Makrizi, loc. cit.; al-Kalkhaṇḍi, ii, 410), and although al-Mu’tadid attempted to prevent the customary horseplay in the streets during the midsummer saturnalia, he was unsuccessful (al-Ṭabarī, loc. cit.). In the various parts of the Ottoman Empire, the day was celebrated as a public holiday, and in Persia it has throughout its history been marked by great festivities as the chief secular holiday of the year.

Many of the features of these celebrations in Persia are familiar from other cultures where a new year or a new phase of life is being marked, such as the donning of new clothes just before the New Year actually begins, or where the end of the season of winter is marked, in rural society by such practices as the lighting of piles of thorn and brushwood and then the jumping over them by the family, friends and neighbours. But above all characteristic of the New Year celebrations is the preparation on New Year’s Day of the háft sín “the seven items beginning with the letter sín” (sc. sīb “apple”, sīr “garlic”, sumāk “sumac”, sinjdīj “jujube”, sumānī “a kind of sweetmeat”, sīka “vignar” and sabzī “greens”), which are placed on a cloth spread on the floor in front of a mirror and candles in company with dishes of certain foods. See Bess A. Donaldson, The wild rue. A study of Muhammadan magic and folklore in Iran, London 1938, 120-3.

In East Africa.

As recently as 1971 Tibbetts reported that the Nawruz calendar, as modified by Sidi Čelebi, was used by navigators throughout the Indian Ocean. He had corrected the practice followed in the works of Ahmad b. Maḍjīd and by Sulaymān al-Mahrī, who did not observe an intercalary day in each fourth year, so that their Nawruz calendar receded ten days in each forty years. On the eastern African coast, Swahili fishermen and agriculturalists all used the unreformed Nawruz calendar, finding the Islamic calendar suitable only for religious purposes. In Swahili, Nawruz is vocalised as Nairuz. Its earliest attestation is in an Arabic History of Kilwa redacted ca. 1550, recording the Portuguese arrival on the coast in 1498 and using both calendars. Doubtless it had been in use long before.

The Nairuzi ceremonies in Zanzibar and Pemba display a symetresm between Islam and earlier religious practices. In the 1950s they were studied in Zanzibar by Sir John Gray, then Chief Justice. Study in Pemba by the late Dr P.L. Lienhardt in 1958 has not yet seen the light of day.

The ceremonies are organised by waqfale, with a view to propitiating mizimu, best described as genii loci. These are often hereditary from father to son, but women also may act. The mizimu may be malign or benign, and it is wiser not to offend them, on land or at sea. This is especially important in the seven days before Nairuzi. A feast is held on the first day, after which fishing and collecting firewood are banned for the week. On the sixth day Kurân school pupils assemble at the teachers’ houses. They recite from the Kurân, partake of a meal, and sleep in the teacher’s house. The next day they proceed to the beach for a further recitation. These recitations are apparently the only Islamic element among the ceremonies. The
pupils and older persons then bathe ceremonially, and put on clean clothes. In Zanzibar, women danced and sang and waved branches in the streets. A ceremonial meal followed, women preparing a kitawee (savory stew). Then, at a given signal, all fires were extinguished, to be relit with firesticks, the most primitive of all human methods. The old ashes were carried to crossroads, where a fire was started. While some elements in these ceremonies can be paralleled elsewhere, their origin, meaning and purpose is not wholly clear in this context.


(S.G.P. Freeman-Greeneville)

**AL-NAWSHARI** [see AL-NUSHARI].

**NAWUSIYYA,** *Nawusiyya*, the name of an extremist Shi'ite sect (ruzafiy) attached to a certain Ibn Nawis or Ibn Naous (sometimes changed into Ibn Munis), whose personal name varies according to the sources ('Adiljan, 'Abd Allâh, Hamlàn, etc.), or else attached to a place in the vicinity of Hit called Nawûsaa (see Ibn Khurradadbih, 72, 217; al-Baladhuri, *Fatâh*, 179; Yákût, s.v.; al-Ibrâhîmi, index; Le Strange, *Lands*, 64-5).

The Nawusiyya were characterized by the idea (sometimes attributed to the caliph Abû Dja'far al-Mansûr, 138-58/754-75) that the form must be a hypercorrection from A. nuwwâb, pl. of *nuwwâb* [g.v.], used, as often in Persian usage (cf. arabb ‘master’, umâla ‘workman’, and see D.C. Phillott, *Higher Persian grammar*, Calcutta 1919, 65) as a singular.

The title was originally granted by the Mughal emperors to denote a viceroy or governor of a province, and was certainly current by the 18th century, often in combination with another title, e.g. the Nawáb-Wazir of Awadh (Awaâd), the Nawáb-Nâzim of Bengal. A nawáb might be subordinate to another governor, as was the Nawáb of Arcot (Ariqat) to the Nâzim of Hydardârâbâd, and the title tended to become a designation of rank without necessarily having any office attached to it. Several of the rulers of princely states in British Indian times bore this title, e.g. the Nawáb of Bhopâl and Râmpûr [g.v.].

In the late 18th century, the term was imported into English usage in the form Nabob, applied in a somewhat derogatory manner to Anglo-Indians who had returned from the subcontinent laden with wealth (cf. Sir Percival Spear, *The Nabobs, a study of the social life of the English in eighteenth-century India*, London 1963). The word gained currency in England especially after the production in 1768 of Samuel Foote's play, *The Nabob*, and eventually passed into other languages, including French (cf. the title of Daudet's *Le Nabab, mœurs parisiennes*, 1877).


**NAWWAB SAYYID SIDDIK HASAN KHAN** al-Husayni al-Bukhari al-Kannawdji (1248-1303/1832-90), Indian writer, statesman and poet.

He was born at Bareilly in Rohelkhand on 19 Dhimadâd 1248/14 October 1832, the son of Sayyid Awaâl Hasân and a daughter of the Mufti Muhammâd Iwaâd, his family claiming descent from al-Husayn b. 'Ali, hence from Fatimah and the Prophet. According to the family genealogy, the family moved from Medina to Bâghdâd and thence to Bukhârâ, until Sayyid Djâlal Gulsûrh took up residence in 635/1237-8; his grandson was the famed mystic and traveller, Djâlal al-Din Husayn [g.v.], known as Makhûlîm-î Djâhânîây Djâhânâsgâd, d. 785/1384, who is buried at Ucch near Multân. His great-grand-uncle, Djâlal al-Din Bâhlîl muqaddas from Multân to Dîhil where the Sultan BahluL Lodi [see Lodîs] gave him a qââqîr (title) at Kânnawâd [g.v.] which became the family seat for many generations. Sayyid 'Ali Aâshâr of the fifth generation there became a Shi'a when the area fell under the Nawâbs of Awadh (Oudh). The family remained Shi'a for the next five generations until Sayyid Awaâl 'Ali Khân *Anwâr Djâng Bahâdur* (d. 1218/1803), keeper of the Golkônda Fort under the Nâzîm of Hydardârâbâd, Deccan, whose son, Sayyid Awaâl Hasân (d. 1253/1837) renounced Shi'ism and severed relations with the Shi'is in the family. Awaâl Hasân was one of the deputies of Sayyid Ahmad Bârîwâl Sâhid (d. 1246/1831 [q.v.]), and Siddîk Hasân was the second of his three sons.

Siddîk Hasân acquired a traditional Islamic education in his home town and the north Indian cities of Fârrukhâbâd, Kânîpûr and Dîhil, where he studied under its Mufti Sa'di al-Din Aâzûrâh (d. 1285/1868) for about two years. Memories of his father's association with the Dîhilî movement and education under Aâzûrâh, influenced Siddîk Hasân to become one of the major advocates of the new creed of the Aâlî- Nahfî ' [g.v.], who rejected taklîf in fîkh. He began his career as a junior clerk in the princely states of Bhopâl (1855-6) and Tonk (1858). A year later he was appointed to write the official history of Bhopal and married Dâkhîyya Begum, daughter of the Prime Minister (Maddar al-Mahmûd) of Bhopâl, Munshî Djamal al-Dîn Khân, in 1860. He performed the Pilgrimage in 1285/1869, meeting many *ulamâ* in the Yemen and Hîjâz, and acquiring ms. of important Arabic works. On his return, he was appointed inspector of schools. A year later he became the state's head clerk (Mir Munshî) and was awarded the title of Khân.

He found the great opportunity of his life when Nawâb Shâh Dâhân Begum (reigned 1868-1901) married him in May 1871, with formal British consent. Her first husband, Nawâb Bâkî Muhammad Khân, had died in 1284/1867. Two months later he was elevated to the post of Mumtâzâm al-Mahmûd, second only to that of the Prime Minister. In September 1872 the Begum prevailed upon the British authorities to award Siddîk Hasân all the official
honours bestowed on her late husband, including a djagir worth Rs. 75,000 a year. A month later, the British Government conferred upon him the title of Nawab Wali'djdh Amir al-Mulk, with entitlement to a 17-gun salute within British India.

Siddik Hasan's marriage to the Begum was resented by a group in the royal family, especially by her daughter and heir-apparent, Sultan Djahan Begum, who feared being bypassed if a male child were to be born of the new marriage. The dissident party found the British Political Agent at Bhopal, Sir Lepel Griffin, more than sympathetic. On his advice, the first British accusation of treachery was made against the Nawwab Walddjdh Amir al-Mulk for his deposition. His important works nevertheless included some Yemenis. He dispatched emissaries to

In his religious writings, Siddik Hasan repeats a limited range of topics: e.g. opposition to fikhi taklid (which he regarded as responsible for the Muslims' intellectual stagnation), tasawwuf and fikhi rigidness, necessity of tafsir, admonition against excessive display and decadence in religious and civil ceremonies, and exposition of the conditions preceding the Day of Judgement. Unscrupulous copying from previous works attracted sharp criticism from some contemporary 'ulama', e.g. 'Abd al-Ha'y al-Lakhnawi (Ibriz al-ghayy) and Tabarakat al-najid, Lucknow 1301/1884. His literary activity, however, continued under the protection of the British.

His son lists his works which had alienated Hanafi personalities, including the Mahdi of the Sudan. Griffin had originally recommended to the Viceroy, Lord Dufferin, the death sentence for the Nawwab or his marriage with the Begum placed enormous funds in the hands of the Begum (reigned 1901-26), who feared being bypassed with entitlement to a djagir. On his advice, the Nawwab Walddjdh Amir al-Mulk was allowed to print his books in India, Cairo and Istanbul for free distribution worldwide. A latter-day printing press and a team of court 'ulamā', at his disposal. He had free access to eight official printing presses and a team of court 'ulamā', as well as the 'ulamd', he had alienated Hanafi

At present, the town (lat. 29° 14' N., long. 54° 18' W.) was a figurehead, and real power was exercised by her daughter, Sultan Djahan Begum and the Prime Minister henceforth appointed by the British, whilst Siddik Hasan remained under house-arrest in his palace at Bhopal. He dispatched emissaries to

In his religious writings, Siddik Hasan repeats a limited range of topics: e.g. opposition to fikhi taklid (which he regarded as responsible for the Muslims' intellectual stagnation), tasawwuf and fikhi rigidness, necessity of tafsir, admonition against excessive display and decadence in religious and civil ceremonies, and exposition of the conditions preceding the Day of Judgement. Unscrupulous copying from previous works attracted sharp criticism from some contemporary 'ulama', e.g. 'Abd al-Ha'y al-Lakhnawi (Ibriz al-ghayy) and Tabarakat al-najid, Lucknow 1301/1884. His literary activity, however, continued under the protection of the British.
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The history of this terminology has still to be written.

In the oldest version of Aristotle's logic, a com-

pendium written by 'Abd Allîb b. al-Mukaffa' (executed 1397/56 or later) or his son Muhammad,

'ilm and 'isma are already distinguished as branches of

philosophy (hikma), but 'ilm is defined as a tabâsûr and
takfakkur of the kalb (i.e. of the mind); cf. G. Furlani,
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Mantik li-Ibn al-Mukaffa', ed. M. Taqî Dânishpažhâb, 

Teheran 1977, 2, 2 f.

The oldest speculative theologians of Islam were

perhaps more familiar with the distinction 'ilm
'shâriy' than with nazar'i 'isma'. The 'akl is generally
recognised as a 'root' of the Mu'tazilî system.

The Zâdi al-Kâsim mentioned it (beginning of the 3rd
century A.H.) among his uṣûl: 'akl, Kurân and sunna
(Madelung, 129). Nazar was felt to be an innovation
like nû and kiyâd in fikr; the Hanbali school objected
to it, though the leading theologian Zâdi al-
'akl without hesitation—of course the 'akl created
and equipped by God—as a source of knowledge.
Not blind belief ('tablîd) nor deduction from the unknown
(kiyâd) were to lead it to the acceptance of the Kurân,
sunna and idgâma, but quite certain knowledge. There
is nothing which Ibn Hazm insists upon so often and
so emphatically as this; there is no other way to cer-
tainty than that of tracing it to sensual perception
(hisû) and intuition of the intelligence ('akl). Indeed,
sensual perception is so much preferred by him that
comprehension by the reason is called a sixth idrâk
(Kitâb al-Fisâq, i, Cairo 1889, 4-7). The philosophical
position of Ibn Hazm recalls Hellenistic eclecticism,
according to which all human cognition arises either
from sensual perception or intuition or is derived from
these sources through the intermediary of proof.
Many, however, emphasise the direct evidence of sen-
sual perception (cf. already nûra X, 101 etc.; van Es, 
239), and regard the method of proof as a difficult and
uncertain one. Hence we have the emphasis laid on
general agreement (A. idgâma and idgâma') as a possi-
ble, but often doubted (cf. van Es 308 ff.), criterion of
truth. Only where there is no agreement is investi-
gation necessary.

The dualistic epistemology of the eccentics (senses x
reason) was very greatly modified in Islam by the
penetration of the intellectual monism into Neo-
Platonic mysticism and Aristotelian logic. While dif-
f erent stages in human knowledge were distinguished,
true knowledge was only to be attained by rational
intuition and the intermediary activity of the mind.
The main thing for the Neo-Platonist was intuition
(nazar, bašar). It is remarkable how in the Neo-
Platonic Theology of Aristotle, the latter is made to say
(Arabic text ed. Fr. Dieterici, Leipzig 1881, 163):
'Plato recognised all things bi-nazar al-'akl (intuition),
lâ bi-manâsh uwa-kîyâd', i.e. Plato as the divine perceives
everything at once like God himself and pure 'akl.
Nazar in this sense of direct perception is constructed
with ilâ, in other cases, however, with fikr. Indeed, the
transmitted reflection of the human intelligence, the
Theory generally uses fikr and rasaâyîa and the world
of senses, with which our soul is associated, is called
'ilm al-fikr wa l-rasaâyîya. Following the Theory, the
Muslim mystics generally used nazar for spiritual perception (cf. L. Massignon, *Essai sur les origines du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane*, Paris 1922, index).

In *kālām*, however, in the disputes of the theological sects, whose members sometimes are called *ahl al-nazar* (*q.*), nazar receives the dialectical meaning of "reflection", "rational, discursive thinking"; it is an obligation of man, can produce knowledge (*tīm;* see Gardet-Anawati, 350 ff.) and may be classified as nazar al-ḥālī (*q.* van Ess, 238 ff.; Peters, 57 ff.; Bernard, *Problème*, 201 ff.). In his *Makālāt* (ed. H. Ritter, Wiesbaden 1963, 51-2), al-Ashʿarī gives a survey of the different views of the eight parties of the *Rasaʿifī* fi *l-nazar wa l-kīyās*. According to him, groups 1-3 consider all cognition (*maʿārīf*) as necessary (*qiddir*) (i.e. given with the mind itself or not given), so that nazar and kīyās can add nothing to them; these, as well as group 8, which traces all knowledge to the Prophet of God and the Imām, differ from the rest on this point. The other four recognise some kind of acquired knowledge (in both cases the reference is to the apprehension of God) as follows: 4 (the Aṣḥāb al-Hishām b. al-Ḥakam) by nazar wa *l-istīdālī*; 5 (al-Ḥasan b. Muṣḥa) possibly by a kind of kāb which cannot be more exactly defined (cf. this kāb with the kāb al-ṣafīl of the later Al-Ashʿarī sect) as necessary (idtīrdr, *maʿdrij*) (deduction by analogy) and *istīdāl* (*proof by circumstantial evidence*). From what we know of kīyās in fīkh (*see kīyās*) (and of kīyās in medicine (see Masʿūdī, *Warith*, iv, 40, vii, 172 ff. = §§ 1368, 2857 ff.), we have probably to think of a process which is a mixture of induction and deduction, often used very arbitrarily. Analogous cases, often superficially regarded as similar (cf. Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḏokhrāzī, Maṣṭḥīl al-*ulūm*, ed. van Vloten, Leiden 1895, repr. 1968, 8-9), were sought for, the *sīla*, i.e. not the actual cause (*causa*) but the reason (*ratio*) in a higher conception of method or species, under which the further cases could be grouped. For Aristotle and his followers in Islam (al-Fārābī, etc.), deduction had one meaning; they believed in causality or even in the creative activity of abstract thought. The great majority of Muslim theologians, jurists and physicians did not rise so far.

It was not till the school of al-Ashʿarī that the method of nazar superficially grasped penetrated into kālām, and kālām was defined as *tīm al-nazar wa l-istīdālī*. Rejected at first by the majority, gradually tolerated and used as an instrument against heretics and sophists, nazar in the orthodox school was finally recognized as a religious obligation.

Let us now turn back to the general conception of the *ulūm nazarīyya*. Al-Fārābī (d. 339/950) distributed them from the philosophical point of view in a special treatise (*fiḥāl al-*ulūm*, ed. ʿUthmān Amin, Cairo 1968) in a way which became the model for later times. It was he who first worked on the logic of Aristotle, whence his school was often called that of the *Manṭiqīyya*. He assumed, with Aristotle, that the *sīla* contained in itself the fundamental principles of all knowledge, the evidence of which had simply to be acknowledged. But the way of reflection and proof leads to the evident, the culmination of which, apodeictic proof (*barḥân*), is described in the *Posterior Analytics*. From this eminence, the branches of knowledge can be surveyed. After some observations on philosophy (ch. i; cf. the *Stoics*) there follows the chapter on logic—whether as instrument of philosophy or as a part of it is a matter of indifference. Logic itself is, of course, a nazar with an object of its own.

Next come the sciences of physics, mathematics and metaphysics with main and subsidiary branches. Each is a nazar. But it is noted that, for example, among the physical sciences, medicine is a mixture of theoretical and practical, and similarly music and mathematical subjects. Metaphysics is, however, like logic purely theoretical. Finally, the three practical sciences of Aristotle, sc. ethics, economics and politics, are united under the head of political science, with the addition of *fīkh* and kālām; al-Fārābī remarks that the science of *fīkh* and the art (šināʿa) of kālām have to do partly with opinions (ʿanāʾ), partly with actions (qāʿīf).

In summary, let us compare with this philosophical division that of the Aṣḥāb al-Kāhirī theologian ʿAbd al-Qāhir b. Tahir al-Baghdādī (d. 1209-78) in his *Usul al-dīn*, Istanbul 1928, 8-14 (cf. Wensinck, 250-63). After the distinction between divine knowledge and the knowledge possessed by other living creatures is laid down, the latter is classified as follows:

1. *darūrī* (necessary, directly evident)
2. *bāḥthī* 2. *hāssī* (internal and external perception)
3. *muktasab* (= *ulūm nazarīyya*) (acquired)
4. *qiddiryya* (*dāʿīyya*) (knowledge acquired by reason and by law)

The *ulūm nazarīyya* are further divided into four, according to the way in which they are acquired:

1. *Istīdāl bi l-*qiddir min ḍiqāḥ al-kīyās wa l-*ulūm* (speculative theology);
2. *Maṣʿūm min ḍiqāḥ al-tadārīq wa l-*ulūm* (e.g. medicine);
3. *Maṣʿūm min ḍiqāḥ al-*ṣāḥīh* (legal science);

Compared with the *sīla* monism of al-Fārābī, this division still looks rather eclectic. But from the 11th to the 13th centuries A.D. philosophy and theology, without becoming one, were approaching one another more closely. Ibn Sinā, who builds upon al-Fārābī, was the intermediary. Al-Qazālī sought to combine the *sīla* of the Neo-Platonic mysticism with the *fīkh* of the rationalist thinkers, and Fahār al-Dīn al-Rāzī appropriated the methods or proof of Aristotelian logic to a much greater extent than his theological predecessors.

Nazar — Nazim Farrukh Husayn


Nāzīla (A.), active participle of the verb nazala [q.v.], "to go down", made into a noun with the specialised use (mainly among the Mālikīs of the Maghrib, but, occasionally, elsewhere and among other law schools) as a legal term meaning "specific case, case in question". The plural nāzuṣīl figures in the title of a fairly considerable number of collections, the greater part of them still in manuscript, put together by jurists utilising material from their own experience and from the works of their predecessors in order to offer the public, but above all, the kā dib [q.v.], a choice of questions bearing on specific cases and accompanied by the solutions in practice adopted.

The principle of the nāzuṣīl is inscribed in the Mālikī school's tradition, whose founder Mālik b. Anas [q.v.] already preferred to deal with real cases rather than construct a doctrine based upon theoretical solutions for hypothetical problems. In one sense, the nāzila would appear to be identical with the fatwa [q.v.]; it is neverthless to be distinguished from it by the fact that it is not, properly speaking, a juridical consultation but a case which is set forth as a real case and the way in which it was resolved by such-and-such jurist designated by name in the case when the detailing of the matter and the decision are taken from an earlier work. One should however add that a certain imprecision in the use of the technical terms introduces a kind of confusion and prevents one from making a great leap to find a known work, that of al-Buzūzī (d. 841/1438 [q.v.]), the Dījāmī al-nāzuṣīl imīmm nāzīla min al-khāṣṣāyā b-sīla aw sīla, which is one of the main sources of the famous K. al-Mīyār al-mughrib wa l-djāmī, al-mu'rib 'ammā ta'dammanahu fatāwī 'l-ulamā? Iṣrīhiyya wa l-Andalus wa l-Maghrib of al-Wansharī (d. 914/1508 [q.v.]), lib. Fās 1315, 12 vols., repr. Beirut, partial tr. E. Amar, in AM, xii, 1908. In the second half of the 19th century, a Moroccan jurist, al-Mahdī al-Wazzānī, obviously wished to remodel and update, whilst mainly utilising, al-Wansharī's master work, by taking up again its title, al-Mīyār al-djādīl, lib. Fās 1328/1909, 11 vols. Out of this enormous mass of documents, J. Berque has extracted the Nāzuṣīl al-muzā'ara which he has extensively commented upon and translated (Rabat 1940). The list of sources upon which al-Wangārī sees directly to have drawn (60-1) comprises nearly two dozen texts, which only six bear the title of nāzuṣīl and three of fatāwāfatāwā, that is to say, as often happens in Arabic, several terms are used side-by-side to express a single concept without one being able to discern nuances of meaning amongst them, since their terminological shift is so shifting. The result is that semantic evolution distorts classifications which seem to have become established, so that nāzīla and fatāwā end up being employed interchangeably, just as e.g. risāla ends up being used for mukāma and vice-versa.

Bibliography: Given in the article. (Ed.)

Nazim Farrukh Husayn (ca. 1016-81/1607-70), a Persian poet. Mulā Nāzīm, son of Shāh Rīdā Sabzawārī, was born in Harāt about 1016/1607 and spent the greater part of his life there. Little is known of his career, except that he made a journey to India and, after spending several years in Dijāhā zangār, returned to his native town where he died in 1081/1670-71. He was court poet of the Beglbergis of Harāt and his greatest work, the Yūsuf...
u Zulaykha, begun in 1058/1648 and finished in 1072/1661-2, was dedicated to ... 1966; Yusuf He Menofis, 1967; Demokles'in hlici, 1974; Ivan Ivanovif var miydi yok muydu?, 1985. (c) Novels: Kan konus-

June 1963. He was the grandson of Mehmed Nazim distorted and thinks that some of the details put in by him can only have a humorous effect on the reader. But it must be agreed that Nazim judged the taste of his period very well, for his work became extremely popular, especially in Central Asia. While Firdawsi's poem is now known to only a few enthusiasts, manuscripts of Nazim's Yüsun u Zulaykha are still quite common in the bazaars of the larger cities of Central Asia, as are those of the even more celebrated version of the same subject by Djam [g.o.]. His lyrical Dü slim is less well known, but it contains many excellent poems (especially ghazals), some of which are even at the present day sung by the classically-trained singers of Bukhara and Samarkand.

**Bibliography:** H. Ethê, GHP, ii, 231-2; Rieu, Catalogue, 692b and 370a; Yüsun u Zulaykha, lith. Lucknow 1870; J. Rypka et ali, History of Iranian literature, Dordrecht 1968, 300. (E. BETHELS)

NAZİM, MUSTAFA, an Ottoman poet of the 11th century whose poetry is known only from the samples found in the tezkires and mevlevis (although Beliğ reports the existence of a complete diwān; cf. also Sādīq-i ʿOthmānî). Born in Istanbul as the son of Yeni Bağcıklı Ördek Ismaʿil Efendi, a yeničeri efendi, i.e. head of the government registry office for the names and salaries of the Janissaries, he himself first rose to the position of baṣr-i baṭli (head clerk) in the same office and later was appointed to the same position his father had held. He died in 1108/1696 returning from Mustafâ II's second campaign against Austria.

The samples of Nazım's poetry that we have seen point to moderate poetic qualities without striking individuality. It is reported that he also had musical talent and composed. His brother ʿOthmān Hamdi (died 1132/1920-21) was also a poet besides being a well-known calligrapher.

Bibliography:
Sağy, Tekhir, Sağy, Tekhir, Beliğ, Nukhbat-ı âtrab-i derya Zühtüt-E Şehir, ʿShirḵ ʿel-silām Mehdī Esmâʿîl Efendi, Aṣār el-ʿâṭrāb, Mustakmāzām Süleymān Saʿdeddin Efendi, Tuhfe-yi bâṣr-i Ṭabâb, Saʿdīq-i ʿOthmānî, iv, 534; Hammer-Purgstall, Geschichte der osmanischen Dichtkunst, iii, 572-6; Flügel, Die arabischen, persischen und türkischen Handschriften der kaiserlich-königlichen Hofbibliothek zu Wien, i, 646-5; K. J. Başağaçan, Etablissements de la littérature ottomane, Istanbul 1910, 127; Th. Menzel, in EI, s.v. Nazım; M. C. Baysun, in IA, s.v. Nazım Mustafa Efendi, Hammer-Purgstall, Flügel and Başağaçan confused Nazım with the more important poet Yahya Nazım [q.v.] either with respect to biography or to œuvre. These three sources apparently led Menzel to attribute to Nazım part of the large diwān of Nazım, who is erroneously named Nazım in EI [see Nazım, Yahya]. (E.G. AMBROS)

NAZİM, YAHYA, the most important Ottoman religious poet of his period, as is apparent from his epithet Naʿý-gī, the singer of hymns. Born in 1059/1649 in Kaşfam Pağal at Istanbul, he entered the Serai as a boy, where he received the education of the Endewin and had the opportunity to acquire special proficiency in Arabic and Persian. He showed a talent for poetry and considerable musical ability. His beautiful voice and his work as a poet and composer gained him the favour of Sultan Murâd IV. He was given important offices at the court as a result: the office of a kâleş-i ʿâqsi to the kâfî-i kâfî; he next became mevlevi baṣr and kuro yemisti baṣr and attained considerable influence. He then retired of his own accord and became baṣr baṣr. Later, he made the pilgrimage to Mecca. He remained in Medina as a muqavvar, where he died at the age of 80 in 1139/1726. According to another statement (Bursalı Mehmed Tahir), he died in Edirne.

He flourished under Mehmed IV and down to the reign of Ahmed III. He was a member of the Mewlewi order. Sheykhu Neshātī-yi Mewlewi was his teacher in poetry and probably also in music. Nazım is the most religious poet of his period. He devoted the whole of his poetical talent to the naʿt or hymn. His Diwān therefore resembles a warrant of pardon (kerāt-i ġufrān). He also gave special attention to the devotional forms of the tevhīd, tabārīd and mandāqāt.

His Diwān, first printed in Constantinople in 1257/1841, forms a thick volume of 500 pages, on which one-third is devoted to the naʿt in the form of 60 kaşās, hundreds of ʿhazās, ʿkīfās, ʿtekbīs and tekbīs, müseddels and muḥammēs, ṭuruṣī and a mevlevis for the Prophet. The Diwān is divided into five parts, each of which is in turn a kind of Diwān in itself. He also wrote madhḥīyâs for Mehmed IV and Mustafâ II, and there is also the Sevdāh bul 1957) is based on 5 Istanbul ms. plus a ms. duvānīe.

Nazım was a clever technician who gave expression to his effort for variety and change, not in the matter but in the form. In all his works, however, a deep love of religious belief, even fanaticism, is marked. His poems are a true reflection of the inclination of the period for religion and Sūfism.

Bibliography: Feṭîn, Tazkera, Istanbul 1271, 415-16; Taṣyār-zade Ahmed ʿAtā, Taʾrīkh, Istanbul 1293, i, 151-96; Khazren-i funūn, Istanbul 1312, ii, 245-7; El ʿotūs, no. 72; Bursalı Mehmed Tahir, ʿOthmānî miʿâlisâf, i, 452; Kaynarza ʿAtâ, Ateş Mehdī Fuʿād and Shihāb al-Dīn Suleyman, Yeni ʿOthmâni taʾrīkh-i edhusiyat, Istanbul 1332, 371-1; I. Neğmî, Taʾrīkh-i edhisiyat dervishleri, Istanbul 1338, i, 170-1; Abû ʾIsâhak Ismâʿîl Efendi-zade Esâd Mehdī Efendi, Aṭrāb al-ʿâṭrāb fi taḥkîrat sunfî adârî (takım of the singers), IA art. Nazım, Yahya (Halâk İpekten). (W. HARTNER)

NAZİR, NAZİR AL-SAMT (A.), Eng. and Fr. nadrî, the bottom, the pole of the horizon (invisible) under the observer in the direction of the vertical, also the deepest (lowest) point in the sphere of heaven. The nadir is the opposite pole to the zenith [see SAMT AL-RAʾS].

The word nazır (from nazara “to see”, “to observe” originally (and generally) has the meaning diametrically opposite a point on the circumference of a circle or the surface of a sphere; we find mukâbala as a synonym of nazir in this general meaning [see also murâkaba].

W. HARTNER

NAZİR AL-MAZALIM [see MAZALIM]

NAZİR, the pen-name of the Indo-Muslim Persian poet, Muḥammad Husayn, who flourished during the 10th/16th and early 11th/17th centuries, d. 1021/1612-13. He belonged originally to the Nāqshīrūr, from where he went to Kāshān during his youth. There he participated in poetical contests with the leading local poets of the day. He was among the first Persian poets who migrated from their native land
during the Safavid period to seek their fortune at the Mughal court. On his arrival in India (ca. 1002/1593-4), he decided to go on a pilgrimage to Mecca, for which his expenses were paid by his patron. Attacked by the Bedouins during the journey, he lost his possessions, but was able to continue his journey thanks to the help he received from Akbar's foster brother, Khânsâymîzâdî (Mirza 'Azîz Kokâ [q.v.]), who also happened to be on his way to Mecca at the same time. On returning from the pilgrimage he settled down at Ahrâmâbâd in Gujûrat. It is reported that he spent the last twelve years of his life in retirement devoting himself to the learning of Arabic and the study of the bukhârî and exegesis. When Djaçîngîr became ruler, he invited Nazîrî to the court. In 1019/1610-11 the poet presented himself with a kâsidâ, for which he was handsomely rewarded and admitted to the royal service. The emperor also gave him a substantial land grant in appreciation of a ghâzal which Nazîrî composed as an inscription for a building. The poet died in Ahrâmâbâd in 1021/1612-13, and was buried there.

Nazîrî was a man of considerable means. He depended not only on poetry for his source of income; he was also engaged in commercial pursuits, and, according to the Ma'âthîr-i Rahîmî, had a successful business as a goldsmith. He is praised by various writers for his hospitable nature and for his openness and generosity towards friends and visitors. He belonged to the Shi'î sect, and his devotion to that faith is reflected in his kâsidas honouring the eighth Shi'î imâm, 'Alî al-Rîdâ. It would seem that he held fixed religious views, for in a kâsidâ addressed to Akbar's second son, Murâd (d. 1008/1600), he denounces as heretics the authors of the eclectic religion that Akbar tried to promote [see biwâr], and praises the prince for his efforts to counteract it.

Nazîrî holds a place of distinction among the leading poets of the Mughal period, and his achievements have been rightly acknowledged by contemporary and later sources. He has left a sizable dîwân comprising kâsidas, ghâzals, târkîb-bands, târdjîl-bands, biyâs and râbî'îs. His poetic skill is evident in all these genres, but it is the ghâzal in which his true talents are revealed. Nazîrî's ghâzals contain mystical and philosophical ideas, and are conspicuous for their modes of thought and expression as well as for their music. He is also the author of several elegiac compositions which are noted for their poignant and sincere feelings. His poems are often patterned after those of early masters, such as Anwârî and Khânsâyî [q.v.], but his ghâzals show the influence of the models of his kâsidâ, and Hâfiz [q.v.], who sets the tone for his ghâzals.

al-Nürî. In 1065/1654-5 he became šeyḫ (geist-nāḥi‘īn [q.v.]) in the Khalwetî monastery of Yawashđje Mehmed Ağa near Şehr Eminî, later (1105/1693) also preacher (waṣṣa‘) at the Şulţân Wâlûde mosque. He died on Ashādż 1112/14 April 1701 and was buried in a special türbe. His son was ’Abd al-Rahmân Râfi‘. Nazmî was considered a high authority on hadith. He wrote a number of works, none of which have been printed, including the Ḥadîṣiyat al-ğâwûd ("Present of the Brethren"), comprising biographies of the seven greatest Khalwetî personalities (Yûsuf al-Makhdûmī; Muhammad Râkiyî; Şahîh-Kubîdî-i Şairîs; 4 Al-Medîjî-i Şairîs; Şahîh al-Dîn-i Siwâsî; 5 Al-Medîjî-i Siwâsî; ’Abd al-Abâd al-Nûrî) and some accounts of their successors.

His poetical works consist of the rhymed Turkish translation of the first book of the Mevlânen of Qalâl ad-Dîn Rûmî; a diwān of the usual type (with many hymns and sacred songs); and the Mî‘ydr al-tankat ("Touchstone of the order").

Bibliography: Mehmed Thürûyya, Sigîlî-i ʿothmâniî, iv, 560; Hîlîmî, ʿZyârî-i evliyâ‘î, Istanbul, 1325, 120-1; Sâmi, ʿKâmi‘ al-ʿâlîm, viii, 4589-90; Bursaîlî Mehmed Tâhir, ʿOthmâniî mû‘alîflîsî, i, 175; Hâmmîr, GOD, iii, 596-7; Başmîdîyan, ʿEssat sur l’histoire de la littérature ottomane, Istanbul 1910, 127; IA, art. s.v. (Abûlûbâlî Gîlpînârî). (T. MENZEL)

AL-NAZÜR (A.), a term used in Muslim Spain and certain parts of the Maghrib (nâdür) in mediaeval times to denote a look-out or watch-tower of one kind or another, and, in parts of the 19th-century Maghrib at least, a lighthouse. Based on one of the so-called intensive forms of the participial pattern fa‘ā‘ū, used to convey the idea of habitual or occupational activity, the word can be said originally to denote the man whose business it was to keep watch, for it is clearly in this sense (pace Dozy’s "une tour" [Suppl., s.v.]) that Ibn Bâtîta [q.v.] uses it (iv, 364-5) in an account of a Christian descent on the Andalusian coast from ships lying off Suhaîlî, now Fuengirola. He does, it is true, speak of his coming upon the hurûd al-nâdür in the vicinity of the port, but he thereupon says he could not say how he learned that at the time of the attack lam yâkun al-nâdür bi ʿl-hurûd—which can only mean "the watchman was not in the tower".

Corroboration and clarification of the primary sense of nâdür are to be found in the Valencian Vocabulista in arabico (ed. C. Schiaparelli, Florence 1871) attributed to Raimon Martî and dating from the second half of the 13th century. There the term is translated by the Latin speculator and glossed as qui custodit portum (p. 586). Mis-translated by Dozy (loc. cit.), the gloss means not "the man who keeps watch on a gate" ("l’homme qui fait le guet sur une porte"), but "the man who watches over a port". As a synonym, the Vocabulista (loc. cit.) offers fa‘ā‘ū, pl. fa‘ā‘ū̀lî, fa‘ā‘ū̀lî, lit. "man who goes up", sc. into a high place, tower or the like.

Two composite place-names in which al-nâdür is the second element are to be found in a source earlier than those so far cited, viz. Idríssî, Maghrib (5th/12th century). Of these, one is Tarâf al-Nâzûr (op. cit., 193/235), identifiable as Santa Pola on the coast of southeastern Spain, some 16 km/10 miles as the crow flies, south of the seaport of Alicante. The other is Hisn al-Nâzûr (ibid., 93/108; cf. Ibn Khalûdûn-de Slane, ii, 55: "Le Nador"), now uninhabitâted, but situated in the Central Maghrib, well inland, on the road from Bigûja [q.v.] to al-Kal‘a [see ʿkal‘at bânî Ṭumâmâd] in a region notorious for the depredations of Arab tribes. In neither of these two cases is the sense of nâdür unequivocal, for there is nothing to indicate whether the referent is the agent or the place of his work. Like the English "look-out" and the Spanish mirador and vigía, each of which is both a noun agentis and a n. loci, the concept of nâdür in a neutral context defies determination. What is required is information such as that offered by one al-Anşârî, the author of an early 15th-century monograph on Ceuta (Sabâa).

Speaking of Ceuta’s formidable defence system as he knew it prior to the Portuguese occupation (1415), al-Anşârî describes the univalled—his term—principal look-out (al-tâlî‘ al-kabir) as "the look-out of Ceuta" (pace Dozy and Engelmann, who misinterpret Pedro de Alcâla’s transliteration and offer al-tâlî‘a as the etymology [C. Esp., 209; for abbrev., see Dozy, Suppl., p. xxii])—is, as in the Vocabulista, synonymous with nâdür, though in the sense of the place rather than that of the person, and, secondly, that, on the face of it, tâlî‘ is thought by the author to be a more literary term than nâdür.

The nature of Ceuta’s al-Nâzûr as known to al-Anşârî is worth detailing if only because it may well be thought to shed some light on the nature of Hisn al-Nâzûr in the Central Maghrib (see above). The watch-tower from which it took its name was not an isolated edifice; it formed just one, albeit the main, part of a true fortress (hîm) with its own enceinte, gates and a large kalîhûra (calahorra) accommodating a mosque within. The sum of its parts, then, constituted a true stronghold, and, since it could function as an independent unit, it was considered a refuge and safeguard against the dangers to which siege or internal upheaval might expose the town of Ceuta on the isthmus. Its main value to the Ceutans, however, lay, in the intelligence it could gather of potential danger from the sea. In the best weather conditions nothing could pass unobserved through or across the Straits of Gibraltar. Consequently, Ceuta’s al-Nâzûr afforded a clear prospect of the coasts of both Spain and northern Morocco. From it an observer could survey the coast of the Rif as far as Badîs [q.v.], and the view of the Andalusian littoral could extend as far as Mâlaga in the east and beyond Tarîfa in the west. It was, so al-Anşârî tells us, built by the Almoravids as a fortress (hîm) "for the benefit of the observer garrisoned in the watch-tower" (la ‘l- ʿnâdür al-nâzûr bi-hi‘ [sc. al-tâlî‘]) and constructed with the help of the Kâdi ʿiyâ‘î [see iyyâ‘ b. mûsâ].

E. Teréz has drawn attention to the existence of a number of place-names both in Spain and Morocco, which, either in whole or in part, derive or can reasonably be supposed to derive from al-nâdür (with the phonetic shift ـ > ض, common in the Muslim West). Thus, in Morocco, only a few kilometres down the coast from the Spanish enclave of Medîlla (Malâla [q.v.]), lie the town and district of what the Spaniards know as Nador, above which rise heights commanding a wide view of land and sea and bearing the Spanish name "Tetas de Nador". On the Atlantic seaboard of Morocco an urban quarter of Larache (al-ʿArâbîgha [q.v.]) in the coastal sector of the town which pushes out towards the lighthouse also takes its name—"al-barrio de Nador"—from the Arabic al-nâdür. From the latter, it may be added, derives also the name of an inland mountain pass, crossed at 1,514 m/4,970 ft. near an old military post
on the post-1956 Route de l’Unité running from Ketama (Kutama) in the north to the city of Fez (Fès).

In Spanish place-names, al-NAZUR has survived, both singly and in compounds, either in barely disguised or in barely disguised sort or another (e.g. Dafiador, Torre del Andador, Garb (e.g. Anador, Castillo Afiador, Anaor) or in less singular and in compounds, either in barely disguised sort or another (e.g. Dafiador, Torre del Andador, Garb (e.g. Anador, Castillo Afiador, Anaor) or in less

In his concept of God, al-Nazzam advocated a rigorous via negativa. He did not therefore develop a tazili theologian, who died between 220/835 and 230/845 while still, as it seems, at the age of 23. He had returned from Marw. He became the first of the philosophers, and enjoyed a wide reputation, partly as a poet and partly as a philosopher. He was a pupil of al-Hudhayl al-Allaf [q.v.], but he succeeded in getting

al-Nazzam's reputation waned rather quickly. He fell victim to his own wit and imagination; some of his ideas were regarded as wild, and even al-Djahiz rejected them. He had built his theology on a broad speculative basis of natural philosophy which was more elaborate than and differed from that of Abu ’l-Hudhayl. Abu ’l-Hudhayl had been an atomist; he had regarded bodies as aggregates of juxtaposed, isolated particles which are held together merely by God's omnipotence. Al-Nazzam, on the contrary, thought that the elements which make up the body permeate each other and may be either visible at its surface or hidden in its interior [see KUMUN]. God created them all at once; when bodies undergo a change they do normally not add on a new accident but rather bring a hitherto hidden component to the surface. Change is therefore not abrupt, but slow and imperceptible. The only accident which al-Nazzam acknowledged was movement, here the translation from rest to abrupt, even rest, though results from an inherent force (’itmâl) which may be interpreted as movement without locomotion and which sets the body in motion once all obstacles are removed. Movement has a wider range than locomotion, anyway; it comprises “all actions depending on man’s will: Praying and fasting, acts of willing, knowing and ignorance, speech and silence (s), etc.”. Al-Nazzam thus makes a sharp difference between the realm of man, which is dominated by free will, and the realm of nature where everything acts and reacts bi-idgdâ al-ikhïla, i.e. according to an inherent mechanical impetus which was added to it by creation. His idea of locomotion, however, was affected by his rejection of atomism. If a finite distance cannot be subdivided into an infinite number of fractions but is subject to infinite divisibility, locomotion has to include a leap (tâfâ) since not every imaginable point on the surface on which it proceeds can be touched. This concept which, as many of his other ideas, was suggested to al-Nazzám by speculations prepared in Asiatic Hellenism did not catch on in Islam; it was rejected by the theologians (muktâlibîmân) as well as by philosophers like Ibn Sînå.

For al-Nazzám, this outline of physical theory was, in spite of very elaborate discussion, not a purpose in itself but part of his theology. He shared a good number of the aforementioned axioms with Iranian dualism, especially with Manichean opponents whom he used to attack, but he differed from them in assuming that the ingredients contained in the physical bodies were not a fixed number but subject to an independent force which brings them together, in spite of their diversity and opposition, namely God. Therefore he called the element which guarantees the identity of acting bodies ihkîla and not only tabîna “nature”. In the same way, it is God who is responsible for good and bad effects in the things He has created. His omnipotence only stops in front of man’s free will. But even man’s ability of choosing between the good and evil is only a result of an enforced mixture between his body and his “soul” or “spirit” (nûh) which is a “body”, i.e. a material entity, too. For if the spirit were left alone it would only perform the good; it is merely through the integration into the body which acts as a harm (dâd) to it that it discovers the possibility of evil and is able to do it. Permeation imparts the evil to man only when it penetrates the soul, but the soul, for its part, invaded by “bodies” perceived by the senses, e.g. sounds contained in the air. The soul therefore serves as a sensus communis. It is not located at a specific place, e.g. in the heart; it has rather to be equated with life which is “interlaced” with all limbs. Life guarantees capability of acting (sitîsâ), but during the actual performance man has to take into account the dhâlika of the object which is affected by it, for instance by processing the weight of the body and the “movability” of a stone when throwing it.

The act of knowing is a “movement”, too; as an accident it has no permanence. But it may lead to rest; this is why al-Nazzám defined truth as “quantiﬁcity of the heart” (zânâl al-kalb). His criterion of truth was the absence of a tradition of multiple attestation (khabar al-wdhid) where a person pronouncing it. Therefore an isolated saying of the Prophet (khabar al-wdhid) may well be true, whereas a tradition of multiple attestation (mutawâdir [q.v.]) may be false if external criteria prove it to be so. Man should argue on the basis of free idghdâ; even the fatwa) reported from the Companions are not binding. Al-Nazzâm showed that they contradict each other; the material he collected was later on especially appreciated by Shi’î writers.

In his concept of God, al-Nazzâm advocated a rigorous via negativa. He did not therefore develop a
doctrine of attributes as elaborate as that of his uncle Abu 'l-Hudhayl; he devoted closer examination only to God's will and power, in connection with the problem of theodicy. He limited God's omnipotence by saying that He not only avoids doing evil but is not even capable of it. In spite of that, God is just and good not out of necessity but by free choice; His power still extends to unlimited possibilities, the only restriction being that all of them would be equally good for man, a benefit (lutf) of the same magnitude as the one realised in creation. God always does what is most fitting (aslah), but there is an infinite number of alternatives. His power is on line with His always being most perfect. The miracles He produces serve to prove the veracity of His prophets. In the case of Muḥammad, this was not achieved through the rhetorical insuperability of the Kurʾān but through the predictions contained in it. Muḥammad's pagan adversaries were not permanently incapable of producing anything linguistically comparable to His revelations, but temporarily "averted" from using their rhetorical and poetical skill (sarfa).

Al-Nazzām's works are lost except for a few fragments. Most of them come from his K. al-Nakṭ (see J. van Ess, Das Kitāb an-Nakṭ des Nazzām und seine Rezeption im Kitāb al-Futūḥ des Ḥāfiẓ, Göttingen 1972; another ca. 35 fragments are now found in Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's Maṣāḥīḥ fi ʿilm usūl al-fikr, ed. Tāhā Ḥāfūẓ Fāyūzī al-Ålāwī, Riḍād 1399-1400/1980-81, ii/1, 438 ff.). Others belong to his K. al-Ṭafra, his K. al-Lūʿaṣ, possibly his K. al-Radd ʿalā ṣaḥīḥ al-tūḥayn, and to a treatise in which he criticised the ṣaḥīḥ al-badīḥ (see J. van Ess, Ein unbekanntes Fragment des Nazzām, in Der Orient in der Forschung, Festschrift O. Spies, 170 ff.).